# **COMPLIANCE AUDIT**

# City of Warren Police Pension Plan

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

# October 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 Warren Warren County Warren, PA 16365

We have conducted a compliance audit of the City of Warren Police Pension Plan for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017. We also evaluated compliance with some requirements subsequent to that period when possible. The audit was conducted pursuant to authority derived from Section 402(j) of Act 205 and in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our finding and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our finding and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The objectives of the audit were:

- 1. To determine if municipal officials took appropriate corrective action to address the finding contained in our prior audit report; and
- 2. To determine if the pension plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies.

Our audit was limited to the areas related to the objectives identified above. To determine if municipal officials took appropriate corrective action to address the finding contained in our prior audit report, we inquired of plan officials and evaluated supporting documentation provided by officials evidencing that the suggested corrective action has been appropriately taken. To determine whether the pension plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies, our methodology included the following:

We determined whether state aid was properly determined and deposited in accordance with Act 205 requirements by verifying the annual deposit date of state aid and determining whether deposits were made within 30 days of receipt for all years within the period under audit.

- We determined whether annual employer contributions were calculated and deposited in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by examining the municipality's calculation of the plan's annual financial requirements and minimum municipal obligation (MMO) and comparing these calculated amounts to amounts actually budgeted and deposited into the pension plan as evidenced by supporting documentation.
- We determined whether annual employee contributions were calculated, deducted, and deposited into the pension plan in accordance with the plan's governing document and applicable laws and regulations by testing total members' contributions on an annual basis using the rates obtained from the plan's governing document in effect for all years within the period under audit and examining documents evidencing the deposit of these employee contributions into the pension plan.
- We determined whether retirement benefits calculated for both of the plan members who retired during the current audit 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 the retired individuals and comparing these amounts to supporting documentation evidencing amounts determined and actually paid to the recipients.
- We determined whether the January 1, 2015 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.
- · We determined whether transfers were properly authorized, timely, and appropriately recorded by plan officials by examining supporting documentation for the transfer made during the audit period.

The City of Warren contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm for annual audits of its basic financial statements which are available at the city's offices. Those financial statements were not audited by us and, accordingly, we express no opinion or other form of assurance on them.

City officials are responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls to provide reasonable assurance that the City of Warren Police Pension Plan is administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies. In conducting our audit, we obtained an understanding of the city's internal controls as they relate to the city's compliance with those requirements and that we considered to be significant within the context of our audit objectives, and assessed whether those significant controls were properly designed and implemented. Additionally and as

previously described, we tested transactions, assessed official actions, performed analytical procedures, and interviewed selected officials to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance with legal and regulatory requirements or noncompliance with provisions of contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies that are significant within the context of the audit objectives.

The results of our procedures indicated that, in all significant respects, the City of Warren Police Pension Plan was administered in compliance with applicable state laws, regulations, contracts, administrative procedures, and local ordinances and policies, except as noted in the following finding further discussed later in this report:

Finding – Noncompliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Provide A Killed In Service Benefit

The finding contained in this audit report repeats a condition that was cited in our previous audit report that has not been corrected by city officials. We are concerned by the city's failure to correct this previously reported audit finding and strongly encourage timely implementation of the recommendation noted in this audit report.

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 City of Warren and, where appropriate, their responses have been included in the report. We would like to thank city officials for the cooperation extended to us during the conduct of the audit.

October 5, 2018

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE

Eugraf J-Pager

Auditor General

# CONTENTS

<u>Pag</u>	<u>e</u>
Background	1
Status of Prior Finding	3
Finding and Recommendation:	
Finding – Noncompliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Provide A Killed In Service Benefit	4
Supplementary Information	7
Comment	4
Report Distribution List	6

#### BACKGROUND

On December 18, 1984, the Pennsylvania Legislature adopted the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act (P.L. 1005, No. 205, as amended, 53 P.S. § 895.101 et seq.). The Act established mandatory actuarial reporting and funding requirements and a uniform basis for the distribution of state aid to Pennsylvania's public pension plans. Section 402(j) of Act 205 specifically requires the Auditor General, as deemed necessary, to make an audit of every municipality which receives general municipal pension system state aid and of every municipal pension plan and fund in which general municipal pension system state aid is deposited.

