# LIMITED PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

# Perkasie Borough Police Pension Plan

Bucks County, Pennsylvania
For the Period
January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018

January 2020



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 Borough Council Perkasie Borough Bucks County Perkasie, PA 18944

We conducted a Limited Procedures Engagement (LPE) of the Perkasie Borough Police Pension Plan for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018 to determine its compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. We also evaluated compliance with some requirements subsequent to that period when possible. The LPE was conducted pursuant to authority derived from Section 402(j) of the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act (P.L. 1005, No. 205, as amended, 53 P.S. § 895.101 et seq.) but was not conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. 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. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis to support our LPE results.

#### Our LPE was limited to determining the following:

- · 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 engagement period.
- 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.
- Whether annual employee contributions were required during the engagement period and, if so, were calculated, deducted, and deposited into the pension plan in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by testing total members' contributions on an annual basis using the rates obtained from the plan's governing document in effect for all years within the engagement period and examining documents evidencing the deposit of these employee contributions into the pension plan.

- Whether retirement benefits calculated for plan members who retired during the engagement 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 retired individuals and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined and actually paid to recipients.
- · Whether the January 1, 2015 and January 1, 2017 actuarial valuation reports were prepared and submitted by March 31, 2016 and 2018, 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.

Based on the results of our procedures performed during our LPE, nothing came to our attention indicating that the Perkasie Borough Police Pension Plan was not being administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies, except as noted in the following finding further discussed later in this report:

Finding – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Underpayment Of State Aid

Our determination to perform a LPE for this engagement period does not preclude the Department from conducting an audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* of the pension plan in subsequent periods. The borough should continue to maintain documentation related to this pension plan.

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.

The contents of this report were discussed with officials of Perkasie Borough and, where appropriate, their responses have been included in this report.

January 10, 2020

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE

Eugnat: O-Pagur

Auditor General

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Finding And Recommendation:	
Finding – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Underpayment Of State Aid	1
Supplementary Information	3
Report Distribution List	10

# PERKASIE BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

# <u>Finding – Incorrect Data On Certification Form AG 385 Resulting In An Underpayment Of State Aid</u>

<u>Condition</u>: The borough failed to certify an eligible police officer (2 units) on the Certification Form AG 385 filed in 2016, 2017 and 2018 and understated payroll by \$38,129 on the Certification Form AG 385 filed in 2018. The data contained on these certification forms is based on prior calendar year information.

<u>Criteria</u>: Pursuant to Act 205, at Section 402(e)(2), an employee who has been employed on a full-time basis for at least six consecutive months and has been participating in a pension plan during the certification year is eligible for certification.

In addition, Section 4.4(a) of Article IV of the separately executed plan agreement with the plan custodian, states:

Any member who enters the uniformed service as defined by USERRA and returns to service as a Member within the authorized time period of the law, shall have the authorized time spent in such service credited to the Member's employment record for pension or retirement benefits if the Member makes the required member contributions.

Therefore, it is the policy of the department to allow municipalities to certify police officers on intervening military service.

<u>Cause</u>: Plan officials were unaware that active members of the plan serving on qualified military duty were eligible for certification.

<u>Effect</u>: The data submitted on these certification forms is used, in part, to calculate the state aid due to the municipality for distribution to its pension plans. Because the borough's state aid allocations were based on unit value, the borough received a total underpayment of state aid as identified below:

Year	Units Understated	Unit Value			tate Aid erpayment
2016	2	\$	4,375	\$	8,750
2017	2		4,588		9,176
2018	2		4,684		9,368
Total Underpayment of State Aid					27,294

# PERKASIE BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

#### **Finding – (Continued)**

Although the borough will be reimbursed for the underpayment of state aid due to the borough's certification errors, the full amount of the 2016, 2017 and 2018 state aid allocations were not available to be deposited timely and therefore were not available to pay operating expenses or for investment. It was also noted that a similar effect resulted from the years 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 and went undetected during the course of our prior engagement. This prior information was forwarded to the Department of the Auditor General, Municipal Pension & Fire Relief Programs Unit, accordingly, for those years.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We recommend that in the future, plan officials implement adequate internal control procedures, such as having at least two people review the data certified, to ensure compliance with the instructions that accompany Certification Form AG 385 and the plan's governing document to assist them in accurately reporting the required pension data.

