

# COMPLIANCE AUDIT

---

## City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania For the Period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2014

---

March 2016



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Department of the Auditor General

Eugene A. DePasquale • Auditor General



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Department of the Auditor General  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0018  
Facebook: Pennsylvania Auditor General  
Twitter: @PAAuditorGen  
www.PaAuditor.gov

EUGENE A. DePASQUALE  
AUDITOR GENERAL

The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
City of Lower Burrell  
Westmoreland County  
Lower Burrell, PA 15068

We have conducted a compliance audit of the City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan for the period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2014. We also evaluated compliance with some requirements subsequent to that period when possible. The audit was conducted pursuant to authority derived from Section 402(j) of Act 205 and in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The objectives of the audit were:

1. To determine if municipal officials took appropriate corrective action to address the finding contained in our prior audit report; and
2. To determine if the pension plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies.

Our audit was limited to the areas related to the objectives identified above. To determine if municipal officials took appropriate corrective action to address the finding contained in our prior audit report, we inquired of plan officials and evaluated supporting documentation provided by officials evidencing that the suggested corrective action has been appropriately taken. To determine whether the pension plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies, our methodology included the following:

- × We determined whether state aid was properly determined and deposited in accordance with Act 205 requirements by verifying the annual deposit date of state aid and determining whether deposits were made within 30 days of receipt for all years within the period under audit.

- × We determined whether annual employer contributions were calculated and deposited in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by examining the municipality's calculation of the plan's annual financial requirements and minimum municipal obligation (MMO) and comparing these calculated amounts to amounts actually budgeted and deposited into the pension plan as evidenced by supporting documentation.
- × We determined whether annual employee contributions were calculated, deducted, and deposited into the pension plan in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by testing members' contributions on an annual basis using the rates obtained from the plan's governing document in effect for all years within the period under audit and examining documents evidencing the deposit of these employee contributions into the pension plan.
- × We determined whether retirement benefits calculated for the 2 plan members who retired during the current audit period represent payments to all (and only) those entitled to receive them and were properly determined and disbursed in accordance with the plan's governing document, applicable laws and regulations by recalculating the amount of the monthly pension benefit due to the retired individuals and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined and actually paid to the recipients. We also determined whether retirement benefits calculated for the plan member who elected to vest during the current audit period represent payments to all (and only) those entitled to receive them and were properly determined in accordance with the plan's governing document, applicable laws and regulations by recalculating the amount of the pension benefit due and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined.
- × We determined whether the January 1, 2011 and January 1, 2013 actuarial valuation reports were prepared and submitted to the Public Employee Retirement Commission (PERC) by March 31, 2012 and 2014, respectively, in accordance with Act 205 and whether selected information provided on these reports is accurate, complete, and in accordance with plan provisions to ensure compliance for participation in the state aid program by comparing selected information to supporting source documentation.
- × We determined whether all annual special ad hoc postretirement reimbursements received by the municipality were authorized and appropriately deposited in accordance with Act 147 by tracing information to supporting documentation maintained by plan officials.
- × We determined whether transfers were properly authorized, timely, and appropriately recorded by plan officials by examining supporting documentation for all of the transfers made during the audit period.

- × We determined whether provisions of the Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP) were in accordance with the provisions of Act 205 by examining provisions stated in the plan's governing documents.

City officials are responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls to provide reasonable assurance that the City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan is administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. In conducting our audit, we obtained an understanding of the city's internal controls as they relate to the city's compliance with those requirements and that we considered to be significant within the context of our audit objectives, and assessed whether those significant controls were properly designed and implemented. Additionally and as previously described, we tested transactions, assessed official actions, performed analytical procedures, and interviewed selected officials to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance with legal and regulatory requirements or noncompliance with provisions of contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies that are significant within the context of the audit objectives.

The results of our procedures indicated that, in all significant respects, the City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies, except as noted in the following findings further discussed later in this report:

- Finding No. 1 – Partial Compliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Properly Pay Killed In Service Benefit
- Finding No. 2 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Overpayment Of State Aid
- Finding No. 3 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 64 Resulting In An Excess Reimbursement For Special 2002 Ad Hoc Postretirement Adjustment

Finding No. 1 contained in this audit report repeats a condition that was cited in our previous audit report that has not been corrected by city officials. We are concerned by the city's failure to correct this previously reported audit finding and strongly encourage timely implementation of the recommendation noted in this audit report.