Annual state aid allocations are provided from a 2 percent foreign (out-of-state) casualty insurance premium tax, a portion of the foreign (out-of-state) fire insurance tax designated for paid firefighters and any investment income earned on the collection of these taxes. Generally, municipal pension plans established prior to December 18, 1984, are eligible for state aid. For municipal pension plans established after that date, the sponsoring municipality must fund the plan for three plan years before it becomes eligible for state aid. In accordance with Act 205, a municipality's annual state aid allocation cannot exceed its actual pension costs.

In addition to Act 205, the City of Warren Police Pension Plan is also governed by implementing regulations adopted by the former Public Employee Retirement Commission published at Title 16, Part IV of the Pennsylvania Code and applicable provisions of various other state statutes including, but not limited to, the following:

- Act 67 The Third Class City Code, Act of November 24, 2015 (P.L. 242, No. 67), as amended, 11 Pa. C.S. § 10101 et seq.
- Act 177 General Local Government Code, Act of December 19, 1996 (P.L. 1158, No. 177), as amended, 53 Pa.C.S. § 101 et seq.

The City of Warren Police Pension Plan is a single-employer defined benefit pension plan locally controlled by the provisions of Ordinance No. 1669, as amended. The plan is also affected by the provisions of collective bargaining agreements between the city and its police officers. The plan was established May 7, 1945. Active members are required to contribute 2 percent of compensation to the plan. As of December 31, 2017, the plan had 14 active members, no terminated members eligible for vested benefits in the future, and 24 retirees receiving pension benefits from the plan.

#### **BACKGROUND** – (Continued)

As of December 31, 2017, selected plan benefit provisions are as follows:

# **Eligibility Requirements**:

Normal Retirement Completion of 20 years of service.

Early Retirement None

Vesting A member is 100% vested after 12 years of service.

# Retirement Benefit:

Benefit equals 50% of final 36 months average compensation, plus a monthly service increment equal to  $1/40^{th}$  of the retirement allowance for each year of service in excess of 20 years, up to a maximum of \$500 per month.

#### Survivor Benefit:

Before Retirement Eligibility Refund of member contributions plus interest.

After Retirement Eligibility A monthly benefit equal to 100% of the pension the

member was receiving or was entitled to receive on the

day of the member's death.

#### Service Related Disability Benefit:

Benefit equals 50% of the final 36 months average compensation prior to disablement.

# CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN STATUS OF PRIOR FINDING

# Noncompliance With Prior Audit Recommendation

City of Warren has not complied with the prior audit recommendation concerning the following as further discussed in the Finding and Recommendation section of this report:

· Failure To Provide A Killed In Service Benefit

## CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

# <u>Finding – Noncompliance With Prior Audit Recommendation – Failure To Provide A</u> <u>Killed In Service Benefit</u>

Condition: As disclosed in our prior audit reports, on January 21, 2013, the city passed Ordinance No. 1822, effective January 1, 2013, which repealed the killed in service benefit for its police officers previously provided by Section 4.01 of Ordinance No. 1669. During the current period, the city again failed to reinstate a provision for a killed in service benefit in the pension plan's governing document as required by the Third Class City Code.

Criteria: Section 14301 of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

Section 14301. Police Pension Fund.

- (a) Establishment. Cities shall establish, by ordinance, a police pension fund.
- (b) Requirements. The following shall apply to a police pension fund established pursuant to this section:
  - (1) The fund shall be maintained by an equal and proportionate monthly charge against each member of the police force that may not exceed annually 4% of the pay of the member and an additional amount not to exceed 1% of the pay of the member.
  - (2) The charges under paragraph (1) shall be paid by the member or the municipal corporation to provide sufficient funds for payments required by section 14303(f) (relating to allowances and service increments).
  - (3) The payments under paragraph (2) shall be made to a surviving spouse even if the spouse remarries or, if no spouse survives or if the individual survives and subsequently dies, to the children under 18 years of age of:
    - (i) a member of the police force;
    - (ii) a member retired on pension; or
    - (iii) a member who died in service. (Emphasis added)

Furthermore, Section 14303(b) of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

The basis of the apportionment of the pension:

