

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY 44-208

LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

Released August 2013

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE - AUDITOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL





TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY 44-208

LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011



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 Oliver, Mifflin County, for the period January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011. 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 Oliver, Mifflin County's Forms MS-965 for the period January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011 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*.

As described in Note 4, the adjustments included on the Forms MS-965 With Adjustments are made by the Department of the Auditor General.

<u>Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)</u>

As discussed in Finding No. 1, the township was overcharged \$194.86 for 9.5mm and 25.0mm Superpave during 2011. Additionally, as discussed in Finding No. 2, during 2010 the township expended \$2,821.24 for the purchase of ID-2 Wearing Course and \$10,366.40 for the purchase of BCBC from its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund, which are not types of hot mixed asphalt that are approved by the Department of Transportation for use by municipalities. Furthermore, as discussed in Finding No. 3, the township expended \$8,800.00 during 2010 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for the purchase of a Fall Model 312R 12 foot snow plow that the township thought was purchased from a COSTARS contract. However, the make of the snow plow was not part of the COSTARS contract.

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 Oliver, Mifflin County, for the period January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011, 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 Oliver, Mifflin 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 Oliver, Mifflin County's Forms MS-965 that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the Township of Oliver, Mifflin County's internal control. We consider the deficiency described in the finding below to be a significant deficiency in internal control over reporting on the Forms MS-965:

Vendor Overcharge.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

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 Oliver, Mifflin County's internal control. Our consideration of the internal control over reporting on the Forms MS-965 would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be significant deficiencies and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all significant deficiencies that are also considered to be material weaknesses. We consider the significant deficiency described above to be a material weakness.

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

- Nonpermissible Expenditures.
- Purchase Of Snow Plow That Was Not Part Of The COSTARS Contract.

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

January 14, 2013

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE

Eugraf. O-Pager

Auditor General

CONTENTS

<u>Page</u>
Background
Financial Section:
2010 Form MS-965 With Adjustments
2011 Form MS-965 With Adjustments5
Notes To Forms MS-965 With Adjustments
Finding And Recommendations:
Finding No. 1 - Vendor Overcharges
Finding No. 2 - Nonpermissible Expenditures
Finding No. 3 - Purchase Of Snow Plow That Was Not Part Of The COSTARS Contract
Summary Of Exit Conference
Report Distribution

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND BACKGROUND FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

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 OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 1 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Expenditure Summary	Reported		Adjustments (Note 4)		Adjusted Amount	
Major equipment purchases	\$	8,800.00	\$	-	\$	8,800.00
Minor equipment purchases		_		-		-
Computer/Computer related training		-		-		-
Agility projects		-		-		-
Cleaning streets and gutters		-		-		-
Winter maintenance services		11,072.86		-		11,072.86
Traffic control devices		700.91		-		700.91
Street lighting		-		-		-
Storm sewers and drains		-		-		-
Repairs of tools and machinery		-		-		-
Maintenance and repair of						
roads and bridges		155,091.36		(127,221.76)		27,869.60
Highway construction and						
rebuilding projects		-		127,221.76		127,221.76
Miscellaneous		-				-
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	\$	175,665.13	\$		\$	175,665.13

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 2 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Fund Balance	Reported		Reported Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
1. Balance, January 1, 2010	\$ 226,282.75		\$	-	\$	226,282.75
Receipts:						
2. State allocation		72,641.96		-		72,641.96
2a. Turnback allocation		44,120.00		-		44,120.00
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		378.53		-		378.53
2c. Miscellaneous		-		-		
3. Total receipts		117,140.49				117,140.49
4. Total funds available		343,423.24				343,423.24
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		175,665.13				175,665.13
6. Balance, December 31, 2010	\$	167,758.11	\$		\$	167,758.11

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 3 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Equipment Balance	Reported		Adjustments (Note 4)		Adjusted Amount	
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	34,491.04	\$	8,377.00	\$	42,868.04
2. Add: Current year equipment allocation (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	n	23,352.39		-		23,352.39
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments						<u>-</u>
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		57,843.43		8,377.00		66,220.43
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		8,800.00				8,800.00
6. Remainder		49,043.43		8,377.00		57,420.43
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	\$	49,043.43	\$	8,377.00	\$	57,420.43

