

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY 63-403

LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND EXAMINATION REPORT

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

Released May 2013

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE - AUDITOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL





BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY 63-403

LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND EXAMINATION REPORT

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

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Background	1
Independent Auditor's Report	3
Financial Section:	
2010 Form MS-965 With Adjustments	7
2011 Form MS-965 With Adjustments	10
Notes To Forms MS-965 With Adjustments	13
Findings And Recommendations:	
Finding No. 1 - Documentation For Price Quotations Was Not Available For Examination	19
Finding No. 2 - Purchases Over \$10,000.00 In Noncompliance With Advertising And Bidding Requirements	22
Comment	25
Summary Of Exit Conference	26
Report Distribution	27

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE 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.





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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne 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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne 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.

(FECUR)

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

As discussed in Finding No. 1, the borough expended \$8,742.93 during 2010 for repairs to Ridge Street and \$9,685.15 during 2011 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for pothole patching materials. The borough was required to obtain three written or telephonic price quotations for these expenditures. However, documentation for price quotations was not available for examination. Additionally, as discussed in Finding No. 2, the borough expended \$15,635.00 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for snow removal between February 27, 2010 and March 1, 2010 without advertising for bids.

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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne 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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne 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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne County's Forms MS-965 that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the Borough of Honesdale, Wayne County's internal control.

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

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 Borough of Honesdale, Wayne County's internal control.

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*:

- Documentation For Price Quotations Was Not available For Examination.
- Purchases Over \$10,000.00 In Noncompliance With Advertising And Bidding Requirements.

We are concerned in light of the municipality's failure to correct a previously reported finding regarding failure to maintain documentation for price quotations. During our current examination we again noted that the municipality failed to maintain documentation for price quotations and made purchases over \$10,000.00 in noncompliance with advertising and bidding requirements. The municipality should strive to implement the recommendations and corrective actions noted in this report.

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

July 25, 2012

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE
Auditor General

Eugraf O-Purper



BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 1 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

					Adjusted
Expenditure Summary	Reported		Adjustments		 Amount
Major equipment purchases	\$	62,869.00	\$	-	\$ 62,869.00
Minor equipment purchases		4,400.00		-	4,400.00
Computer/Computer related training		-		-	-
Agility projects		-		-	-
Cleaning streets and gutters		921.79		-	921.79
Winter maintenance services		45,250.76		-	45,250.76
Traffic control devices		1,082.59		-	1,082.59
Street lighting		-		-	-
Storm sewers and drains		51,886.27		-	51,886.27
Repairs of tools and machinery		24,946.92		-	24,946.92
Maintenance and repair of					
roads and bridges		17,800.53		-	17,800.53
Highway construction and					
rebuilding projects		_		-	-
Miscellaneous (Note 6)		7,978.47		_	 7,978.47
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	\$	217,136.33	\$	-	\$ 217,136.33

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 2 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Fund Balance	Reported		Reported		djustments (Note 4)	Adjusted Amount
1. Balance, January 1, 2010	\$ 326,633.91		\$ -	\$ 326,633.91		
Receipts:						
2. State allocation		98,136.06	-	98,136.06		
2a. Turnback allocation		9,680.00	-	9,680.00		
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		2,180.30	-	2,180.30		
2c. Miscellaneous (Note 5)		7,863.45	 1,451.40	9,314.85		
3. Total receipts		117,859.81	1,451.40	119,311.21		
4. Total funds available		444,493.72	1,451.40	445,945.12		
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		217,136.33		217,136.33		
6. Balance, December 31, 2010	\$	227,357.39	\$ 1,451.40	\$ 228,808.79		

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2010 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 3 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Equipment Balance	Reported		Reported		Reported		Reported		Reported Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	65,133.11	\$ -	\$	65,133.11							
2. Add: Current year equipment allocation (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	n	21,563.21	-		21,563.21							
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments			 									
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		86,696.32	-		86,696.32							
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		62,869.00	 		62,869.00							
6. Remainder		23,827.32			23,827.32							
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	\$	23,827.32	\$ 	\$	23,827.32							

