



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE - AUDITOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL





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

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE AUDITOR GENERAL

Independent Auditor's Report

The Honorable Barry J. Schoch, P.E. Secretary Department of Transportation Harrisburg, PA 17120

We examined the accompanying Forms MS-965 With Adjustments for the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund of the Township of Dover, York County, for the period January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012. The municipality's management is responsible for the Forms MS-965. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Forms MS-965 With Adjustments based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. An examination includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the Township of Dover, York County's Forms MS-965 for the period January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012 and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

We are mandated by Section 403 of *The Fiscal Code*, 72 P.S. § 403, to audit each municipality's Liquid Fuels Tax Fund to ensure that funds received are expended in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States include attestation engagements as a separate type of audit. An attestation engagement performed pursuant to *Government Auditing Standards* involves additional standards that exceed the standards provided by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Accordingly, this attestation engagement complies with both *Government Auditing Standards* and Section 403 of *The Fiscal Code*.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

As discussed in the Findings and Recommendations and Comments sections of this report:

- The municipality expended \$8,142.00 during 2011 from its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for concrete curbing, which is a nonpermissible expenditure (Finding No. 1).
- The municipality expended \$5,280.52 during 2011 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for engineering services in excess of 10 percent of the total cost of road project No. C-11-66205-17 (Finding No. 2).
- During our 2010 examination period the municipality expended \$61,978.43 from its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for engineering fees in excess of the 10 percent of the total project cost. This amount was reimbursed to the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund on March 7, 2013, which was subsequent to our examination period (Comment No. 2).

In our opinion, except for the matters discussed in the preceding paragraph, the Forms MS-965 With Adjustments present, in all material respects, the information required by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund of the Township of Dover, York County, for the period January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012, in conformity with the criteria set forth in Note 1.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report findings of significant deficiencies in internal control, violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and abuse that are material to the Forms MS-965 and any fraud and illegal acts that are more than inconsequential that come to our attention during our examination. We are also required to obtain the views of management on those matters. We performed our examination to express an opinion on whether the Forms MS-965 are presented in accordance with the criteria described above and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the internal control over reporting on the Forms MS-965 or on compliance and other matters; accordingly, we express no such opinions.

A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the Township of Dover, York County's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report data reliably in accordance with the applicable criteria such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the Township of Dover, York County's Forms MS-965 that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the Township of Dover, York County's internal control.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency or combination of significant deficiencies that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the Forms MS-965 will not be prevented or detected by the Township of Dover, York County's internal control.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

Our consideration of internal control over reporting on the Forms MS-965 was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses, as defined above, in internal control over reporting on the Forms MS-965.

The results of our tests disclosed the following instances of noncompliance that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards:*

- Nonpermissible Expenditure.
- Liquid Fuels Money Expended For Engineering Fees In Excess Of 10 Percent Of The Total Project Cost.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the management of the Township of Dover, York County, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Eugent: O-Purgue

August 6, 2013

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE Auditor General

CONTENTS

Background	1
Financial Section:	
2011 Form MS-965 With Adjustments	2
2012 Form MS-965 With Adjustments	5
Notes To Forms MS-965 With Adjustments	8
Findings And Recommendations:	
Finding No. 1 - Nonpermissible Expenditure	12
Finding No. 2 - Liquid Fuels Money Expended For Engineering Fees In Excess Of 10 Percent Of The Total Project Cost	14
Comments	16
Summary Of Exit Conference	17
Report Distribution	18

Page

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND BACKGROUND FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2011 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

Background

The Liquid Fuels Tax Municipal Allocation Law, Title 72 P.S. § 2615.5, provides municipalities other than counties (townships, boroughs, cities, towns, home rule, and optional plan governments) with an annual allocation of liquid fuels taxes from the state's Motor License Fund to be used for the maintenance and repair of streets, roads, and bridges for which the municipality is responsible. The allocation of these funds to municipalities is based: (1) 50 percent on the municipality's proportion of local road mileage to the total local road mileage in the state, and (2) 50 percent on the proportion of a municipality's population to the total population in the state.

The Vehicle Code, Title 75 P.S. § 9511, provides municipalities with annual maintenance payments to be received from the Motor License Fund for functionally local highways that were transferred to a municipality from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Each municipality must deposit the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund money and annual maintenance payments that it receives into a special fund called the Municipal Liquid Fuels Tax Fund or State Fund. A municipality may not deposit any other monies into this fund except when the municipality does not have enough money in the special fund to meet the payments called for by its current annual budget for road and bridge purposes. In this case, the municipality may borrow money or transfer money from its General Fund to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

The Department of Transportation has been given the regulatory authority for the administration of these funds. To qualify for its annual allocation, each municipality shall submit the following documents and information to the Department of Transportation:

- 1. Evidence that the treasurer is bonded in accordance with the law, or that its treasurer is a bank requiring no bond by January 31 of each year.
- 2. A report indicating the manner in which its liquid fuels tax allocation was expended in the previous year (Form MS-965) by January 31 of each year.
- 3. A report of elected and appointed officials by January 31 of each year.
- 4. A Survey of Financial Condition by March 15 of each year.