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

Expenditure Summary	Reported		Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
Major equipment purchases	\$	63,562.24	\$	_	\$	63,562.24
Minor equipment purchases		-		-		_
Computer/Computer related training		-	-			_
Agility projects		-		-		_
Cleaning streets and gutters		-		-		-
Winter maintenance services		9,896.74		-		9,896.74
Traffic control devices		-		-		-
Street lighting		-		-		-
Storm sewers and drains		-		-		-
Repairs of tools and machinery		-		-		-
Maintenance and repair of roads and bridges		10,021.25		-		10,021.25
Highway construction and						
rebuilding projects		-		-		-
Miscellaneous						
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	\$	83,480.23	\$		\$	83,480.23

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

Fund Balance		Reported		Reported A		ıstments	 Adjusted Amount
1. Balance, January 1, 2011	\$ 167,758.11		\$	-	\$ 167,758.11		
Receipts:							
2. State allocation		74,347.77		-	74,347.77		
2a. Turnback allocation		44,120.00		-	44,120.00		
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		125.17		-	125.17		
2c. Miscellaneous				-	 		
3. Total receipts		118,592.94			 118,592.94		
4. Total funds available		286,351.05			 286,351.05		
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		83,480.23		_	 83,480.23		
6. Balance, December 31, 2011	\$	202,870.82	\$	_	\$ 202,870.82		

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

Equipment Balance	Reported		Adjustments (Note 4)		 Adjusted Amount
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	49,043.43	\$	8,377.00	\$ 57,420.43
2. Add: Current year equipment allocation (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	1	23,693.55		-	23,693.55
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments		<u>-</u>			
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		72,736.98		8,377.00	81,113.98
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		63,562.24			63,562.24
6. Remainder		9,174.74		8,377.00	 17,551.74
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	\$	9,174.74	\$	8,377.00	\$ 17,551.74

1. Criteria

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.
- Minor equipment purchases are purchases of road machinery and road equipment that cost \$4,000.00 or less.
- 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.

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.

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

Section 3 (Continued)

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. Criteria (Continued)

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, 2011. 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, 2011 consists of the following:

Cash \$202,870.82

3. <u>Interest On Investments</u>

Our examination disclosed that the municipality deposited idle liquid fuels tax money in an interest-bearing account which earned \$378.53 during 2010, and \$125.17 during 2011, thus providing additional funds for road maintenance and repairs.

4. Adjustments

2010 - Section 1

Adjustments were made to "Maintenance and repair of roads and bridges" and "Highway construction and rebuilding projects" because expenditures of \$127,221.76 were misclassified.

2010 - Section 3

An adjustment of \$8,377.00 was made to "Prior year equipment balance" because an incorrect equipment balance was carried forward.

2011 - Section 3

An adjustment of \$8,377.00 was made to "Prior year equipment balance" to reflect the adjustment made to the equipment balance in 2010 - Section 3.

Finding No. 1 - Vendor Overcharges

Our examination disclosed that the municipality was overcharged a total of \$194.86 during 2011 for the purchase of 9.5mm and 25.0mm Superpave as follows:

Product	Tons Purchased	Contract Price	Invoice Price	Unit Price Difference	Total Price Difference
25 mm	22.42	\$50.00	\$53.22	3.22	\$ 72.20
25 mm	15.15	50.00	53.22	3.22	48.79
25 mm	15.50	50.00	53.22	3.22	49.92
9.5 mm	15.20	66.67	67.25	.58	8.82
9.5 mm	26.09	66.67	67.25	.58	<u>15.13</u>
			Amount	toverpaid	<u>\$194.86</u>

Good internal controls ensure that invoice prices are compared to contract prices before payments are made on vendor invoices. The failure to follow this procedure increases the possibility that overpayments can be made on vendor invoices and go undetected for long periods of time.

Recommendations

We recommend that the municipality reimburse \$194.86 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification of the Department of Transportation. We also recommend that the municipal officials contact the vendor as soon as possible to obtain reimbursement.

We further recommend that the municipality compare invoice prices to contract prices prior to making payments on vendor invoices.

Management's Response

The secretary/treasurer stated:

In response to the overcharge totaling \$194.86: We will contact the vendor for reimbursement of the difference between the contracted amount and the amount invoiced on several invoices from vendors during 2011 for 9.5mm and 25.0mm Superpave.

Finding No. 1 - Vendor Overcharges (Continued)

Auditor Conclusion

During our next examination period we will determine if the township complied with our recommendations.