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 1 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Expenditure Summary	Reported		Adjustments		Adjusted Amount	
<u> </u>					-	
Major equipment purchases	\$	70,011.63	\$	-	\$	70,011.63
Minor equipment purchases		239.00		_		239.00
Computer/Computer related training		_		-		-
Agility projects		_		-		-
Cleaning streets and gutters		269.87		-		269.87
Winter maintenance services		46,145.57		-		46,145.57
Traffic control devices		88.80		-		88.80
Street lighting		-		-		-
Storm sewers and drains		7,646.67		-		7,646.67
Repairs of tools and machinery		2,013.13		-		2,013.13
Maintenance and repair of						
roads and bridges		16,310.74		-		16,310.74
Highway construction and						
rebuilding projects		_		-		-
Miscellaneous				_		
T (1/T S (21 5)	ф.	1 40 705 41	Φ.		Φ.	1 40 705 41
Total (To Section 2, Line 5)	<u> </u>	142,725.41	\$	_	\$	142,725.41

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 2 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Fund Balance	Reported		Reported		djustments (Note 4)	Adjusted Amount
1. Balance, January 1, 2011	\$ 227,357.39		\$ 1,451.40	\$ 228,808.79		
Receipts:						
2. State allocation		99,201.55	-	99,201.55		
2a. Turnback allocation		9,680.00	-	9,680.00		
2b. Interest on investments (Note 3)		1,807.81	(82.27)	1,725.54		
2c. Miscellaneous (Note 5)		27,408.00	 6,400.00	 33,808.00		
3. Total receipts		138,097.36	 6,317.73	 144,415.09		
4. Total funds available		365,454.75	 7,769.13	 373,223.88		
5. Expenditures (Section 1)		142,725.41	 	142,725.41		
6. Balance, December 31, 2011	\$	222,729.34	\$ 7,769.13	\$ 230,498.47		

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND 2011 FORM MS-965 – SECTION 3 WITH ADJUSTMENTS

Equipment Balance	1	Reported	Adin	stments		Adjusted Amount
<u>Lquipiiciit Baranee</u>		керопец		surcits		7 HIIOUIL
1. Prior year equipment balance	\$	23,827.32	\$	-	\$	23,827.32
2. Add: Current year equipment allocatio (20% of Lines 2 + 2a, Section 2)	n	21,776.31		-		21,776.31
3. PENNDOT approved adjustments		27,408.00				27,408.00
4. Total funds available for equipment acquisition		73,011.63		-		73,011.63
5. Less: Major equipment expenditures		70,011.63				70,011.63
6. Remainder		3,000.00				3,000.00
7. Equipment balance available for subsequent year (Lesser of Line 6 or Section 2 balance, but not less than zero)	¢	3,000.00	\$		\$	3,000.00
out not ress than zero)	Ψ	3,000.00	Ψ		Ψ	3,000.00

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 Borough Code, Title 53 P.S § 46316, authorizes the borough 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.

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND NOTES TO FORMS MS-965 WITH ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE PERIOD

JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

2. Deposits (Continued)

Fund Balance

The fund balance as of December 31, 2011 consists of the following:

Cash \$ 97,163.35

Certificates of deposit 133,335.12

Total \$230,498.47

3. Interest On Investments

Our examination disclosed that the municipality deposited idle liquid fuels tax money in an interest-bearing account and certificates of deposit which earned \$2,180.30 during 2010, and \$1,725.54 during 2011, thus providing additional funds for road maintenance and repairs.

4. Adjustments

2010 - Section 2

An adjustment of \$1,451.40 was made to "Miscellaneous" because these receipts were understated.

2011 - Section 2

An adjustment of \$1,451.40 was made to "Balance, January 1, 2011" to reflect the adjustment made to the fund balance in 2010 - Section 2.

An adjustment of \$(82.27) was made to "Interest on investments" because interest earned was overstated.

An adjustment of \$6,400.00 was made to "Miscellaneous" because these receipts were understated.

5. <u>Miscellaneous Receipts</u>

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

Source	Description	2010	2011
Commonwealth of	Deposit in error		
Pennsylvania	(Note 7)	\$7,863.45	\$ -
Vendor	Refund overpayment		
	(Note 8)	712.70	-
Vendor	Refund overpayment		
	(Note 8)	738.70	-
General Fund	Reimbursement		
	(Comment)	-	6,400.00
Resident	Sale of vehicles		27,408.00
Total		<u>\$9,314.85</u>	\$33,808.00

6. Miscellaneous Expenditures

The following miscellaneous expenditures were paid from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund during the examination period:

Payee	Description	_2010_
General Fund	Correction of deposit in error	
	(Note 5)	\$7,863.45
Vendor	Purchase of checks	115.02
Total		<u>\$7,978.47</u>

7. Deposit In Error

On October 21, 2010 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania electronically deposited \$7,863.45 into its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund in error. On November 29, 2010, the municipality transferred this amount from its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund to its General Fund to correct the deposit in error.