Department of Transportation *Publication 9* contains the policies and procedures that govern the use of Liquid Fuels Tax Fund money. However, if there is a difference between *Publication 9* and any legislation, the legislation shall govern.

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 1 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Expenditure Summary	Reported		Reported Adjustments		ustments	Adjusted Amount	
Major equipment purchases	\$	19,248.00	\$	-	\$	19,248.00	
Minor equipment purchases		-		-		-	
Computer/Computer related training		-		-		-	
Agility projects		-		-		-	
Cleaning streets and gutters		-		-		-	
Winter maintenance services		91,255.52		-		91,255.52	
Traffic control devices		-		-		-	
Street lighting		-		-		-	
Storm sewers and drains		-		-		-	
Repairs of tools and machinery		-		-		-	
Maintenance and repair of							
roads and bridges		50,798.41		-		50,798.41	
Highway construction and							
rebuilding projects		410,443.83		-		410,443.83	
Miscellaneous		-		-		-	
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	\$	571,745.76	\$	-	\$	571,745.76	

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 2 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Fund Balance	Reported		Reported		Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
1. Balance, January 1, 2011	\$	349,908.11	\$	-	\$	349,908.11		
Receipts:								
2. State allocation		475,981.12		-		475,981.12		
2a. Turnback allocation		36,600.00		-		36,600.00		
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		2,504.52		-		2,504.52		
2c. Miscellaneous (Note 4)		15,439.75		-		15,439.75		
3. Total receipts		530,525.39		_		530,525.39		
4. Total funds available		880,433.50		-		880,433.50		
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		571,745.76		-		571,745.76		
6. Balance, December 31, 2011	\$	308,687.74	\$	-	\$	308,687.74		

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 3 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Equipment Balance		Reported	Ad	justments	 Adjusted Amount
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	349,908.11	\$	-	\$ 349,908.11
2. Add: Current year equipment allocation (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	1	102,516.22		-	102,516.22
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments				-	
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		452,424.33		-	452,424.33
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		19,248.00			 19,248.00
6. Remainder		433,176.33		-	 433,176.33
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	\$	308,687.74	\$	-	\$ 308,687.74

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2012 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 1 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Expenditure Summary	Reported		Reported Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
Major equipment purchases	\$	12,169.00	\$	-	\$	12,169.00
Minor equipment purchases		-		-		-
Computer/Computer related training		-		-		-
Agility projects		-		-		-
Cleaning streets and gutters		-		-		-
Winter maintenance services		34,678.05		-		34,678.05
Traffic control devices		-		-		-
Street lighting		-		-		-
Storm sewers and drains		-		-		-
Repairs of tools and machinery		-		-		-
Maintenance and repair of						
roads and bridges		63,891.10		-		63,891.10
Highway construction and						
rebuilding projects		165,984.09		-		165,984.09
Miscellaneous		-		-		-
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	\$	276,722.24	\$	-	\$	276,722.24

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2012 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 2 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Fund Balance	Reported		Reported		Reported Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
1. Balance, January 1, 2012	\$	308,687.74	\$ -	\$	308,687.74			
Receipts:								
2. State allocation		522,422.77	-		522,422.77			
2a. Turnback allocation		36,600.00	-		36,600.00			
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		1,582.61	-		1,582.61			
2c. Miscellaneous		-	 -		-			
3. Total receipts		560,605.38	 -		560,605.38			
4. Total funds available		869,293.12	 -		869,293.12			
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		276,722.24	 -		276,722.24			
6. Balance, December 31, 2012	\$	592,570.88	\$ -	\$	592,570.88			

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2012 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 3 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Equipment Balance		Reported	Adj	ustments	 Adjusted Amount
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	308,687.74	\$	-	\$ 308,687.74
2. Add: Current year equipment allocation (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	1	111,804.55		-	111,804.55
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments				_	
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		420,492.29		-	420,492.29
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		12,169.00			 12,169.00
6. Remainder		408,323.29		-	 408,323.29
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	\$	408,323.29	\$		\$ 408,323.29

1. <u>Criteria</u>

Section 1

This section of Form MS-965 With Adjustments provides a summary of Liquid Fuels Tax Fund expenditures by category. Categories requiring explanation include:

- Major equipment purchases are purchases of road machinery and road equipment that cost in excess of \$4,000.00 prior to 2012 and in excess of \$10,000.00 during 2012 and subsequent years.
- Minor equipment purchases are purchases of road machinery and road equipment that cost \$4,000.00 or less prior to 2012 and \$10,000.00 or less during 2012 and subsequent years.
- Agility projects are exchanges of services with the Department of Transportation.