The accompanying supplementary information is presented for purposes of additional analysis. We did not audit the information or conclude on it and, accordingly, express no form of assurance on it. However, **we are extremely concerned about the funded status of the plan contained in the schedule of funding progress included in this report which indicates the plan's funded ratio is 64.4% as of January 1, 2013**, which is the most recent data available. We encourage city officials to monitor the funding of the police pension plan to ensure its long-term financial stability.

The contents of this report were discussed with officials of the City of Lower Burrell and, where appropriate, their responses have been included in the report. We would like to thank city officials for the cooperation extended to us during the conduct of the audit.

February 25, 2016



EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE  
Auditor General

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Background.....	1
Status of Prior Finding.....	3
Findings and Recommendations:	
Finding No. 1 – Partial Compliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Properly Pay Killed In Service Benefit.....	4
Finding No. 2 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Overpayment Of State Aid.....	9
Finding No. 3 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 64 Resulting In An Excess Reimbursement For Special 2002 Ad Hoc Postretirement Adjustment ....	10
Potential Withhold of State Aid.....	12
Supplementary Information .....	13
Report Distribution List .....	17

## BACKGROUND

On December 18, 1984, the Pennsylvania Legislature adopted the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act (P.L. 1005, No. 205, as amended, 53 P.S. § 895.101 et seq.). The act established mandatory actuarial reporting and funding requirements and a uniform basis for the distribution of state aid to Pennsylvania's public pension plans. Section 402(j) of Act 205 specifically requires the Auditor General, as deemed necessary, to make an audit of every municipality which receives general municipal pension system state aid and of every municipal pension plan and fund in which general municipal pension system state aid is deposited.

Annual state aid allocations are provided from a 2 percent foreign (out-of-state) casualty insurance premium tax, a portion of the foreign (out-of-state) fire insurance tax designated for paid firefighters and any investment income earned on the collection of these taxes. Generally, municipal pension plans established prior to December 18, 1984, are eligible for state aid. For municipal pension plans established after that date, the sponsoring municipality must fund the plan for three plan years before it becomes eligible for state aid. In accordance with Act 205, a municipality's annual state aid allocation cannot exceed its actual pension costs.

In addition to Act 205, the City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan is also governed by implementing regulations adopted by the Public Employee Retirement Commission published at Title 16, Part IV of the Pennsylvania Code and applicable provisions of various other state statutes including, but not limited to, the following:

Act 317 - The Third Class City Code, Act of June 23, 1931 (P.L. 932, No. 317), as amended, 53 P.S. § 35101 et seq.

The City of Lower Burrell Police Pension Plan is a single-employer defined benefit pension plan locally controlled by the provisions of Ordinance No. 7-2011, as amended, adopted pursuant to Act 317. The plan is also affected by the provisions of collective bargaining agreements between the city and its police officers. The plan was established May 19, 1961. Active members are required to contribute 5 percent of compensation, plus \$1 per month for the service increment benefit. As of December 31, 2014, the plan had 15 active members, 1 terminated member eligible for vested benefits in the future, and 17 retirees receiving pension benefits from the plan.

## **BACKGROUND – (Continued)**

As of December 31, 2014, selected plan benefit provisions are as follows:

### Eligibility Requirements:

Normal Retirement    Age 50 and 20 years of service.

Vesting                    A member is 100% vested after 12 years of service.

### Retirement Benefit:

Benefit equals 50% of compensation, plus a service increment of 2.5% of the basic normal retirement benefit for each year of service in excess of 20 years (but not greater than \$100 per month).

### Survivor Benefit:

Before Retirement Eligibility    Refund of member contributions.

After Retirement Eligibility    A monthly benefit equal to 100% of the pension the member was receiving or was entitled to receive on the day of the member's death.

### Service Related Disability Benefit:

Benefit equals 50% of the member's salary at the time the disability was incurred, offset by Social Security disability benefits received for the same injury.