- (1) Shall be determined by the rate of the monthly pay of the member at the date of injury, <u>death</u>, honorable discharge, vesting under section 14302.1 (relating to limited vested benefit) or retirement, or the highest average annual salary that the member received during any five years of service preceding injury, <u>death</u>, honorable discharge, vesting under section 14302.1 or retirement, whichever is higher.
- (2) Except as to service increments provided for in subsection (d), may not exceed in a year one-half the annual pay of the member computed at the monthly or average annual rate, whichever is higher. (Emphasis added)

#### CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

### <u>Finding – (Continued)</u>

In addition, Section 14303(e) of the Third Class City Code states, in part:

The spouse of a member of the police force or a member who retires on pension who dies or, if no spouse survives or if the spouse survives and subsequently dies or remarries, the child or children under 18 years of age of a member of the police force or a member who retires on pension who dies on or after August 1, 1963, shall, during the lifetime of the surviving spouse, even if the surviving spouse remarries, or until reaching 18 years of age in the case of a child or children, be entitled to receive a pension calculated at the rate of 50% of the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving if the member was retired at the time of the member's death and may receive the pension the member was receiving or would have been receiving had the member been retired at the time of the member's death.

Finally, Section 14308(c) of the Third Class City Code states:

In the event of the death of a member of the police force <u>not in the line of service</u> before the member becomes entitled to a pension and if the member is not survived by a spouse or family entitled to payments as provided in this subdivision, the total amount of contributions paid into the pension fund by the member shall be paid over to the member's estate. (Emphasis added)

Based on these sections of the Third Class City Code taken as a whole, the Department has concluded that the Code mandates the provision of a benefit for survivors of police officers killed in service.

<u>Cause</u>: The city contends that the Third Class City Code makes no reference to a killed in service benefit; therefore, the benefit is not mandated.

<u>Effect</u>: The continued failure to reinstate a killed in service benefit could result in a potential unrecognized liability to the plan or deny plan members benefits to which they are statutorily entitled.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We again recommend that city officials review the plan's governing document and take appropriate action to ensure compliance with the Third Class City Code.

# CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

# **Finding** – (Continued)

<u>Management's Response</u>: Municipal officials disagreed with the finding and recommendation and stated their position remains the same as provided in the written response dated May 5, 2016. The City of Warren believes that the Third Class City Code makes no reference to a killed in service benefit.

<u>Auditor's Conclusion</u>: As previously cited, it is the position of the Department that the Third Class City Code mandates a benefit for survivors of police officers killed in service. Therefore, based on the Criteria previously stated, the city should reinstate a killed in service benefit provision to ensure the plan is in compliance with the Third Class City Code.

The supplementary information contained on Pages 7 through 10 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 AND 2015

		<u>2014</u>		<u>2015</u>
Total Pension Liability				
Service cost	\$	181,479	\$	152,075
Interest		518,950		512,602
Change of benefit terms		-		(18,267)
Difference between expected and actual experience		-		(267,700)
Changes of assumptions		-		-
Benefit payments, including refunds of member				
contributions		(479,565)		(459,060)
Net Change in Total Pension Liability		220,864		(80,350)
Total Pension Liability - Beginning		6,973,104		7,193,968
Total Pension Liability - Ending (a)	\$	7,193,968	\$	7,113,618
Plan Fiduciary Net Position				
Contributions - employer	\$	221,701	\$	188,168
Contributions - member	Ψ	16,650	Ψ	17,049
Net investment income		556,253		(66,660)
Benefit payments, including refunds of member		330,233		(00,000)
contributions		(479,565)		(459,060)
Administrative expense		(36,676)		(36,431)
Net Change in Plan Fiduciary Net Position		278,363	-	(356,934)
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Beginning		7,556,913		7,835,276
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Ending (b)	\$	7,835,276	\$	7,478,342
Fian Fiduciary Net Fosition - Ending (b)	Φ	7,833,270	Φ	1,470,342
Net Pension Liability - Ending (a-b)	\$	(641,308)	\$	(364,724)
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the Total				
Pension Liability		108.9%		105.1%
Tension Eldomity		100.770		103.170
Estimated Covered Employee Payroll	\$	782,344	\$	937,229
Net Pension Liability as a Percentage of Covered				
Employee Payroll		(82.0%)		(38.9%)
		(02.070)		(20.570)