Section 2

This section of Form MS-965 With Adjustments provides information on the fund balance. Categories requiring explanation include:

- The state allocation is generally received from the Department of Transportation during the first week in April of each year. The amount the municipality receives is based half on its population and half on its road mileage.
- The turnback allocation is generally received from the Department of Transportation during the first week in April of each year. A municipality receives a yearly turnback allocation based on road mileage for all roads that were transferred to the municipality from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through the Highway Transfer Program.
- Expenditures include the total transferred from Section 1.

1. <u>Criteria (Continued)</u>

Section 3

This section of Form MS-965 With Adjustments determines if the municipality expended Liquid Fuels Tax Fund money in excess of the permissible amount for equipment and the balance that the municipality may carry forward for the purchase of equipment to the subsequent year.

Department of Transportation *Publication 9* requires that the amount expended for equipment purchases in a given year not exceed the sum of the equipment balance carried forward from the previous year and 20 percent of the current year's Liquid Fuels Tax Fund allocation and, if applicable, 20 percent of the turnback allocation plus other Department of Transportation approved adjustments.

If the municipality spent in excess of the amount listed on Line 4, the excess must be reimbursed to the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

The equipment balance to be carried forward for the subsequent year is the lesser of the amount on Line 6 or the ending fund balance on Line 6 of Section 2, but not less than zero.

Basis Of Presentation

The financial activities of the municipality are accounted for in separate funds. The Liquid Fuels Tax Fund is used to account for state aid revenues from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation used primarily for building and improving local roads and bridges. The Forms MS-965 have been prepared in accordance with reporting requirements prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation as a result of the Fuels Tax Act 655, dated 1956 and as amended, which does not constitute a complete presentation of the entity's assets, liabilities, expenses, and fund balance. Accordingly, the presentation of Forms MS-965 With Adjustments is restricted to the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund, which represents a segment of the entity.

Basis Of Accounting

The accompanying Forms MS-965 With Adjustments are prepared in accordance with reporting requirements prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Under this method, revenues are recognized when received and expenditures are recorded when paid.

1. <u>Criteria (Continued)</u>

General Fixed Assets

General fixed assets are recognized as expenditures at the time of purchase. No depreciation has been provided on the heavy equipment used to maintain and repair roads and bridges.

2. Deposits

The Second Class Township Code, Title 53 P.S. § 68204, authorizes the township to deposit its funds in the following:

- Deposits in savings accounts or time deposits, other than certificates of deposit or share accounts of institutions having their principal place of business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or other like insurance. For any amount above the insured maximum, the depository shall pledge approved collateral.
- Certificates of deposit purchased from institutions insured by the FDIC or other like insurance to the extent that such accounts are so insured. For any amounts in excess of the insured maximum, such deposits shall be collateralized by a pledge or assignment of assets. Certificates of deposit may not exceed 20 percent of a bank's total capital surplus or 20 percent of a savings and loan's or savings bank's assets minus liabilities.

Deposits consist of receipts and deposits in a financial institution. Pennsylvania statutes require all deposits to be insured and, for any amount above the insured maximum, to be secured with approved collateral as defined.

There were no deposits exposed to custodial credit risk as of December 31, 2012. Custodial credit risk, as defined by GASB No. 40, includes deposits that are not covered by depository insurance and the deposits are uncollateralized, collateralized with securities held by the pledging financial institution, or collateralized with securities held by the pledging financial institution's trust department or agent but not in the municipality's name.

2. <u>Deposits (Continued)</u>

Fund Balance

The fund balance as of December 31, 2012 consists of the following:

Cash

\$592,570.88

3. Interest On Investments

Our examination disclosed that the municipality deposited idle liquid fuels tax money in an interest-bearing account which earned \$2,504.52 during 2011, and \$1,582.61 during 2012, thus providing additional funds for road maintenance and repairs.

4. <u>Miscellaneous Receipts</u>

The following miscellaneous receipts were deposited into the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund during the examination period:

Source	Description	2011
General Fund	Reimbursement	
	(Comment No. 1)	\$14,875.00
Local business	Winter maintenance agreement	564.75
Total		\$15,439.75

Finding No. 1 - Nonpermissible Expenditure

Our examination disclosed that the municipality expended \$8,142.00 during 2011 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for concrete curbing, which is a nonpermissible expenditure.