### Non-Service Related Disability Benefit:

If less than 10 years of service, 25% of the member's annual compensation, if more than 10 years of service, 50% of the member's annual compensation.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
STATUS OF PRIOR FINDING

Partial Compliance With Prior Audit Recommendation

The City of Lower Burrell has partially complied with the prior audit recommendation concerning the following:

- Failure To Properly Pay Killed In Service Benefit

Municipal officials provided documentation that they contacted appropriate representatives of the Commonwealth to ensure that the deceased police officer's surviving spouse is receiving the mandated killed in service benefits due pursuant to Act 51 provisions; however, municipal officials have failed to reinstate a killed in service benefit provision as required by the Third Class City Code, as further discussed in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 1 – Partial Compliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Properly Pay Killed In Service Benefit**

Condition: As disclosed in our prior audit report, municipal officials were required to work with representatives of the Commonwealth to ensure that the deceased officer’s surviving spouse receives, both currently and prospectively, the mandated killed in service benefits due pursuant to Act 51 provisions. Furthermore, it was recommended that the city should reinstate a killed in service benefit provision to ensure the plan is in compliance with the Third Class City Code. During the current audit period, municipal officials worked with appropriate representatives of the Commonwealth to ensure that the proper benefits due are being paid; however, the pension plan’s governing document, Ordinance No. 7-2011, does not contain a provision for a killed in service benefit, as required by the Third Class City Code.

Criteria: Section 4301 of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

Cities shall establish, by ordinance, a police pension fund... to be maintained by an equal and proportionate monthly charge against each member of the police force, which shall not exceed annually four per centum of the pay of such member and an additional amount not to exceed one per centum of the pay of such member to be paid by such member or the municipal corporation to provide sufficient funds for payments required by subsection (d) of section 4303 to surviving spouses even if they remarry, or if no spouse survives or if such person survives and subsequently dies, then to the child or children under the age of eighteen years, of members of the police force or of members retired on pension or who die in service... [Emphasis added.]

Furthermore, Section 4303(a) of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

The basis of the apportionment of the pension shall be determined by the rate of the monthly pay of the member at the date of injury, death, honorable discharge, vesting under section 4302.1 or retirement, or the highest average annual salary which the member received during any five years of service preceding injury, death, honorable discharge, vesting under section 4302.1 or retirement, whichever is the higher. [Emphasis added.]

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 1 – (Continued)**

In addition, Section 4303(c) of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

The spouse of a member of the police force or a member who retires on pension who dies or if no spouse survives or if such person survives and subsequently dies or remarries, then the child or children under the age of eighteen years of a member of the police force or a member who retires on pension who dies on or after the effective date of this amendment, shall, during the lifetime of the surviving spouse, even if the surviving spouse remarries, or until reaching the age of eighteen years in the case of a child or children, be entitled to receive a pension calculated at the rate of fifty per centum of the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving had he been retired at the time of his death and may receive the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving had he been retired at the time of his death.

Finally, Section 4308 of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

In the event of the death of a member of the police force not in the line of service before the member becomes entitled to the pension aforesaid and such member is not survived by a spouse or family entitled to payments as hereinbefore provided, the total amount of contributions paid into the pension fund by the member shall be paid over to his estate. [Emphasis added.]

Based on these sections of the Third Class City Code taken as a whole, the Department has concluded that the Code mandates the provision of a benefit for survivors of police officers killed in service.

Cause: Plan officials maintain that the city was authorized to remove the plan's killed in service benefit due to the passage of Act 51 of 2009.

Effect: The failure to provide a killed in service benefit could result in a potential unrecognized liability to the plan or deny plan members benefits to which they are statutorily entitled.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 1 – (Continued)**

Recommendation: We again recommend that city officials review the plan’s governing document and take appropriate action to ensure compliance with the Third Class City Code.

Management’s Response: The Finding acknowledges the applicability of Act 51 of 2009 and the Commonwealth’s obligation to pay killed in service benefits. The City is in full agreement that Act 51 benefits apply to this situation, but respectfully disagrees with other important components of the Department’s analysis.