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

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: Compliance with the finding will be subject to verification through our next plan engagement.

The supplementary information contained on Pages 3 through 6 reflects the implementation of GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*. The objective of this statement is to improve financial reporting by state and local governmental pension plans.

### SCHEDULE OF CHANGES IN THE NET PENSION LIABILITY AND RELATED RATIOS FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014 AND 2015

		<u>2014</u>		<u>2015</u>
Total Pension Liability				
Service cost	\$	323,097	\$	323,317
Interest		472,170		515,326
Difference between expected and actual experience		233,498		-
Changes of assumptions		-		21,989
Benefit payments, including refunds of member				
contributions	-	(244,170)		(244,504)
Net Change in Total Pension Liability		784,595		616,128
Total Pension Liability – Beginning		8,382,261		9,166,856
Total Pension Liability – Ending (a)	\$	9,166,856	\$	9,782,984
Plan Fiduciary Net Position				
Contributions – employer	\$	156,704	\$	204,552
Contributions – member		86,667		86,836
Net investment income		455,674		(24,638)
Benefit payments, including refunds of member				
contributions		(244,170)		(244,504)
Administrative expense	-	(18,100)		(20,027)
Net Change in Plan Fiduciary Net Position		436,775		2,219
Plan Fiduciary Net Position – Beginning		8,304,154		8,740,929
Plan Fiduciary Net Position – Ending (b)	\$	8,740,929	\$	8,743,148
Net Pension Liability – Ending (a-b)	\$	425,927	\$	1,039,836
The Tension Elacinity Bland (a c)	Ψ	123,721	Ψ	1,037,030
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the Total				
Pension Liability		95.35%		89.37%
Estimated Covered Employee Payroll	\$	1,747,282	\$	1,740,255
Net Pension Liability as a Percentage of Covered				
Employee Payroll		24.38%		59.75%
- · ·				

## SCHEDULE OF CHANGES IN THE NET PENSION LIABILITY AND RELATED RATIOS FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2016, 2017 AND 2018

		<u>2016</u>		<u>2017</u>		<u>2018</u>
Total Pension Liability						
Service cost	\$	266,269	\$	334,112	\$	339,613
Interest		546,196		582,863		610,722
Difference between expected and actual experience		267,812		-		549,715
Changes of assumptions		356,959		-		-
Benefit payments, including refunds of member						
contributions		(240,039)		(429,773)		(352,912)
Net Change in Total Pension Liability		1,197,197		487,202		1,147,138
Total Pension Liability – Beginning		9,782,984	1	10,980,181	1	1,467,383
Total Pension Liability – Ending (a)	\$ 1	0,980,181	\$ 1	11,467,383	\$ 1	2,614,521
Plan Fiduciary Net Position						
Contributions – employer	\$	195,291	\$	243,719	\$	254,236
Contributions – member		86,191		96,105		117,410
Net investment income		734,848		1,609,132		(444,933)
Benefit payments, including refunds of member						
contributions		(240,039)		(429,773)		(352,912)
Administrative expense		(25,600)		(23,801)		(24,669)
Net Change in Plan Fiduciary Net Position		750,691		1,495,382		(450,868)
Plan Fiduciary Net Position – Beginning		8,743,148		9,493,839	1	0,989,221
Plan Fiduciary Net Position – Ending (b)	\$	9,493,839	\$ 1	10,989,221	\$ 1	0,538,353
Net Pension Liability – Ending (a-b)	\$	1,486,342	\$	478,162	\$	2,076,168
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the						
Total Pension Liability		86.46%		95.83%		83.54%
·						
Estimated Covered Employee Payroll	\$	1,723,828	\$	1,999,600	\$	2,032,523
Not Dension Lightlitry on a Densentant of Comment						
Net Pension Liability as a Percentage of Covered		86.22%		23.91%		102.15%
Employee Payroll		8U.ZZ%		23.91%		102.13%