8. Overpayment Of Invoices

On February 9, 2010 the municipality expended \$862.00 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund to pay vendor invoice No. 1605976 for the purchase of stone However, the amount of the invoice was only \$149.30. On April 23, 2010 the municipality deposited \$712.70 into its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund that was received from the vendor to correct the overpayment.

Additionally, on April 20, 2010, the municipality expended \$11,125.00 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund to pay vendor invoice No. 2748 for the repair of a street sweeper. However, the amount of the invoice was only \$10,386.30. On May 19, 2010 the municipality deposited \$738.70 into its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund that was received from the vendor to correct the overpayment.

Finding No. 1 - Documentation For Price Quotations Was Not Available For Examination

Our examination disclosed that the borough expended \$8,742.93 during 2010 for repairs to Ridge Street and \$9,685.15 during 2011 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for pothole patching material. The borough was required to obtain three written or telephonic price quotations for these expenditures. However, documentation for price quotations was not available for examination. The repairs and pothole patching materials were as follows:

Invoice Number	Invoice <u>Date</u>	Check Number	Check Date	Amount	<u>Total</u>
9954	06/23/10	899	07/19/10	\$ 8,742.93	
2010 Total					\$8,742.93
Various	Various	1064	07/13/11	2,581.76	
Various	Various	1065	08/11/11	3,814.39	
Various	Various	1072	09/14/11	1,852.34	
Various	Various	1081	11/04/11	1,436.66	
2011 Total					9,685.15
Two Year Total					<u>\$18,428.08</u>

The above expenditures were not made in compliance with the contract requirements of *The Borough Code*, 53 P.S. § 46402(a.1), (also found at § 1402(a.1) of *The Borough 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.

<u>Finding No. 1 - Documentation For Price Quotations Was Not Available For Examination</u> (Continued)

In addition, the above expenditures were not made in compliance with the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9*, Appendix D, Section 449.7(d), which states, in part:

...For material estimates between \$4,000 and \$10,000, three telephone price quotes shall be obtained prior to the selection of a supplier. In lieu of the price quotations, a memorandum shall be kept on file showing that fewer than three qualified contractors service the market area within which it is practicable to obtain quotations. If the cost during the year of an unadvertised item or group of like items ordinarily supplied by a single supplier exceeds \$10,000 or if the cost was between \$4,000 and \$10,000 and three price quotes were not obtained, the entire cost shall be ineligible for payment from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary [of the Department of Transportation] that it was reasonably believed that the cost of the year's requirements of that item or group of like items would not exceed \$10,000 or be between \$4,000 and \$10,000 as specified above.

The failure to comply with *The Borough Code* and the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* could result in the borough having to reimburse \$18,428.08 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

A similar finding was also written in our prior report.

Recommendations

We recommend that the borough reimburse \$18,428.08 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

We again recommend that, in the future, the borough comply with *The Borough Code* and the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* as noted in this finding.

<u>Finding No. 1 - Documentation For Price Quotations Was Not Available For Examination</u> (Continued)

Management's Response

The borough secretary stated:

The public works department failed to secure telephonic price quotations for the purchase of pothole patching materials. Ridge Street for \$8,472.93 was an emergency situation after heavy rainfall caused road surface and storm line damage. Actions were taken as per council directions.

Auditor's Conclusion

The Department of Transportation's *Publication 9*, Appendix D, Section 449.3(d), states:

(d) Emergency exception to advertising and bidding requirements.

Whenever municipal officials determine that an emergency condition exists rendering it essential to undertake immediate repair or maintenance work to protect the health, safety, or welfare of the people, such emergency work may be contracted for by the municipality without the necessity of advertising for competitive bids for the project.

- (1) An emergency which will warrant dispensing with advertising for competitive bids must be immediate, unforeseen, and existing. A condition which may or may not arise in the future or a condition which should reasonably have been foreseen in time to advertise for bids will not warrant dispensing with normal advertising and bidding requirements.
- (2) The determination of the emergency and the actions of the municipal officials in contracting for emergency work must be fully documented for department review.

The municipality did not provide us with documentation that an emergency situation existed. During our next examination we will determine if the municipality complied with our recommendations.

