### **COMPLIANCE AUDIT**

## Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan

Delaware County, Pennsylvania For the Period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2019

### March 2021



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General

Timothy L. DeFoor • Auditor General



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

TIMOTHY L. DEFOOR AUDITOR GENERAL

The Honorable Mayor and Borough Council Sharon Hill Borough Delaware County Sharon Hill, PA 19079

We have conducted a compliance audit of the Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2019. We also evaluated compliance with some requirements subsequent to that period when possible. The audit was conducted pursuant to authority derived from the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act (Act 205 of 1984, as amended, 53 P.S. § 895.402(j)), which requires the Auditor General, as deemed necessary, to audit every municipality which receives general municipal pension system state aid and every municipal pension plan and fund in which general municipal pension system state aid is deposited. The audit was not conducted, nor was it required to be, in accordance with Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. We planned and performed the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide 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 findings contained in our prior 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 findings contained in our prior 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 total 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 plan members who retired 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 benefits due to the retired individuals and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined and actually paid to the recipients.
- We determined whether the January 1, 2015, January 1, 2017, and January 1, 2019 actuarial valuation reports were prepared and submitted by March 31, 2016, 2018, and 2020, 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 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.

Borough officials are responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls to provide reasonable assurance that the Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan is administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. As previously described, we tested transactions, interviewed selected officials, and performed procedures to the extent necessary 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 Sharon Hill Borough 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	<ul> <li>Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Pension Benefits Not In Compliance With Act 600 Provisions</li> </ul>
Finding No. 2	<ul> <li>Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Unauthorized Provision For A Killed In Service Benefit</li> </ul>
Finding No. 3	<ul> <li>Failure To Fully Pay The Minimum Municipal Obligation Of The Plan</li> </ul>
Finding No. 4	<ul> <li>Inconsistent Pension Benefits</li> </ul>

Findings No. 1 and 2 contained in this audit report repeat conditions that were cited in our previous report that have not been corrected by borough officials. We are concerned by the borough's failure to correct those previously reported findings and strongly encourage timely implementation of the recommendations noted in this audit report.

As previously noted, one of the objectives of our audit of the Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan was to determine compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. Act 205 was amended on September 18, 2009, through the adoption of Act 44 of 2009. Among several provisions relating to municipal pension plans, the act provides for the implementation of a distress recovery program. Three levels of distress have been established:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Indication</u>	Funding Criteria
I	Minimal distress	70-89%
II	Moderate distress	50-69%
III	Severe distress	Less than 50%

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 67.4% as of January 1, 2019, which is the most recent data available. Based on this information, the Municipal Pension Reporting Program issued a notification that the borough is currently in Level II moderate distress status. We encourage borough 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 Sharon Hill Borough and, where appropriate, their responses have been included in the report.

February 24, 2021

Timothy L. DeFoor
Auditor General

#### CONTENTS

<u>Page</u>
Background 1
Status of Prior Findings
Findings and Recommendations:
Finding No. 1 – Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Pension Benefits Not In Compliance With Act 600 Provisions
Finding No. 2 – Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Unauthorized Provision For A Killed In Service Benefit
Finding No. 3 – Failure To Fully Pay The Minimum Municipal Obligation Of The Plan7
Finding No. 4 – Inconsistent Pension Benefits
Potential Withhold of State Aid
Supplementary Information
Report Distribution List

#### **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.

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 Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan is also governed by implementing regulations 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 600 - Police Pension Fund Act, Act of May 29, 1956 (P.L. 1804, No. 600), as amended, 53 P.S. § 767 et seq.

The Sharon Hill Borough Police Pension Plan is a single-employer defined benefit pension plan locally controlled by the provisions of Resolution No. 275-R, as amended, adopted pursuant to Act 600. The plan is also affected by the provisions of collective bargaining agreements between the borough and its police officers. The plan was established May 1, 1958. Active members are required to contribute 5 percent of compensation to the plan. As of December 31, 2019, the plan had 11 active members, no terminated members eligible for vested benefits in the future, and 9 retirees receiving pension benefits.