Fundamentally, the Finding is premised upon a strained interpretation of the Third Class City Code. Specifically, “the Department has concluded that the Code mandates the provision of a benefit for survivors of police officers killed in service.” Killed in service benefits are prescribed simply and clearly in Act 600 (as they are in 53 P.S. § 891). Despite the General Assembly’s clear prescription in other instances, the Third Class City Code is essentially silent on the subject of “killed in service” benefits. “It is a principle of statutory construction that when the legislature adopts a statute it must be presumed that it does so with full knowledge of existing statutes relating to the same subject.” Seliga v. SERS, 682 A.2d 77, 79 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996) (citations omitted); *see also* Gault v. PSERS, 720 A.2d 1090, 1094 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1998) (interpreting Seliga to mean: “where a statute contains a particular provision, the omission of that provision in the enactment of a similar section is significant to show a different intention.”).

The provisions of the Third Class City Code identified in the Finding are more easily understood and accurately interpreted to mean that an officer who otherwise has a sufficient pension right will not have that benefit extinguished by reason of death. Indeed, the most applicable provision (prescribing the survivor benefit) says that the survivor(s) “shall . . . be entitled to receive a pension calculated at the rate of fifty per centum of the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving **had he been retired at the time of his death** and may receive the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving **had he been retired at the time of his death.**” 53 P.S. § 39303(c) (emphasis supplied).

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 1 – (Continued)**

The General Assembly's failure to identify and specifically provide a killed in service benefit in the Third Class City Code is critical on two levels. First, it points decidedly away from the Department's interpretation of the Third Class City Code in the Finding. Second, it explains the General Assembly's lack of repeal of any provision in the Third Class City Code. On this point, Act 51 specifically repealed the killed in service benefit (53 P.S. § 771(e)(2)) provided through Act 600. This begs the critical question in reaching a proper interpretation of Act 51. Since (as the Department acknowledges) Act 51 provides for benefits when an officer in a Third Class City (or any municipality) is killed in service, why is there no repeal of a killed in service benefit under the Third Class City Code? There is only one answer that makes sense - the Third Class City Code does not contain a killed in service benefit in the first instance. This answer fits with the plain language and clear intent of the General Assembly. Certainly, Act 51 is aimed at ensuring a full and uniform killed in service benefit to survivors. There is no indication, and it is difficult to imagine any, that the General Assembly intended to establish differential treatment depending upon whether an officer was employed in a borough or township as compared to a third class city. Unfortunately, the Department's interpretation would result in just that type of effect. The City, therefore, requests that the Department reconsider its initial analysis and an interpretation that would have the payment of benefits (and the financial viability of a police pension plan in a third class city) hinge upon the time that it took to repeal a benefit not provided for in the first place. The General Assembly neither provided nor intended such a result through its legislative enactments.

The set off language in Section 1(d) applies to "any worker's compensation or pension or retirement benefits *paid* to such survivors." Use of the word "paid" is significant. In other set-off provisions, the General Assembly has not hesitated to broaden the reach of a set-off where it so intended. For instance, in the tort context, municipalities enjoy a set-off "if a claimant receives **or is entitled to receive** benefits from a policy of insurance . . ." 42 Pa.C.S. § 8553(d) (emphasis supplied). There are numerous other examples. *See, e.g.* 75 P.S. § 1720 (subrogation rights limited where benefits "paid or payable" per another insurance contract or program). To this end, the monthly benefits payable to the widow are reduced by the worker's compensation paid. If, however, she had chosen not to apply for or receive worker's compensation benefits the set-off would not apply under Act 51. So too, there is no applicable set-off here because pension or retirement benefits have not been paid. The City has complied with the plain language and import of Act 51.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 1 – (Continued)**

Regarding the city no longer providing a killed in service benefit, city officials believe that the plan's governing document and the actuarial data provided to the pension plan's actuary are in compliance with Act 317. For the reasons set forth above, city officials maintain that the General Assembly through Act 51 provides that benefits are to be paid by the Commonwealth when a municipal police officer is killed in service. The Department's interpretation would thwart the plain intent of the General Assembly and the clear import of Act 51. Moreover, the Department's approach would subject Third Class cities and the members of the police pension plan (having already been put in the position of dealing with the tragic loss of an officer) to inequitable and significant financial burdens not required of other municipalities.

