

# **SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY**

Audit Report

## **ROAD FUND**

*July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006*



**JOHN CHIANG**  
California State Controller

February 2008



**JOHN CHIANG**  
**California State Controller**

February 29, 2008

James R. Patterson  
Board of Supervisors, Chairperson  
San Luis Obispo County  
1055 Monterey Street, Room D430  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Dear Mr. Patterson:

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited San Luis Obispo County's Road Fund for the period of July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006. We also audited the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) allocations recorded in the Road Fund for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2006. We also reviewed road-purpose revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2005. The results of this review are included in our audit report.

The county accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys and TCRF allocations in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution, the Streets and Highways Code, and the SCO's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual.

In addition, we audited Transportation Equity Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) Matching and Exchange moneys and Senate Bill (SB) 1435 allocations from the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) for fiscal year (FY) 2001-02 through FY 2005-06, at the request of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The TEA-21- and RTPA-funded projects were verified to be for road-related purposes and are eligible expenditures. The TEA-21 and RTPA moneys received by the county were accounted for and expended in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and Streets and Highways Code section 182.6.

If you have any questions, please contact Steven Mar, Chief, Local Government Audits Bureau, at (916) 324-7226.

Sincerely,

*Original signed by*

**JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD**  
Chief, Division of Audits

JVB/sk:wm

cc: The Honorable Gere W. Sibbach  
Auditor-Controller  
San Luis Obispo County  
Noel King  
Director of Public Works and Transportation  
San Luis Obispo County  
Grace Kong, Chief  
Local Program Accounting Branch  
Department of Transportation

# Contents

## **Audit Report**

<b>Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	1
<b>Objectives, Scope, and Methodology</b> .....	2
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	3
<b>Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings</b> .....	3
<b>Views of Responsible Officials</b> .....	3
<b>Restricted Use</b> .....	4
<b>Schedule 1—Reconciliation of Road Fund Balance</b> .....	5
<b>Schedule 2—Reconciliation of TEA-21 and RTPA Balance</b> .....	6

# Audit Report

## Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited San Luis Obispo County's Road Fund for the period of July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006 (fiscal year (FY) 2005-06). We also audited the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) allocations recorded in the Road Fund for July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2006. Further, we reviewed road-purpose revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2005.

This review was limited to performing inquiries and analytical procedures to ensure that (1) highway users tax apportionments and road-purpose revenues were properly accounted for and recorded in the Road Fund; (2) expenditure patterns were consistent with the period audited; and (3) unexpended fund balances were carried forward properly.

Our audit and review disclosed that the county accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys and TCRF allocations in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution, the Streets and Highways Code, the Revenue and Taxation Code, and the SCO's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual.

In addition, we audited Transportation Equity Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) Matching and Exchange moneys and Senate Bill (SB) 1435 allocations from the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) for FY 2001-02 through FY 2005-06, at the request of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The TEA-21- and RTPA-funded projects were verified to be for road-related purposes and are eligible expenditures. The TEA-21 and RTPA moneys received by the county were accounted for and expended in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and Streets and Highways Code section 182.6.

## Background

We conducted an audit of the county's Road Fund in accordance with Government Code section 12410. The Road Fund was established by the county boards of supervisors in 1935, in accordance with Streets and Highways Code section 1622, for all amounts paid to the county out of moneys derived from the highway users tax fund. A portion of the Federal Forest Reserve revenue received by the county is also required to be deposited into the Road Fund (Government Code section 29484). In addition, the county board of supervisors may authorize the deposit of other sources of revenue into the Road Fund. Once moneys are deposited into the Road Fund, it is restricted to expenditures made in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and Streets and Highways Code Sections 2101 and 2150.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 created a federal program designed to increase flexibility in federal funding for transportation purposes by shifting the funding responsibility to state and local agencies. The TEA-21 is a continuation of this

program. The funds are restricted to expenditures made in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution. Caltrans requested that we audit these expenditures to ensure the county's compliance.

Government Code section 14556.5 created a Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) in the State Treasury for allocating funds quarterly to cities and counties for street or road maintenance, reconstruction, and storm damage repair. Counties must deposit funds received into the county Road Fund. We conducted our audit of the county's TCRF allocations under the authority of Streets and Highways Code section 2182 for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03, and Revenue and Taxation Code section 7104 for fiscal years thereafter.