### SHARON HILL BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN STATUS OF PRIOR FINDINGS

#### Noncompliance With Prior Recommendations

Sharon Hill Borough has not complied with the prior recommendations concerning the following as further discussed in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report:

- Pension Benefits Not In Compliance With Act 600 Provisions
- · Unauthorized Provision For A Killed In Service Benefit

### <u>Finding No. 1 – Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Pension Benefits Not In</u> <u>Compliance With Act 600 Provisions</u>

Condition: As disclosed in the prior four audit reports, the collective bargaining agreement between the police officers and the borough contains a monthly service increment benefit that conflicts with the pension plan's governing document and is not in compliance with Act 600. Furthermore, the prior audit reports disclosed that two police officers who retired, one after 25 years and 3 days of service and another after 25 years and 7 months of credited service, were both granted a monthly service increment in the amount of \$100 in accordance with the provision contained in the collective bargaining agreement. During the current audit period, a police officer who retired after 25 years and 18 days of service was granted a monthly service increment in the amount of \$100 in accordance with the provision contained in the collective bargaining agreement. The specific inconsistency is noted below:

Benefit Provision	Governing Document	Collective Bargaining Agreement	Act 600 (as amended)
Length of service increment	A monthly service increment benefit equal to \$100 if the member's years of service total 26 or more.	An officer who works beyond his 25 <sup>th</sup> anniversary date of employment shall have his annual pension payment increased \$1,200.	Any borough, town, township or regional police department may establish and pay length of service increments for years of service beyond twenty-five years for each completed year of service in excess of twenty-five years, not to exceed one hundred dollars (\$100) per month for each completed year of service in excess of twenty-five years up to a maximum of five hundred dollars (\$500) per month after five completed years of service in excess of twenty-five years up to a maximum of five hundred dollars (\$500) per month after five completed years of service in excess of twenty-five years. [Emphasis added]

#### Finding No. 1 – (Continued)

<u>Criteria</u>: The plan's governing document and the collective bargaining agreement should contain consistent benefit provisions that are in compliance with Act 600, as amended.

<u>Cause</u>: Plan officials failed to adopt adequate internal control procedures to ensure compliance with this department's prior audit recommendation.

<u>Effect</u>: As previously disclosed, three retired police officers were granted a monthly service increment benefit pursuant to the provision contained in the collective bargaining agreement which conflicts with the pension plan's governing document and is not in compliance with Act 600.

Providing unauthorized pension benefits increases the plan's pension costs and reduces the amount of funds available for investment purposes or for the payment of authorized benefits or administrative expenses. Since the borough received state aid based on unit value during the current audit period, it did not receive allocations attributable to the excess pension benefits provided. However, the increased costs to the pension plan as a result of the excess pension benefits could result in the receipt of excess state aid in the future and increase the municipal contributions necessary to fund the plan in accordance with Act 205 funding standards.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We again recommend that municipal officials, after consulting with their solicitor, take whatever action is necessary to bring the police pension plan's benefit structure into compliance with Act 600, as amended, at their earliest opportunity to do so.

To the extent that the borough is not in compliance with Act 600 and/or is contractually obligated to pay benefits to existing retirees in excess of those authorized by Act 600, the excess benefits must be reflected in the Act 205 actuarial valuation reports for the plan and funded in accordance with Act 205 funding standards. Furthermore, such benefits will be deemed ineligible for funding with state pension aid. In such case, the plan's actuary may be required to determine the impact, if any, of the excess benefits on the plan's future state aid allocations and submit this information to the department.

<u>Management's Response</u>: Municipal officials agreed with the finding without exception. Due to the disclosure of this finding in five consecutive audit reports, a written response to this finding was requested of municipal officials; however, as of March 16, 2021, no such response has been provided.

