LIMITED PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

City of Corry Police Pension Plan

Erie County, Pennsylvania
For the Period
January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017

July 2018



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General

Eugene A. DePasquale • Auditor General





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

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE AUDITOR GENERAL

The Honorable Mayor and City Council City of Corry Erie County Corry, PA 16407

We conducted a Limited Procedures Engagement (LPE) of the City of Corry Police Pension Plan for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017 to determine its compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. We also evaluated compliance with some requirements subsequent to that period when possible. The LPE was conducted pursuant to authority derived from Section 402(j) of the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act (P.L. 1005, No. 205, as amended, 53 P.S. § 895.101 et seq.) but was not conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The act established mandatory actuarial reporting and funding requirements and a uniform basis for the distribution of state aid to Pennsylvania's public pension plans. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis to support our LPE results.

Our LPE was limited to determining the following:

- Whether state aid was properly determined and deposited in accordance with Act 205 requirements by verifying the annual deposit date of state aid and determining whether deposits were made within 30 days of receipt for all years within the engagement period.
- Whether annual employer contributions were calculated and deposited in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by examining the municipality's calculation of the plan's annual financial requirements and minimum municipal obligation (MMO) and comparing these calculated amounts to amounts actually budgeted and deposited into the pension plan as evidenced by supporting documentation.
- Whether annual employee contributions were required during the engagement period and, if so, were calculated, deducted, and deposited into the pension plan in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by testing total members' contributions on an annual basis using the rates obtained from the plan's governing document in effect for all years within the engagement period and examining documents evidencing the deposit of these employee contributions into the pension plan.

- Whether retirement benefits calculated for plan members who retired during the engagement period represent payments to all (and only) those entitled to receive them and were properly determined and disbursed in accordance with the plan's governing document, applicable laws and regulations by recalculating the amount of the monthly pension benefit due to retired individuals and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined and actually paid to recipients.
- · Whether the January 1, 2015 and January 1, 2017 actuarial valuation reports were prepared and submitted by March 31, 2016 and 2018, respectively, in accordance with Act 205 and whether selected information provided on these reports is accurate, complete, and in accordance with plan provisions to ensure compliance for participation in the state aid program by comparing selected information to supporting source documentation.

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

Finding – Inconsistent Pension Benefit Provision

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

The accompanying supplementary information is presented for purposes of additional analysis. We did not audit the information or conclude on it and, accordingly, express no form of assurance on it.

The contents of this report were discussed with officials of the City of Corry and, where appropriate, their responses have been included in this report. We would like to thank city officials for the cooperation extended to us during the conduct of this LPE.

June 12, 2018

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE

Eugent: O-Pager

Auditor General

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Finding and Recommendation:	
Finding – Inconsistent Pension Benefit Provision	1
Supplementary Information	2
Report Distribution List	8

CITY OF CORRY POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

Finding – Inconsistent Pension Benefit Provision

<u>Condition</u>: The pension plan's governing document, Ordinance No. 768, as amended by Ordinance Nos. 1074 and 1371, among others, contains a normal retirement benefit provision that conflicts with the collective bargaining agreement between the police officers and the city for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018, at Section 9.5.2 as follows:

Benefit Provision	Governing Document	Collective Bargaining Agreement
Normal retirement	Each eligible Policeman may retire from active duty upon his having served as a member of the Police Department for a minimum period of continuous service of twenty (20) years.	Pensions shall be in accordance with Ordinance No. 1074 and its amendments. The city shall, however, subject to the approval of Pension Board, and subject to all State and Federal laws, amend the Police Pension Ordinance to provide for a minimum age requirement of fifty (50) years for police officers hired after January 1, 2012.

<u>Criteria</u>: The plan's governing document and the collective bargaining agreement for the period should contain consistent benefit provisions to ensure the sound administration of retirement benefits.

<u>Cause</u>: 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.

<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 take appropriate action to ensure the plan's governing document and the collective bargaining agreement contain consistent benefit provisions at their earliest opportunity to do so.

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

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

The supplementary information contained on Pages 2 through 4 reflects the implementation of GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*. The objective of this statement is to improve financial reporting by state and local governmental pension plans.

SCHEDULE OF CHANGES IN THE NET PENSION LIABILITY AND RELATED RATIOS FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014, 2015, AND 2016