# SCHEDULE OF CHANGES IN THE NET PENSION LIABILITY AND RELATED RATIOS FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2016, AND 2017

		<u>2016</u>		<u>2017</u>
Total Pension Liability	Φ.	4 = 0 . = 0	4	1=1 001
Service cost	\$	159,679	\$	171,394
Interest		525,986		550,443
Change of benefit terms		-		-
Difference between expected and actual experience		-		(59,672)
Changes of assumptions		-		471,417
Benefit payments, including refunds of member				
contributions		(529,881)		(529,712)
Net Change in Total Pension Liability		155,784		603,870
Total Pension Liability - Beginning		7,113,618		7,269,402
Total Pension Liability - Ending (a)	\$	7,269,402	\$	7,873,272
Plan Fiduciary Net Position	Φ.	100 107	Φ.	4.5.454
Contributions - employer	\$	133,197	\$	145,471
Contributions - member		18,538		17,913
Net investment income		544,151		1,086,322
Benefit payments, including refunds of member				
contributions		(529,881)		(529,712)
Administrative expense		(33,294)		(30,937)
Net Change in Plan Fiduciary Net Position		132,711		689,057
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Beginning		7,478,342		7,611,053
Plan Fiduciary Net Position - Ending (b)	\$	7,611,053	\$	8,300,110
Net Pension Liability - Ending (a-b)	\$	(2/1 651)	\$	(426,838)
Net Fension Liability - Ending (a-0)	<b>D</b>	(341,651)	<u> </u>	(420,636)
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the Total				
Pension Liability		104.7%		105.4%
·				
Estimated Covered Employee Payroll	\$	784,113	\$	931,319
Net Pension Liability as a Percentage of Covered				
Employee Payroll		(43.6%)		(45.8%)

#### 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, 2014, 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 Discount Rate (6.50%) (7.50%)			1% Increase (8.50%)		
Net Pension Liability - 12/31/14	\$	156,414	\$	(641,308)	\$	(1,313,158)
Net Pension Liability - 12/31/15	\$	398,744	\$	(364,724)	\$	(1,009,375)
Net Pension Liability - 12/31/16	\$	443,790	\$	(341,651)	\$	(1,004,525)

In addition, the following presents the net pension liability of the city as of December 31, 2017, calculated using the discount rate of 7.25%, 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			
	Decrease (6.25%)	Discount Rate (7.25%)		1% Increase (8.25%)	
Net Pension Liability- 12/31/17	\$ 436,520	\$ (426,838)	\$	(1,149,096)	

#### SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Year Ended December 31	Det	tuarially termined atribution	Actual tributions	De	ntribution ficiency Excess)	Covered- Employee Payroll*	Contributions as a Percentage of Covered- Employee Payroll
2008	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ 697,393	N/A
2009		-	-		-		
2010		-	-		-	813,673	N/A
2011		174,963	188,423		(13,460)		
2012		174,099	174,099		_	864,627	20.1%
2013		181,370	181,370		-		
2014		221,701	221,701		-	782,344	28.3%
2015		188,168	188,168		-	937,229	20.1%
2016		133,197	133,197		_	784,113	17.0%
2017		145,471	145,471		-	931,319	15.6%

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENT RETURNS

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

2017	14.70%
2016	7.46%
2015	(0.87%)
2014	7.57%

#### 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)	(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	\$ 6,494,538	\$ 6,772,003	\$ 277,465	95.9%
01-01-15	7,358,838	6,908,001	(450,837)	106.5%
01-01-17	7,928,591	7,681,147	(247,444)	103.2%

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 which will be limited to a maximum of 120 percent and a minimum of 80 percent of the fair market value of assets. This method will lower contributions in years of less than expected returns and increase contributions in years of greater than expected returns. The net effect over long periods of time is to have less variance in contribution levels from year to year.

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.