#### Finding No. 1 – (Continued)

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: We are concerned that the municipality has not complied with the prior audit recommendation and encourage compliance at the earliest opportunity to do so. Although the municipality did not provide a written response as of the issuance of this report, any response to the finding provided by officials subsequent to report issuance will be given due consideration upon receipt and compliance will be evaluated during our next audit of the plan, accordingly.

### <u>Finding No. 2 – Noncompliance With Prior Recommendation – Unauthorized Provision For</u> <u>A Killed In Service Benefit</u>

<u>Condition</u>: Sharon Hill Borough maintains a police pension plan governed by the provisions of Act 600, as amended. Prior to the adoption of Act 51 of 2009, Act 600 contained a mandatory killed in service benefit provision; however, Act 51 specifically repealed the section of Act 600 that referenced the mandatory killed in service benefit. As disclosed in the prior two audit reports, the pension plan's governing document continues to provide for a killed in service benefit that is no longer authorized by Act 600.

Section 8.2(b) of Resolution 275-R states:

If the Member is "killed-in-service" the Member's surviving spouse shall receive a monthly pension for life equal in amount to 100% of the Member's base monthly earnings.

In addition, the borough continues to fund a killed in service benefit due to its inclusion in the plan's January 1, 2019, actuarial valuation report.

Criteria: Section 1(a) of Act 51 of 2009 states, in part:

In the event a law enforcement officer, ambulance service or rescue squad member, firefighter, certified hazardous material response team member or National Guard member dies as a result of the performance of his duties, such political subdivision, Commonwealth agency or, in the case of National Guard members, the Adjutant General, or, in the case of a member of a Commonwealth law enforcement agency, the authorized survivor or the agency head, within 90 days from the date of death, shall submit certification of such death to the Commonwealth.

#### Finding No. 2 – (Continued)

In addition, Section 1(d) of Act 51 of 2009 states, in part:

... the Commonwealth shall, from moneys payable out of the General Fund, pay to the surviving spouse or, if there is no surviving spouse, to the minor children of the paid firefighter, ambulance service or rescue squad member or law enforcement officer who died as a result of the performance of his duty the sum of \$100,000, adjusted in accordance with subsection (f) of this section, and an amount equal to the monthly salary, adjusted in accordance with subsection (f) of this section, of the deceased paid firefighter, ambulance service or rescue squad member or law enforcement officer, less any workers' compensation or pension or retirement benefits paid to such survivors, and shall continue such monthly payments until there is no eligible beneficiary to receive them. For the purpose of this subsection, the term "eligible beneficiary" means the surviving spouse or the child or children under the age of eighteen years or, if attending college, under the age of twentythree years, of the firefighter, ambulance service or rescue squad member or law enforcement officer who died as a result of the performance of his duty. When no spouse or minor children survive, a single sum of \$100,000, adjusted in accordance with subsection (f) of this section, shall be paid to the parent or parents of such firefighter, ambulance service member, rescue squad member or law enforcement officer. [Emphasis added]

Furthermore, Section 2 of Act 51 of 2009 states:

#### Repeals are as follows:

- (1) The General Assembly declares that the repeals under paragraph (2) are necessary to effectuate the amendment of section 1 of the act.
- (2) The following parts of acts are repealed:
  - (i) Section 5(e)(2) of the act of May 29, 1956 (1955 P.L.1804, No. 600), referred to as the Municipal Police Pension Law.
  - (ii) Section 202(b)(3)(vi) and (4)(vi) of the act of December 18, 1984 (P.L.1005, No. 205), known as the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act.

Therefore, since Act 51 specifically repealed the killed in service provision of Act 600 and the funding provisions for the killed in service benefit that were contained in Act 205, the provision of a killed in service benefit is no longer authorized.

<u>Cause</u>: Plan officials failed to adopt adequate internal control procedures to ensure compliance with this department's prior audit recommendation.