## **Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

The objectives of our audit of the Road Fund, TEA-21 Matching/Exchange moneys, and RTPA revenues were to determine whether:

- Highway users tax apportionments, TCRF allocations, TEA-21 Matching/Exchange moneys and RTPA revenues received by the county were accounted for in the Road Fund, a special revenue fund;
- Expenditures were made exclusively for authorized purposes or safeguarded for future expenditure;
- Reimbursements of prior Road Fund expenditures were identified and properly credited to the Road Fund;
- Non-road-related expenditures were reimbursed in a timely manner;
- The Road Fund cost accounting is in conformance with the SCO's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual, Chapter 9, Appendix A; and
- Expenditures for indirect overhead support service costs were within the limits formally approved in the Countywide Cost Allocation Plan.

Our audit objectives were derived from the requirements of Article XIX of the California Constitution, the Streets and Highways Code, the Government Code, Revenues and Taxation Code, and the SCO's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual. To meet the objectives, we:

- Gained a basic understanding of the management controls that would have an effect on the reliability of the accounting records of the Road Fund, by interviewing key personnel and testing the operating effectiveness of the controls;
- Verified whether all highway users tax apportionments TEA-21 Matching/Exchange moneys and RTPA revenues received were properly accounted for in the Road Fund, by reconciling the county's records to the State Controller's and Caltrans' payment records;

- Analyzed the system used to allocate interest and determined whether the interest revenue allocated to the Road Fund was fair and equitable, by interviewing key personnel and testing a sample of interest calculations;
- Verified that unauthorized borrowing of Road Fund cash had not occurred, by interviewing key personnel and examining the Road Fund cash account entries; and
- Determined, through testing, whether Road Fund expenditures were in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and with the Streets and Highways Code, and whether indirect cost allocation plan charges to the Road Fund were within the limits approved by the SCO's Division of Accounting and Reporting, County Cost Plan Unit.

We conducted the audit according to *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. We did not audit the county's financial statements. Our scope was limited to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance concerning the allowability of expenditures claimed for reimbursement. Accordingly, we examined transactions on a test basis to determine whether they complied with applicable laws and regulations and were properly supported by accounting records. We considered the county's internal controls only to the extent necessary to plan the audit.

## **Conclusion**

Our audit and review disclosed that the County of San Luis Obispo accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys and TCRF allocations recorded in the Road Fund in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution, the Streets and Highways Code, Revenue and Taxation Code, and the SCO's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual.

Also, we verified that the TEA-21- and RTPA-funded projects were for road- and transportation-related purposes, and are eligible expenditures. The TEA-21 and RTPA moneys received by the county were accounted for and expended in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and the Streets and Highways Code.

## **Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings**

Findings noted in our prior audit report, issued on May 30, 2002, have been satisfactorily resolved by the county.

## **Views of Responsible Officials**

We discussed the audit results with county representatives during an exit conference on April 24, 2007. Lydia Corr, Division Manager, Auditor-Controller's Office, and Merilee Wilhelm, Public Works Administrative Services Manager, agreed with the audit results. Ms. Corr and Ms. Wilhelm further agreed that a draft audit report was not necessary and that the audit report could be issued as final.

**Restricted Use**

This report is solely for the information and use of county management, the county board of supervisors, and the SCO; it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

*Original signed by*

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD  
Chief, Division of Audits

February 29, 2008

---

**Schedule 1—  
Reconciliation of Road Fund Balance  
July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006**

---

	<u>Amount</u>
Beginning fund balance per county	\$ 5,231,443
Revenues	<u>25,526,241</u>
Total funds available	30,757,684
Expenditures	<u>(25,510,858)</u>
Ending fund balance per audit	<u><u>\$ 5,246,826</u></u>

---

**Schedule 2—  
Reconciliation of TEA-21 and RTPA Balance  
July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2006**

---

	<u>Amount</u>
Beginning balance per county	\$ —
Revenues:	
TEA-21 Matching and Exchange funds	2,890,300
RTPA funds	<u>1,522,881</u>
Total fund available	4,413,181
Expenditures:	
Maintenance	<u>4,413,181</u>
Ending balance per audit	<u>\$ —</u>

NOTE: The TEA-21 and RTPA moneys have been accounted for and expended within the Road Fund.

**State Controller's Office  
Division of Audits  
Post Office Box 942850  
Sacramento, CA 94250-5874**

**<http://www.sco.ca.gov>**