# CITY OF INDIO

## Final Audit Report

## SPECIAL GAS TAX STREET FUND AND ROAD MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

*July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025*

MALIA M. COHEN

CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLER

July 2026

C23-GTA-0006

STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE | DIVISION OF AUDITS

Post Office Box 942850 | Sacramento, CA 94250

Sacramento Office: 3301 C Street, Suite 700 | Sacramento, CA 95816 | 916-324-8907

Monterey Park Office: 901 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 200 | Monterey Park, CA 91754 | 323-981-6802

www.sco.ca.gov

Malia M. Cohen
California State Controller

July 14, 2026

Mr. Bryan Montgomery, City Manager
City of Indio
100 Civic Center Mall
Indio, CA  92201

Dear Mr. Montgomery:

The State Controller's Office audited the City of Indio's (the city) Special Gas Tax Street Fund and the city's Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025.

Our audit found an instance of noncompliance. The city understated the Special Gas Tax Street Fund balance by $35,716 as of June 30, 2025, because it charged ineligible expenditures to the fund. However, we found that the city complied with Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program maintenance-of-effort requirements.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Efren Loste, Chief, Local Government Audits Bureau, by telephone at 916-324-7226 or email at eloste@sco.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Original signed by*
Kimberly A. Tarvin, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 942850, Sacramento, CA 94250
SACRAMENTO 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816 | 916.324.8907
LOS ANGELES 901 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 200, Monterey Park, CA 91754 | 323.981.6802

Copy: The Honorable Elaine Holmes, Mayor
City of Indio
Ruby D. Walla, Director of Finance
City of Indio

# CONTENTS

SUMMARY 1

BACKGROUND 1

AUDIT AUTHORITY 2

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY 2

CONCLUSION 5

FOLLOW-UP ON PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS 5

VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS 5

RESTRICTED USE 6

SCHEDULE—RECONCILIATION OF FUND BALANCE 7

FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION 8

# SUMMARY

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited the City of Indio's (the city) Special Gas Tax Street Fund and the city's Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program (RMRP) for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025.

Our audit found an instance of noncompliance. The city understated the Special Gas Tax Street Fund balance by $35,716 as of June 30, 2025, because it charged ineligible expenditures to the fund. However, we found that the city complied with RMRP maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirements.

# BACKGROUND

The State apportions funds monthly from the Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA) in the Transportation Tax Fund to cities and counties for the construction, maintenance, and operation of local streets and roads. The highway users taxes derive from state taxes on the sale of motor vehicle fuels. In accordance with Streets and Highways Code, cities must establish individual Special Gas Tax Street Funds for the deposit of their HUTA fund apportionments. Additionally, cities must expend their HUTA fund apportionments only for street-related purposes in accordance with Article XIX of the California Constitution and Streets and Highways Code.

Senate Bill 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, created the RMRP to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road systems. RMRP funds are apportioned by formula to eligible cities and counties pursuant to Streets and Highways Code (SHC) section 2032. Article XIX of the California Constitution and SHC sections 2030 through 2038 provide the requirements for RMRP funding.

# AUDIT AUTHORITY

We conducted this audit in accordance with Government Code section 12410, which provides the SCO with general authority to audit the disbursement of state money for correctness, legality, and sufficient provisions of law for payment.

# OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

We audited the city's Special Gas Tax Street Fund and the city's RMRP for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025. Our audit objectives were to determine whether the city:

- Accounted for and expended the Special Gas Tax Street Fund and RMRP funds in compliance with Article XIX of the California Constitution, Streets and Highways Code, and Government Code; and
- Was in compliance with the RMRP MOE requirements.

To achieve our objectives, we completed the following procedures:

- We gained an understanding of the city's internal controls that are significant to the audit objectives by reviewing policies and procedures, interviewing the city's key personnel, completing an internal control questionnaire, and reviewing the city's organization chart.
- We assessed the reliability of computer-processed data by reviewing existing information about the data and the system that produced it; by interviewing the city's officials knowledgeable about the data; and by tracing data to source documents, based on auditor judgment and non-statistical sampling. We determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for the purposes of achieving our audit objectives.

- We conducted a risk assessment to determine the nature, timing, and extent of substantive testing.
- We performed analytical procedures to identify and explain the existence of unusual or unexpected account balances.
- We verified the accuracy of fund balances by performing a fund balance reconciliation for the period of July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2021; by recalculating the Special Gas Tax Street Fund trial balance for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025; and by recalculating the RMRP trial balance for the period of July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2025.
- We verified that the components of and changes to fund balances were properly computed, described, classified, and disclosed by scheduling and analyzing account balances.
- We reconciled the revenues recorded in the city's ledger to the balance reported in the SCO's apportionment schedule for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2025, to determine whether the city completely accounted for HUTA and Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account apportionments that it received.
- We reviewed the city's Special Gas Tax Street Fund and RMRP assets to ensure that they were properly recorded and identified.
- We analyzed the system used to allocate interest and determined whether the interest revenue allocated to the Special Gas Tax Street Fund and the RMRP was fair and equitable by interviewing key personnel and recalculating all interest allocations for the audit period.
- We reviewed the fund cash and receivables accounts for unauthorized borrowing to determine whether unexpended funds were available for future street-related expenditures and protected from impairment.