#### Finding No. 2 – (Continued)

<u>Effect</u>: Since Section 1 of Act 51 provides that the Commonwealth is obligated to pay the killed in service benefit less any pension or retirement benefits paid to eligible survivors, the continued provision of a killed in service benefit could result in the pension plan being obligated to pay a benefit that is no longer authorized by Act 600, and would have been paid entirely by the Commonwealth absent such provision.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We again recommend that the municipality review the plan's killed in service benefit with its solicitor in conjunction with Act 51 of 2009 and eliminate this unauthorized benefit provision at its earliest opportunity to do so.

<u>Management's Response</u>: Municipal officials agreed with the finding without exception. Due to the disclosure of this finding in three consecutive audit reports, a written response to this finding was requested of municipal officials; however, as of March 16, 2021, no such response has been provided.

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: Considering the plan's funded status, we again urge borough officials to comply with the finding recommendation at their earliest opportunity to do so, especially in light of the fact that the Commonwealth has assumed the responsibility of paying the mandated killed in service benefit and the elimination of this benefit would improve the funding status of the plan going forward. Although the municipality did not provide a written response as of the issuance of this report, any response to the finding provided by officials subsequent to report issuance will be given due consideration upon receipt and compliance will be evaluated during our next audit of the plan, accordingly.

#### Finding No. 3 – Failure To Fully Pay The Minimum Municipal Obligation Of The Plan

<u>Condition</u>: Subsequent to the current audit period, the municipality did not fully pay the minimum municipal obligation (MMO) that was due to the police pension plan for the year 2020, as required by Act 205. The borough calculated the MMO for the police pension plan in the amount of \$387,151 for the year 2020, but only deposited \$157,563 on October 16, 2020, consisting of the borough's annual state aid allocation. The municipality had an unpaid MMO balance of \$229,588 for the year 2020.

Criteria: With regard to the MMO, Section 302(c) of Act 205 states, in part:

Annually, the chief administrative officer of the pension plan shall determine the minimum obligation of the municipality with respect to the pension plan for the following plan year.

#### Finding No. 3 – (Continued)

Section 302(d) of Act 205 states, in part:

The minimum obligation of the municipality shall be payable to the pension plan from the revenue of the municipality.

Furthermore, Section 302(e) of Act 205 states:

Any amount of the minimum obligation of the municipality which remains unpaid as of December 31 of the year in which the minimum obligation is due shall be added to the minimum obligation of the municipality for the following year, with interest from January 1 of the year in which the minimum obligation was first due until the date the payment is paid at a rate equal to the interest assumption used for the actuarial valuation report or the discount rate applicable to treasury bills issued by the Department of Treasury of the United States with a six-month maturity as of the last business day in December of the plan year in which the obligation was due, whichever is greater, expressed as a monthly rate and compounded monthly.

<u>Cause</u>: Plan officials attributed the failure to fully pay the MMO to financial constraints within the borough.

<u>Effect</u>: The failure to fully pay the MMO could result in the plan not having adequate resources to meet current and future benefit obligations to its members.

Due to the municipality's failure to fully pay the police MMO by the December 31, 2020, deadline, the municipality must add the police MMO balance to the current year's MMO and include interest, as required by Act 205.

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

<u>Recommendation</u>: We recommend that the municipality pay the MMO due to the police pension plan for the year 2020, with interest, in accordance with Section 302(e) of Act 205. A copy of the interest calculation must be maintained by the borough for examination during our next audit of the plan.

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

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: Due to the potential withhold of state aid, the borough's compliance with the finding recommendation will be monitored subsequent to the release of the audit report and through our next audit of the plan.