Auditor's Conclusion: As previously cited, it is the position of the Department that the Third Class City Code mandates a benefit for survivors of police officers killed in service. Therefore, based on the Criteria previously stated, the city should reinstate a killed in service benefit provision to ensure the plan is in compliance with the Third Class City Code.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 2 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Overpayment Of State Aid**

Condition: The city certified 1 ineligible police officer (2 units) and certified 1 ineligible non-uniformed employee (1 unit) on the Certification Form AG 385 filed in 2014. The data contained on this certification form is based on prior calendar year information.

Criteria: Pursuant to Act 205, at Section 402(e)(2), in order to be eligible for certification, an employee must have been employed on a full-time basis for at least six consecutive months and must have been participating in a pension plan during the certification year.

Cause: Plan officials failed to establish adequate internal control procedures to ensure the accuracy of the data certified.

Effect: The data submitted on this certification form is used, in part, to calculate the state aid due to the municipality for distribution to its pension plans. Because the city’s state aid allocation was based on unit value, the incorrect certification of pension data affected the city’s state aid allocation, as identified below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Type Of Plan</u>	<u>Units Overstated</u>	<u>Unit Value</u>	<u>State Aid Overpayment</u>
2014	Police	2	\$3,873	\$ 7,746
2014	Non-Uniformed	1	\$3,873	<u>\$ 3,873</u>
Total Overpayment of State Aid				<u>\$ 11,619</u>

In addition, the city used the overpayment of state aid to pay the minimum municipal obligation (MMO) due to the police pension plan; therefore, if the reimbursement to the Commonwealth is made from the pension plan, the plan’s MMO will not be fully paid.

Furthermore, the city’s future state aid allocations may be withheld until the finding recommendation is complied with.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 2 – (Continued)**

Recommendation: We recommend that the total excess state aid, in the amount of \$11,619, be returned to the Commonwealth from the city's general fund. A check in this amount, with interest compounded annually from date of receipt to date of repayment, at a rate earned by the pension plan, should be made payable to: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and mailed to: Department of the Auditor General, Municipal Pension & Fire Relief Programs Unit, 320 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120. A copy of the interest calculation must be submitted along with the check.

Management's Response: Municipal officials agreed with the finding without exception.

Auditor's Conclusion: Compliance will be evaluated subsequent to the release of the audit report and during our next audit of the plan.

**Finding No. 3 – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 64 Resulting In An Excess Reimbursement For Special 2002 Ad Hoc Postretirement Adjustment**

Condition: The city overstated the total non-employee contributions made to all pension plans on the Certification Form AG 64 filed for 2015.

Criteria: Section 502.1(a)(2) of Act 147 states, in part:

The determination of the reimbursable amount of the amortization contribution requirement attributable to the special ad hoc postretirement adjustment under Chapter 4 in any year shall be calculated as the amortization contribution requirement attributable to the special ad hoc postretirement adjustments under Chapter 4 and reflected in the determination of the financial requirements of the pension plan under Chapter 3 of the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act for the immediate prior year less the product of that amortization contribution requirement multiplied by the ratio of the amount of general municipal pension system State aid allocated to the retirement system in the immediate prior year to the total amount of municipal contributions made to the retirement system from all sources other than employee contributions in the immediate prior year.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding No. 3 – (Continued)**

Cause: Plan officials failed to comply with the instructions that accompany Certification Form AG 64.

Effect: The data submitted on this certification form is used to calculate the reimbursement due the city for ad hoc postretirement adjustments granted pursuant to Chapter 4 of Act 147. The effect of the incorrect certification of pension data on the city’s reimbursement is identified below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Reimbursement Claimed</u>	<u>Reimbursement Due</u>	<u>Excess Reimbursement</u>
2015	\$ 812	\$ 682	\$ 130

Recommendation: We recommend that the total excess reimbursement, in the amount of \$130, be returned to the Commonwealth. A check in this amount, with interest compounded annually from date of receipt to date of repayment, at a rate earned by the pension plan, should be made payable to: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and mailed to: Department of the Auditor General, Municipal Pension & Fire Relief Programs Unit, 320 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120. A copy of the interest calculation must be submitted along with the check.