#### Sensitivity Of The Net Pension Liability To Changes In The Discount Rate

The following presents the net pension liability of the borough as of December 31, 2014 and 2015, calculated using the discount rate of 5.50%, as well as what the borough's net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1 percentage-point lower or 1 percentage-point higher than the current rate:

	1% Decrease (4.5%)	Current Discount Rate (5.5%)	1% Increase (6.5%)	
Net Pension Liability – 12/31/14	\$ 1,736,116	\$ 425,927	\$ (662,495)	
Net Pension Liability – 12/31/15	\$ 2,446,288	\$ 1,039,836	\$ (121,918)	

In addition, the following presents the net pension liability of the borough as of December 31, 2016, 2017 and 2018, calculated using the discount rate of 5.25%, as well as what the borough's net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1 percentage-point lower or 1 percentage-point higher than the current rate:

	1% l	% Increase (6.25%)			
Net Pension Liability – 12/31/16	\$ 3	,103,163	\$ 1,486,342	\$	155,441
Net Pension Liability – 12/31/17	\$ 2	,166,723	\$ 478,162	\$	(911,793)
Net Pension Liability – 12/31/18	\$ 3	,902,959	\$ 2,076,168	\$	566,746

# SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Year Ended December 31	Actuarially Determined Contribution	Actual Contributions	Contribution Deficiency (Excess)	Covered- Employee Payroll	Contributions as a Percentage of Covered- Employee Payroll
2014	\$ 152,533	\$ 156,704	\$ (4,171)	\$1,747,282	8.97%
2015 2016	204,552 195,271	204,552 195,291	(20)	1,740,255 1,723,828	11.75% 11.33%
2017	243,679	243,719	(40)	1,999,600	12.19%
2018	254,236	254,236	-	2,032,523	12.51%

#### 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, 2013, is as follows:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			Unfunded	
		Actuarial	(Assets in	
		Accrued	Excess of)	
	Actuarial	Liability	Actuarial	
Actuarial	Value of	(AAL) -	Accrued	Funded
Valuation	Assets	Entry Age	Liability	Ratio
Date	(a)	(b)	(b) - (a)	(a)/(b)
01-01-13	\$ 8,094,236	\$ 7,864,546	\$ (229,690)	102.9%
01-01-15	8,921,853	9,166,856	245,003	97.3%
01-01-17	10,152,613	10,980,181	827,568	92.5%

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.

### PERKASIE BOROUGH 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, 2017

Actuarial cost method Entry age normal

Amortization method Level dollar

Remaining amortization period 11 years

Asset valuation method The Actuarial Value of Assets equals the plan's

member, municipal, DROP (if applicable) reserve accounts plus the retiree actuarial liability. This asset smoothing is based on the unique legislative structure of PMRS and the administrative rules adopted by the PMRS Board in conjunction with Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement Law, all of which are subject to comply with the Actuarial Standards of Practice No. 44, Selection and Use of Asset Valuation Methods when defining the actuarial

Value of Assets.

Actuarial assumptions:

Investment rate of return 5.25%, compounded annually, net of

investment and administration expenses.

Salary scale Total rate (including inflation) (e.g. age 25 –

7.05%; age 35 - 4.55%; age 45 - 3.97%;

age 55 - 3.44%; age 65 - 2.80%).

Cost-of-living adjustments 2.8% per year, subject to plan limitations.

# PERKASIE BOROUGH 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 John Hollenbach Mayor

> Mr. James Ryder Council President

Mr. James E. Purcell Council Vice President

Mr. Matthew Aigeldinger Councilman

Mr. Steven F. Pizzollo Councilman

Mr. Chuck Brooks
Councilman

Mr. Steve Rose
Councilman

Mr. Aaron Clark Councilman

Mr. Scott Bomboy
Councilman

Mr. Randy Faulkner
Councilman

Ms. Andrea Coaxum Borough Manager

# PERKASIE BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

# **Mr. Glenn Dickerson** Finance Director

### Ms. Charity Rosenberry, CPA

Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at <a href="www.PaAuditor.gov">www.PaAuditor.gov</a>. 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.