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 4-year smoothing – the actuarial

value of assets will be limited to a maximum of 120% and a minimum of 80% of the fair market value of

assets

Actuarial assumptions:

Investment rate of return 7.25%

Projected salary increases\* 4.75%

Cost-of-living adjustments 4.0%

<sup>\*</sup> Includes inflation at 2.75%

#### CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN COMMENT

The city adopted a home rule charter pursuant to the Home Rule Charter and Optional Plans Law, 53 Pa. C.S. §2901 et seq. (previously 53 P.S. §1-101 et seq.). The 6 prior audits for the city's police pension plan covering the years 1994 through 2007, disclosed that the pension plan's governing document includes provisions which are not in compliance with the Third Class City Code. It was noted in the prior audit reports that certain provisions are in excess of Third Class City Code requirements, and certain provisions provide for lesser benefits than mandated by the Third Class City Code. The prior audit report for the period January 1, 2006, to December 31, 2007, recommended that the city restrict pension benefits to those authorized by the Third Class City Code for all employees who began full-time employment on or after January 24, 2001 (the date Municipality of Monroeville v. Monroeville Police Department Wage Policy Committee was issued) upon the renewal, extension, or renegotiation of the collective bargaining agreement. To the extent that the city is not in compliance with the Third Class City Code and/or is contractually obligated to provide benefits in excess of those authorized by the Third Class City Code to employees who began employment on or after January 24, 2001, the excess benefits must be reflected in the Act 205 actuarial valuation reports for the plan and funded in accordance with Act 205 funding standards. Furthermore, to the extent that the city has failed to provide benefits which are mandated by the Third Class City Code, it was recommended that the city increase those benefits for all active plan members to the levels prescribed by the code at its earliest opportunity to do so.

The City of Warren has maintained that pension benefits are subject to collective bargaining and interest arbitration processes. In addition, the city has argued that these matters have been the subject of litigation, which included an appeal and Memorandum Opinion issued by the Commonwealth Court. In particular, certain retired firefighters and the International Association of Firefighters appealed the fact that retired firefighters were receiving benefits below the levels established by the Third Class City Code. In concluding that the pension benefits below those required by the Third Class City Code were not void as against public policy, the Court concluded that the retirees and the Union, "through collective bargaining, bargained away their pension rights." This is particularly true, according to the Court when the parties, as here, negotiated the issue of compliance with the Third Class City Code and, ultimately agreed to lesser benefits which cost less than if the plan were entirely Third Class City Code compliant. Furthermore, the City of Warren had an actuarial cost study done of its plan provisions and the cost to bring them into compliance with the Third Class City Code. That cost study revealed that for the police and firefighter plans, it would be more expensive to comply with the Third Class City Code (and the Department's recommendations) than it would to leave the benefits unchanged.

The city recently negotiated a new collective bargaining agreement with its police officers covering the period January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2020, and the plan's governing document remains not in compliance with the Third Class City Code, as noted in prior audit reports.

#### CITY OF WARREN POLICE PENSION PLAN COMMENT

The Department recognizes that the city is unable to make any unilateral changes to its pension plans due to collective bargaining agreements that have been negotiated. In addition, the Department also recognizes that all of the benefit provisions that deviate from the Third Class City Code do not result in increased pension costs and, to the extent that the city has provided pension benefits which are less than those mandated by the Third Class City Code, it has consequently resulted in lower annual pension costs for the city. However, it remains the Department's position that the city restrict pension benefits to those authorized by the Third Class City Code for all employees who began full-time employment on or after January 24, 2001 (the date Monroeville was issued) upon the renewal, extension, or renegotiation of the collective bargaining agreement and to the extent that the city has failed to provide benefits which are mandated by the Third Class City Code, we again recommend that the city increase those benefits for all active plan members to the levels prescribed by the code at its earliest opportunity to do so. Since the city received its state aid allocations based on unit value during the current audit period, the city did not receive any state aid attributable to pension benefits that deviate from the Third Class City Code. We will continue to monitor the city's compliance with the prior audit recommendations and the effect of providing pension benefits not in compliance with the Third Class City Code on the city's state aid allocations during future audits of the plan.

# CITY OF WARREN 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 Maurice Cashman

Mayor

Mr. Gregory Fraser

Council Vice-President

Ms. Elissa Davis

Council Member

Mr. Paul Giannini

Council Member

Mr. Philip Gilbert

Council Member

Mr. Richard Kolcharno

Council Member

Mr. James Zavinski, Sr.

Council Member

Ms. Nancy K. Freenock

City Manager

Ms. Donna M. Risinger

Finance Officer

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at <a href="www.PaAuditor.gov">www.PaAuditor.gov</a>. Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 229 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: news@PaAuditor.gov.