- We compared the city's RMRP project list with the list submitted to the California Transportation Commission to verify that actual RMRP expenditures were for program projects approved by California Transportation Commission.
- We verified that the city was in compliance with RMRP MOE requirements by recalculating the city's MOE contributions, and judgmentally selecting non-statistical samples of transactions to ensure that the MOE expenditures were street-related, properly supported, and incurred in the proper period.
- We verified that the expenditures incurred during the audit period were supported by proper documentation and eligible in accordance with the applicable criteria, by testing all expenditure transactions that were equal to or greater than the significant item amount (calculated based on materiality threshold), and judgmentally selecting non-statistical samples of other transactions. Errors found were not projected to the intended (total) population. We tested the following categories:
  - Special Gas Tax Street Fund
    - Services and supplies – We tested $2,227,010 of $5,437,586.
    - Labor – We tested $97,408 of $804,203.
    - Indirect costs – We tested all $1,348,556.
    - Transfers – We tested $1,274 of $2,637.
  - RMRP
    - Services and supplies – We tested $1,622,573 of $1,677,981.

We did not audit the city's financial statements. We limited our audit scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that the city accounted for and expended its Special Gas Tax Street Fund and its RMRP funds in accordance with the criteria.

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.

## CONCLUSION

Our audit found an instance of noncompliance. The city understated the Special Gas Tax Street Fund balance by $35,716 as of June 30, 2025, because it charged ineligible expenditures to the fund. The finding is quantified in the Schedule and described in the Finding and Recommendation section. However, we found that the city complied with RMRP MOE requirements.

## FOLLOW-UP ON PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS

The city has satisfactorily resolved the finding noted in our prior audit report for the period of July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, issued on May 23, 2008.

## VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

We issued a draft audit report on May 15, 2026. The city's representatives responded by email on May 22, 2026. This final audit report includes the city's response in the Finding and Recommendation section.

# RESTRICTED USE

This report is solely for the information and use of the city 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 and is available on the SCO website at www.sco.ca.gov.

*Original signed by*
Kimberly A. Tarvin, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

July 14, 2026

# SCHEDULE—RECONCILIATION OF FUND BALANCE

**July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025**

Cities receive apportionments from the State HUTA, pursuant to SHC sections 2103, 2105, 2106, 2107, and 2107.5. The basis of the apportionments varies, but the funds may be used for any street-related purpose. SHC section 2107.5 restricts apportionments to administration and engineering expenditures, except for cities with populations of fewer than 10,000 inhabitants. Those cities may use the funds for rights-of-way and for the construction of street systems. Cities must establish individual Special Gas Tax Street Funds for the deposit of their HUTA fund apportionments.

As participants in the RMRP, cities also receive apportionments from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account of the State Transportation Fund, pursuant to SHC section 2032(h). These funds may be used for basic road maintenance, rehabilitation, and critical safety projects on local street and road systems. Furthermore, SHC section 2036 establishes the MOE requirements, which cities must meet annually in order to remain eligible for an allocation or apportionment of funds. The city's required MOE contribution is $3,035,799.

The following table shows the beginning and ending balances for the city's Special Gas Tax Street Fund and RMRP funds:

| Reconciliation of Fund Balance | Special Gas Tax Street Fund Amount | RMRP Fund Amount | Total Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beginning fund balance, per city | $2,463,817 | $4,472,316 | $6,936,133 |
| Revenues | 2,698,766 | 2,705,061 | 5,403,827 |
| Total funds available | 5,162,583 | 7,177,377 | 12,339,960 |
| Less: Expenditures | 1,445,863 | 1,547,274 | 2,993,137 |
| Ending fund balance, per city | 3,716,720 | 5,630,103 | 9,346,823 |
| Audit adjustment | 35,716 | 0 | 35,716 |
| **Ending fund balance, per audit** | **$3,752,436** | **$5,630,103** | **$9,382,539** |

# FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

## Finding—Ineligible Administrative Cost – Unfunded Liability

The city charged ineligible costs for California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) Unfunded Liability to the Special Gas Tax Street Fund between fiscal year (FY) 2020-21 and FY 2024-25.

During its annual budget process, the city authorizes the number of positions for the upcoming fiscal year. It uses this number of authorized positions to allocate its CalPERS Unfunded Liability costs across citywide costing centers. Costs for CalPERS Unfunded Liability are eligible for gas tax funding for filled positions where costs are actually incurred. Costs allocated to vacant positions are ineligible. We tested the cost allocations for the audit period of FY 2021-22 through FY 2024-25 and found that some of the city's CalPERS Unfunded Liability costs were allocated to vacant positions. As a result, we also tested the same cost allocations for the prior unaudited fiscal years and found that the same costs were allocated to vacant positions in FY 2020-21. The following table shows the city's CalPERS ineligible Unfunded Liability costs by fiscal year:

| Fiscal Year | Unallowable Amount |
|---|---|
| 2020-21 | $15,850 |
| 2021-22 | 13,358 |
| 2022-23 | 6,029 |
| 2023-24 | 346 |
| 2024-25 | 134 |
| **Total** | **$35,716** |

This error occurred because the city's current process for allocating CalPERS Unfunded Liability costs involves allocating costs to the number of authorized positions for the upcoming fiscal year.

During our audit fieldwork, the city reimbursed the Special Gas Tax Street Fund by transferring $35,716 through a journal entry on March 18, 2026.

## Criteria

SHC section 2101 states, in part:

> . . . all moneys in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund and hereafter received in the account are appropriated for . . . (a) The research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways. . . .

## Recommendation

We recommend that the city implement procedures to ensure that all costs charged to the Special Gas Tax Street Fund are eligible costs.

## City's Response

> The City has updated [its] year-end procedures to include the review of vacant positions and preparation of a transfer from [the General Fund] for any allocated costs related [to] unfilled positions.