Finding No. 2 - Purchases Over \$10,000.00 In Noncompliance With Advertising And Bidding Requirements

Our examination disclosed that the borough expended \$15,635.00 from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for snow removal between February 27, 2010 and March 1, 2010 without advertising for bids.

The above expenditures were not made in compliance with the advertising, bidding, and contract requirements of *The Borough Code*, 53 P.S. § 46402(a), (also found at § 1402(a) of *The Borough Code* as published by the Local Government Commission), which requires that purchases made after September 8, 1990, over \$10,000.00 must be advertised, bid, and awarded by contract. *The Borough Code*, 53 P.S. § 46403(a), (also found at § 1403(a) of *The Borough Code* as published by the Local Government Commission) further states that advertising, bidding and contract requirements should not be evaded through piecemeal purchases.

In addition, the above expenditures were not made in compliance with the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9*, Appendix D, Section 449.7(d), which states, in part:

Each municipality shall make an annual estimate of its requirements of road construction and maintenance materials, and shall advertise for bids on all items and groups of like items ordinarily supplied by a single supplier . . . which are estimated to exceed \$10,000 for the year If the cost during the year of an unadvertised item or group of like items ordinarily supplied by a single supplier exceeds \$10,000 . . . the entire cost shall be ineligible for payment from the Liquid Fuels Tax Fund unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary [of the Department of Transportation] that it was reasonably believed that the cost of the year's requirements of that item or group of like items would not exceed \$10,000 . . .

The failure to comply with *The Borough Code* and the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* could result in the borough having to reimburse \$15,635.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund.

Recommendations

We recommend that the borough reimburse \$15,635.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund upon official notification by the Department of Transportation.

Finding No. 2 - Purchases Over \$10,000.00 In Noncompliance With Advertising And Bidding Requirements (Continued)

Recommendations (Continued)

We further recommend that, in the future, the borough comply with *The Borough Code* and the Department of Transportation's *Publication 9* as noted in this finding.

Management's Response

The borough secretary stated:

Snow removal was due to emergency and the need to clear snow from streets, crosswalks and sidewalks. Hiring of contractors was done by council.

Auditor's Conclusion

The Department of Transportation's *Publication 9*, Appendix D, Section 449.3(d), states:

(d) Emergency exception to advertising and bidding requirements.

Whenever municipal officials determine that an emergency condition exists rendering it essential to undertake immediate repair or maintenance work to protect the health, safety, or welfare of the people, such emergency work may be contracted for by the municipality without the necessity of advertising for competitive bids for the project.

- (1) An emergency which will warrant dispensing with advertising for competitive bids must be immediate, unforeseen, and existing. A condition which may or may not arise in the future or a condition which should reasonably have been foreseen in time to advertise for bids will not warrant dispensing with normal advertising and bidding requirements.
- (2) The determination of the emergency and the actions of the municipal officials in contracting for emergency work must be fully documented for department review.

<u>Finding No. 2 - Purchases Over \$10,000.00 In Noncompliance With Advertising And Bidding Requirements (Continued)</u>

Auditor's Conclusion (Continued)

The municipality did not provide us with documentation that an emergency situation existed. During our next examination we will determine if the municipality complied with our recommendations.

Comment – Summary Of Prior Examination Recommendations

In our prior report we recommended that the Department of Transportation review our examination finding to determine if the municipality should reimburse \$6,400.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund for rental of equipment for a project without maintaining documentation for price quotations. A similar finding was also written in our current report (see Finding No.1).

During our current examination we reviewed a letter dated January 5, 2011, from the Department of Transportation informing the municipality to reimburse \$6,400.00 to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund. We noted that the municipality reimbursed this amount to its Liquid Fuels Tax Fund on March 9, 2011.

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE COUNTY LIQUID FUELS TAX FUND SUMMARY OF EXIT CONFERENCE FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

An exit conference was held July 25, 2012. Those participating were:

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE

Ms. Karen A. Breidenstein, Treasurer Ms. Judith Plotanis, Secretary

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. Jerome Werner, Auditor

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

BOROUGH OF HONESDALE WAYNE 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

Borough of Honesdale Wayne County 958 Main Street Honesdale, PA 18431

The Honorable F. J. Monaghan President of Council

Ms. Karen A. Breidenstein Treasurer

Ms. Judith Plotanis Secretary

This report is a matter of public record. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 231 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120. To view this report online or to contact the Department of the Auditor General, please access our web site at www.auditorgen.state.pa.us.