

SHASTA COUNTY

Audit Report

ROAD FUND

July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2008



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

April 2011



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

April 29, 2011

David A. Kehoe, Chair
Board of Supervisors
Shasta County
1450 Court Street, Suite 308B
Redding, CA 96001-1680

Dear Mr. Kehoe:

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited Shasta County's Road Fund for the period of July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2008.

The county accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys 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, except for a procedural finding identified in this report.

The county accounted for and expended fiscal year (FY) 2002-03 through FY 2007-08 Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century Matching and Exchange moneys and Senate Bill 1435 allocations from the regional transportation planning agency 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/vb

cc: Connie Regnell, Auditor-Controller
Shasta County
Patrick J. Minturn, Public Works Director
Shasta County
Gilbert Petrissans, Chief
Local Program Accounting Branch
Department of Transportation

Contents

Audit Report

Summary	1
Background	1
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	2
Conclusion	3
Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings	3
Views of Responsible Officials	3
Restricted Use	4
Schedule 1—Reconciliation of Road Fund Balance	5
Schedule 2—Reconciliation of TEA-21 and RTPA Balances	6
Finding and Recommendation	7

Audit Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited Shasta County's Road Fund for the period of July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2008 (fiscal year [FY] 2002-03 through FY 2007-08).

Our audit disclosed that the county accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys 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, except for a procedural finding identified in this report.

In addition, we audited Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) Matching and Exchange moneys and Senate Bill (SB) 1435 allocations from the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) for FY 2002-03 through FY 2007-08, 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.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

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

- Highway users tax apportionments TEA-21 Matching and 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, 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 and 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 this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

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 disclosed that the Shasta County accounted for and expended Road Fund moneys 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, except for the item described in the Finding and Recommendation section of this report.

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 November 26, 2003, have been satisfactorily resolved by the county.

Views of Responsible Officials

We discussed the audit results with county representatives during an exit conference on August 14, 2009. Patrick J. Minturn, Director of Public Works; Edward Williams, Chief Deputy Auditor; and Barbara Young, Public Works Fiscal Officer, agreed with the audit results. Mr. Minturn 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 Shasta County, the Shasta 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

April 29, 2011

**Schedule 1—
Reconciliation of Road Fund Balance
July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008**

	<u>Amount</u>
Beginning fund balance per county	\$ 9,187,652
Revenues	<u>27,641,873</u>
Total funds available	36,829,525
Expenditures	<u>(23,373,097)</u>
Ending fund balance per county	13,456,428
SCO adjustment	<u>—</u>
Ending fund balance per audit	<u><u>\$ 13,456,428</u></u>

**Schedule 2—
Reconciliation of TEA-21 and RTPA Balances
July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2008**

	Amount
Beginning balance per county	\$ 1,277,775
Revenues:	
TEA-21 Matching and Exchange funds	4,705,176
RTPA funds	1,269,357
Total revenues	5,974,533
Total funds available	7,252,308
Expenditures:	
Maintenance	(7,252,308)
Ending balance per county	—
SCO adjustment	—
Ending balance per audit	\$ —

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

Finding and Recommendation

**FINDING—
Equipment rental rate
for non-road**

During the audit period, the county's Road Fund equipment rental rates did not include a depreciation factor used to bill other county departments and outside parties for non-road reimbursable work. The Cost Accounting Management System's Vehicle and Equipment Listing for fiscal year 2007-08 presented the same equipment rate for regular road work and reimbursable work.

The State Controller's Office's Accounting Standards and Procedures for Counties manual, Chapter 9, Appendix A, section 32 requires a depreciation factor to recover all costs associated with performing non-road reimbursable work. In addition, Road Fund money can be expended only for road or road-related purposes as outlined in Streets and Highways Code sections 2101 and 2150.

Recommendation

The county should establish procedures to include a depreciation factor in its rates for Road Fund-owned equipment when billing other county departments and outside parties for non-road work.

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

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