#### Finding No. 4 – Inconsistent Pension Benefits

<u>Condition</u>: The pension plan's governing document, Resolution No. 275-R, contains benefit provisions that conflict with the collective bargaining agreement between the police officers and the borough, as follows:

Benefit Provision	Governing Document	Collective Bargaining Agreement		
Normal retirement age & service	A member will be eligible for Normal Retirement benefits provided that he retires from the borough's employment and upon such retirement he has attained at least age 50 and completed at least 25 years of service.	As to any officer hired after January 1, 2019, the requirements for a superannuation pension shall be 52 years of age and 25 years of service.		
Service-connected disability benefit	An eligible member shall, while disabled, receive an immediate monthly benefit equal to 100% of his monthly wages at time of disability.	A service-related disability pension shall be 75% of average salary based on the highest 12 months of compensation received by the disabled officer while employed.		

In addition, the actuarial valuation report form C, for the police pension plan, with a valuation date of January 1, 2019, submitted to the Municipal Pension Reporting Program, reported the benefit provisions included in the collective bargaining agreement.

<u>Criteria</u>: A governing document which contains clearly defined and updated benefit provisions, including those negotiated through collective bargaining, is a prerequisite for the consistent, sound administration of retirement benefits.

<u>Cause</u>: Plan officials failed to update the plan's governing document to incorporate the pension benefits collectively bargained for and agreed to in the most recent agreement effective January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2022. Furthermore, plan officials failed to establish adequate internal control procedures to ensure the plan's governing document and the collective bargaining agreement contained consistent benefit provisions.

#### Finding No. 4 – (Continued)

<u>Effect</u>: Inconsistent plan documents could result in inconsistent or improper benefit calculations and incorrect benefit payments from the pension plan.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We recommend that municipal officials amend the plan's governing document as necessary to reflect all benefit obligations of the pension plan and eliminate inconsistencies among the various plan documents.

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

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: Compliance will be evaluated during our next audit of the plan.

### SHARON HILL BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN POTENTIAL WITHHOLD OF STATE AID

A condition such as that reported by Finding No. 3 contained in this audit report may lead to a total withholding of state aid in the future unless that finding is corrected. However, such action will not be considered if sufficient written documentation is provided to verify compliance with this department's recommendation. Such documentation should be submitted to: Department of the Auditor General, Bureau of Municipal Pension & Liquor Control Audits, 314 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120.

#### SHARON HILL BOROUGH 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, 2019, 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)
01-01-15	\$ 3,962,273	\$ 5,231,509	\$ 1,269,236	75.7%
01-01-17	4,220,528	5,555,320	1,334,792	76.0%
01-01-19	4,397,443	6,523,642	2,126,199	67.4%

Note: The market values of the plan's assets at 01-01-15, 01-01-17, and 01-01-19 have been adjusted to reflect the smoothing of gains and/or losses subject to a ceiling of 120 percent of the market value of assets. 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.

#### SHARON HILL BOROUGH 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.

# SHARON HILL BOROUGH POLICE PENSION PLAN SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (UNAUDITED)

#### 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	\$ 205,983	\$ 205,983	\$ -	\$ 788,451	26.13%
2015	204,423	204,423	-	770,442	26.53%
2016	216,792	216,792	-	835,812	25.94%
2017	239,055	239,055	-	919,206	26.01%
2018	290,566	290,566	-	1,213,254	23.95%
2019	292,232	292,232	-	1,230,000	23.76%

#### SHARON HILL 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, 2019

Actuarial cost method Entry age normal

Amortization method Level dollar

Remaining amortization period 13 years

Asset valuation method Plan assets are valued using the

method described in Section 210 of Act 205, as amended, subject to a ceiling of 120% of the market value

of assets.

Actuarial assumptions:

Investment rate of return 8.0%

Projected salary increases 5.0%

Cost-of-living adjustments Cost-of-living increase provided in

accordance with Act 600.

#### SHARON HILL 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 Harry Dunfee

Mayor

Mr. Terrance Oliver

Council President

Ms. Sharon Booker

Council Vice President

Ms. LaTina Bedford-Dean

Councilperson

Ms. Tanya Cavalieri

Councilperson

Mr. Hykeem Green

Councilperson

Mr. Keith Martinez

Councilperson

Mr. William Felder

Councilperson

Mr. William T. Smith

Borough Manager

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.