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Total Pension Liability			
Service cost	\$ 94,295	\$ 85,693	\$ 89,978
Interest	384,584	399,575	415,644
Difference between expected and actual experience	-	(26,819)	-
Benefit payments, including refunds of member			
contributions	(215,528)	(272,631)	(278,073)
Net Change in Total Pension Liability	263,351	185,818	227,549
Total Pension Liability - Beginning	5,139,295	5,402,646	5,588,464
Total Pension Liability - Ending (a)	\$ 5,402,646	\$ 5,588,464	\$ 5,816,013
Plan Fiduciary Net Position			
Contributions - employer	\$ 112,959	\$ 88,748	\$ 41,856
Contributions - employer Contributions - member	27,024	25,035	25,156
Net investment income	304,694	(280,526)	467,021
Benefit payments, including refunds of member	304,094	(200,320)	407,021
contributions	(215,528)	(272,631)	(278,073)
	` ' '	(20,833)	` ' '
Administrative expense	(19,549)		(19,009)
Net Change in Plan Fiduciary Net Position	209,600	(460,207)	236,951
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Beginning	5,723,736	5,933,336	5,473,129
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Ending (b)	\$ 5,933,336	\$ 5,473,129	\$ 5,710,080
Net Pension Liability - Ending (a-b)	\$ (530,690)	\$ 115,335	\$ 105,933
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the Total			
Pension Liability	109.8%	97.9%	98.2%
Estimated Covered Employee Payroll	\$ 717,102	\$ 710,421	\$ 751,242
Estimated Covered Employee Layron	ψ /1/,102	Ψ /10,421	ψ /31,242
Net Pension Liability as a Percentage of Covered			
Employee Payroll	(74.0%)	16.2%	14.1%
* * *	` /		

Sensitivity of the Net Pension Liability to Changes in the Discount Rate

The following presents the net pension liability of the city as of December 31, 2015 and 2016, calculated using the discount rate of 7.50%, as well as what the city's net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1 percentage-point lower or 1 percentage-point higher than the current rate:

	Current			
	1% Decrease (6.50%)	Discount Rate (7.50%)	1% Increase (8.50%)	
Net Pension Liability - 12/31/15	\$ 723,240	\$ 115,335	\$ (391,620)	
Net Pension Liability - 12/31/16	\$ 720,981	\$ 105,933	\$ (406,932)	

Note: The discount rate of 7.50% was used in the preparation of the city's December 31, 2015 and 2016 GASB 67 schedules. This rate differs from the 7.25% reported in the Notes to Supplementary Schedules on page 7 of this report.

SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Year Ended December 31	De	tuarially termined ntribution	Actual tributions	D	entribution eficiency (Excess)	Covered- Employee Payroll*	Contributions as a Percentage of Covered- Employee Payroll
2008	\$	42,024	\$ 42,024	\$	-	\$ 669,941	6.27%
2009		42,551	45,246		(2,695)		
2010		39,157	63,296		(24,139)	696,060	9.09%
2011		159,957	142,624		17,333		
2012		159,052	141,719		17,333	705,330	20.09%
2013		102,062	102,062		-		
2014		112,959	112,959		-	717,102	15.75%
2015		88,748	88,748		-	710,421	12.49%
2016		41,856	41,856		-	751,242	5.57%
2017		38,861	39,957		(1,096)		

^{*} Due to GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*, being implemented only recently, the amount of Covered-Employee Payroll was not provided for odd years prior to 2014. In addition, due to the timing of this engagement, covered-employee payroll for 2017 was not provided in this schedule.

SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENT RETURNS

Annual Money-Weighted Rate of Return, Net of Investment Expense:

2016	8.70%
2015	(4.82%)
2014	5.40%
2013	19.51%

SCHEDULE OF FUNDING PROGRESS

Historical trend information about the plan is presented herewith as supplementary information. It is intended to help users assess the plan's funding status on a going-concern basis, assess progress made in accumulating assets to pay benefits when due, and make comparisons with other state and local government retirement systems.

The actuarial information is required by Act 205 biennially. The historical information, beginning as of January 1, 2013, is as follows:

	$(1) \qquad (2)$		(3)	(4)
			Unfunded	
		Actuarial	(Assets in	
		Accrued	Excess of)	
	Actuarial	Liability	Actuarial	
Actuarial	Value of	(AAL) -	Accrued	Funded
Valuation	Assets	Entry Age	Liability	Ratio
Date	(a)	(b)	(b) - (a)	(a)/(b)
01-01-13	\$ 4,798,492	\$ 4,898,808	\$ 100,316	98.0%
01-01-15	5,665,333	5,375,827	(289,506)	105.4%
01-01-17	6,048,860	5,970,087	(78,773)	101.3%

Note: The market values of the plan's assets at 01-01-13, 01-01-15, and 01-01-17 have been adjusted to reflect the smoothing of gains and/or losses over a 4-year averaging period. 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.

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.

CITY OF CORRY POLICE PENSION PLAN SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION NOTES TO SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULES (UNAUDITED)

The information presented in the supplementary schedules was determined as part of the actuarial valuation at the date indicated. Additional information as of the latest actuarial valuation date follows:

Actuarial valuation date January 1, 2017

Actuarial cost method Entry age normal

Amortization method N/A

Remaining amortization period N/A

Asset valuation method Fair value, 4-year smoothing

Actuarial assumptions:

Investment rate of return * 7.25%

Projected salary increases * 4.75%

Cost-of-living adjustments None assumed

^{*} Includes inflation at 2.75%

CITY OF CORRY 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 David E. Mitchell Mayor

Mr. Jason T. BiondiCity Manager

Ms. Joanne M. Smith City Clerk

Mr. William Roche Finance Director

Ms. Diane L. Cowles
City Controller

Ms. Donna M. Huffman Treasurer

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