Finding No. 2 - Nonpermissible Expenditures

Our examination disclosed that during 2010 the municipality expended \$2,821.24 for the purchase of ID-2 Wearing Course and \$10,366.40 for the purchase of BCBC from its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund. ID-2 Wearing and BCBC are types of hot mixed asphalt that are not approved by the Department of Transportation for use by municipalities. These expenditures were as follows:

Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Check Number	Check Date	Amount	Totals
	<u>BC</u>	BC			
5535377 5536474 5537807 5542367 5552213	07/15/10 07/24/10 07/31/10 08/28/10 10/30/10	2563 2563 2563 2564 2573	08/12/10 08/12/10 08/12/10 09/09/10 12/09/10	\$ 523.20 1,006.54 768.30 171.40 351.80	
					\$ 2,821.24
	<u>ID-2 W</u>	Vearing			
5553229 5554267	11/06/10 11/15/10	2573 2573	12/09/10 12/09/10	3,175.89 7,190.51	
					10,366.40
Total					\$13,187.64

Asphalt approved by the Department of Transportation must meet specifications listed in the Department of Transportation Specifications *Publication 408*, Section 702. ID-2 Wearing and BCBC are not approved for use by municipalities in *Publication 408*.

The failure to purchase asphalt that is approved by the Department of Transportation could result in the municipality having to reimburse \$13,187.64 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

Recommendations

We recommend that the municipality reimburse \$13,187.64 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

Finding No. 2 - Nonpermissible Expenditures (Continued)

Recommendations (Continued)

We further recommend that, in the future, the municipality purchase hot mixed asphalt that is approved by the Department of Transportation.

Management's Response

The secretary/treasurer stated:

The township was not aware that ID-2 and BCBC were non-permissible expenditures. The total amount of \$13,187.64 will be reimbursed to the Liquid Fuels account from the General Account.

Auditor's Conclusion

During our next examination we will determine if the municipality complied with our recommendations.

Finding No. 3 - Purchase Of Snow Plow That Was Not Part Of The COSTARS Contract

Our examination disclosed that the township expended \$8,800.00 during 2010 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for the purchase of a Falls Model 312R 12 foot snow plow. The township thought that the snow plow was purchased from the COSTARS contract. COSTARS is a program run by the Department of General Services that permits local government entities to make purchases from state contracts. However, the make of the snow plow was not part of the COSTARS contract.

The above expenditure was not made in compliance with the contract requirements of *The Second Class Township Code*, 53 P.S. § 68102(b), (also found at § 3102(b) of *The Second Class Township Code* as published by the Local Government Commission), which states, in part:

Written or telephonic price quotations from at least three qualified and responsible contractors shall be requested for all contracts that exceed four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) but are less than the amount [in excess of \$10,000.00] requiring advertisement and competitive bidding or, in lieu of price quotations, a memorandum shall be kept on file showing that fewer than three qualified contractors exist in the market area within which it is practicable to obtain quotations. A written record of telephonic price quotations shall be made and shall contain at least the date of the quotation, the name of the contractor and the contractor's representative, the construction, reconstruction, repair, maintenance or work which was the subject of the quotation and the price. Written price quotations, written records of telephonic price quotations and memoranda shall be retained for a period of three years.

The failure to comply with *The Second Class Township Code* could result in the township having to reimburse \$8,800.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

Recommendations

We recommend that the township reimburse \$8,800.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

We further recommend that, in the future, the township comply with *The Second Class Township Code* as noted in this finding.

Finding No. 3 - Purchase Of Snow Plow That Was Not Part Of The COSTARS Contract (Continued)

Management's Response

The secretary/treasurer stated:

The purchaser at the township was unaware that the brand of snow plow purchased was not included as an option by COSTARS. Also, the vendor was not aware this brand was not covered by COSTARS and informed the township that the purchase was an approved item.

Auditor's Conclusion

The township officials should verify the makes and models of equipment that are available on the COSTARS contract with the Department of General Services before making purchases from the COSTARS contract. During our next examination we will determine if the municipality complied with our recommendations.

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND SUMMARY OF EXIT CONFERENCE FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

An exit conference was held January 14, 2013. Those participating were:

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER

Ms. Lisa A. Heckman, Secretary/Treasurer

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

Mrs. Diane A. Bowman, Auditor Mr. Ryan W. Shrauder, Auditor

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

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER MIFFLIN COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND REPORT DISTRIBUTION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

This report was initially distributed to:

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

Township of Oliver Mifflin County 4670 U.S. Highway 522 South McVeytown, PA 17051

The Honorable Thomas G. White, Jr. Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

Ms. Lisa A. Heckman Secretary/Treasurer

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at 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.