The Department of Transportation's Publication 9, Chapter Two, Section 2.7.2, states:

Examples of unacceptable expenditures for Liquid Fuels Tax Fund monies are:

20. Curbs and sidewalks (except for those needed to comply with ADA requirements).

This curbing was not done to comply with ADA requirements.

The failure to follow the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* as noted above could result in the municipality having to reimburse \$8,142.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

Recommendations

We recommend that the municipality reimburse \$8,142.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

We further recommend that, in the future, the municipality comply with the Liquid Fuels Tax Municipal Allocation Law and the Department of Transportation's Regulations regarding permissible expenditures.

Management's Response

The municipal officials stated:

Our municipal representative did not tell us that we could not use Liquid Fuels Tax Fund money for curbing. He only commented on not using Liquid Fuels Tax Fund money for sidewalks.

Finding No. 1 - Nonpermissible Expenditure (Continued)

Auditor's Conclusion

The municipality should comply with the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* as stated above. During our next examination we will determine if the municipality complied with our recommendations.

Finding No. 2 - Liquid Fuels Money Expended For Engineering Fees In Excess Of 10 Percent Of <u>The Total Project Cost</u>

Our examination disclosed that the municipality expended \$5,280.52 during 2011 for engineering fees from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund in excess of 10 percent of the cost for road project No. C-11-66205-17. Municipalities are required to provide justification for and document engineering fees in excess of 10 percent of the total project cost to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation. The municipality did not provide documentation and justification for the excess engineering costs to the Department of Transportation. These expenditures were as follows:

			Total	
		10 Percent	Engineering	
	Total	of Total	Cost from	Excess
Project No.	Expended	Project	Liquid Fuels	Engineering Fees
C-11-66205-17	\$194,406.92	\$19,440.69	\$24,721.21	\$5,280.52

The Department of Transportation's Publication 9, Chapter Two, Section 2.7.1, states:

Examples of acceptable expenditures for municipal Liquid Fuels Tax Fund are:

17. Payment of engineering fees (fees in excess of 10% of the total project cost must be documented and justified to the satisfaction of PENNDOT).

The failure to comply with the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* could result in the municipality having to reimburse \$5,280.52 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

A similar finding was also written in our prior report. However, during 2012 the municipality complied with our prior examination recommendation.

Recommendations

We recommend that the municipality reimburse \$5,280.52 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

We recommend that, in the future, that engineering costs in excess of 10 percent of the total project cost continue to be documented and justified to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.

<u>Finding No. 2 - Liquid Fuels Money Expended For Engineering Fees In Excess Of 10 Percent Of</u> <u>The Total Project Cost (Continued)</u>

Management's Response

The municipal official stated:

Project engineering fees were incurred before the report was released from the Auditor General's Department.

Comment No. 1 - Summary Of 2008-2009 Examination Recommendations

In our 2008-2009 examination we recommended that the Department of Transportation review our examination finding to determine if the municipality should reimburse \$14,875.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for the failure to obtain project approval.

During our current examination we reviewed a letter dated July 13, 2011, from the Department of Transportation informing the municipality to reimburse \$14,875.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund. We noted that the municipality reimbursed this amount to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund on July 26, 2011.

In our 2008-2009 examination we also recommended that before the municipality expends money on a project, it applies for and obtains approval of the completed work.

During our current examination we noted that the municipality complied with our recommendation.

Comment No. 2 - Summary Of 2010 Audit Recommendations

In our 2010 report we recommended that the Department of Transportation review our examination finding to determine if the municipality should reimburse \$61,978.43 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for overexpending engineering fees in excess of 10 percent of the total project cost. A similar finding was also written in our current report (see Finding No. 2).

During our current examination we reviewed a letter dated February 5, 2013, from the Department of Transportation informing the municipality to reimburse \$61,978.43 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund. We noted that the municipality reimbursed this amount to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund on March 7, 2013, which was subsequent to our examination period.

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND SUMMARY OF EXIT CONFERENCE FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2011 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

An exit conference was held August 6, 2013. Those participating were:

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER

Ms. Laurie J. Rummel, Treasurer Mr. Glenn A. Kern, Highway Crew Chief

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. Ryan W. Shrauder, Auditor

The results of the examination were presented and discussed in their entirety.

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER YORK COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND REPORT DISTRIBUTION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2011 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

This report was initially distributed to:

The Honorable Barry J. Schoch, P.E. Secretary Department of Transportation

> Township of Dover York County 2480 West Canal Road Dover, PA 17315

The Honorable Monica J. Love

Chairperson of the Board of Supervisors

Ms. Laurie J. Rummel

Treasurer

This report matter of public record is available online is a and at http://www.auditorgen.state.pa.us. Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 231 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: news@auditorgen.state.pa.us.