Management’s Response: Municipal officials agreed with the finding without exception.

Auditor’s Conclusion: Compliance will be evaluated subsequent to the release of the audit report and during our next audit of the plan.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
POTENTIAL WITHHOLD OF STATE AID

Finding No. 2 contained in this audit report cites an overpayment of state aid to the city in the amount of \$11,619. A condition of this nature may lead to a total withholding of state aid in the future unless that finding is corrected. A check in this amount with interest, at a rate earned by the pension plan, should be made payable to: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and mailed to: Department of the Auditor General, Municipal Pension & Fire Relief Programs Unit, 320 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
 (UNAUDITED)

SCHEDULE OF FUNDING PROGRESS

Historical trend information about the plan is presented herewith as supplementary information. It is intended to help users assess the plan's funding status on a going-concern basis, assess progress made in accumulating assets to pay benefits when due, and make comparisons with other state and local government retirement systems.

The actuarial information is required by Act 205 biennially. The historical information, beginning as of January 1, 2009, is as follows:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Actuarial Valuation Date	Actuarial Value of Assets (a)	Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) - Entry Age (b)	Unfunded (Assets in Excess of) Actuarial Accrued Liability (b) - (a)	Funded Ratio (a)/(b)
01-01-09	\$ 4,340,911	\$ 7,607,141	\$ 3,266,230	57.1%
01-01-11	5,393,454	8,344,700	2,951,246	64.6%
01-01-13	5,778,641	8,969,532	3,190,891	64.4%

Note: The market values of the plan's assets at 01-01-09 and 01-01-11 have been adjusted to reflect the smoothing of gains and/or losses over a 5-year averaging period. This method will lower contributions in years of less than expected returns and increase contributions in years of greater than expected returns. The net effect over long periods of time is to have less variance in contribution levels from year to year.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
(UNAUDITED)

The comparability of trend information is affected by changes in actuarial assumptions, benefit provisions, actuarial funding methods, accounting policies, and other changes. Those changes usually affect trends in contribution requirements and in ratios that use the actuarial accrued liability as a factor.

Analysis of the dollar amount of the actuarial value of assets, actuarial accrued liability, and unfunded (assets in excess of) actuarial accrued liability in isolation can be misleading. Expressing the actuarial value of assets as a percentage of the actuarial accrued liability (Column 4) provides one indication of the plan's funding status on a going-concern basis. Analysis of this percentage, over time, indicates whether the system is becoming financially stronger or weaker. Generally, the greater this percentage, the stronger the plan.

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
(UNAUDITED)

SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM EMPLOYER  
AND OTHER CONTRIBUTING ENTITIES

Year Ended December 31	Annual Required Contribution	Percentage Contributed
2009	\$ 415,725	100.0%
2010	416,824	100.0%
2011	432,734	100.0%
2012	418,748	100.0%
2013	509,819	100.0%
2014	501,729	100.0%

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
NOTES TO SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULES  
(UNAUDITED)

The information presented in the supplementary schedules was determined as part of the actuarial valuation at the date indicated. Additional information as of the latest actuarial valuation date follows:

Actuarial valuation date	January 1, 2013
Actuarial cost method	Entry age normal
Amortization method	Level dollar
Remaining amortization period	12 years
Asset valuation method	Market value
Actuarial assumptions:	
Investment rate of return	8.0%
Projected salary increases	5.0%

CITY OF LOWER BURRELL POLICE PENSION PLAN  
REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

This report was initially distributed to the following:

**The Honorable Tom W. Wolf**  
Governor  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

**The Honorable Richard Callender**  
Mayor

**Ms. Kelly Biddle Cook**  
City Clerk

**Mr. Anthony Farina**  
City Controller

**Mr. Brian J. Eshbaugh**  
City Treasurer

**Mr. Chris Koziarski**  
Councilman

**Mr. Joseph Grillo**  
Councilman

**Mr. Christopher Fabry**  
Councilman

**Mr. Frank J. Trozzi, Jr.**  
Councilman

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at [www.PaAuditor.gov](http://www.PaAuditor.gov). Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 229 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: [news@PaAuditor.gov](mailto:news@PaAuditor.gov).