November 9, 2017

Commissioner Charles H. Martin, Chairman
County of Bucks
Commissioners’ Office
55 East Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901

Re: Audit of Ray Wall, Bensalem Township Tax Collector

Dear Chairman Martin:

Enclosed is the report for the audit of the Settlement of Duplicates for the Bucks County real estate taxes of the Bensalem Township Tax Collector, Ray Wall, for the tax years ended January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014. The January 15th dates reflect the settlement dates for three tax years included in the audit period. The section of the report titled Report to Management includes our findings and recommendations.

This examination was made in order to ascertain that Bucks County real estate tax collections were properly processed, that adequate and accurate financial records were maintained by the Tax Collector to reflect compliance to the Tax Collector’s Manual, the Local Tax Collection Law and County policies and that the said collections were properly forwarded to the County. The audit was conducted in accordance with U.S. generally accepted auditing standards and included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We express our appreciation for the courtesies extended to our auditors and acknowledge the cooperative assistance we received from the Tax Collector.

Should you have any questions regarding this audit, please call us at (215) 348-6556 between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Michael J. Gallagher
Bucks County Controller
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cc: Ray Wall, Bensalem Township Tax Collector
Brian Hessenthaler, CPA, Chief Operating Officer, Commissioners’ Office, County of Bucks
David P. Boscola, Director, Finance Department, County of Bucks
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To Commissioner Charles H. Martin, Chairman
County of Bucks
Commissioners' Office
55 East Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901

We have audited the accompanying Settlement of Duplicates – cash basis, applicable to Bucks County (County) real estate taxes of the Bensalem Township Tax Collector (Tax Collector), for the tax years ended January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014, and the related notes to the Settlement of Duplicates.

Management's Responsibility for the Settlement of Duplicates

The Tax Collector is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the Monthly Report to Taxing Districts (MRTD) sheets, which are the basis for the preparation of the Settlement of Duplicates in accordance with the cash basis of accounting described in Note 1.D. This includes determining that the cash basis of accounting is an acceptable basis for the preparation of the Settlement of Duplicates in the circumstances. The Tax Collector is also responsible for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the Settlement of Duplicates that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Settlement of Duplicates based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with U.S. generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Settlement of Duplicates are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the Settlement of Duplicates. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the Settlement of Duplicates, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the Tax Collector's preparation and fair presentation of the Settlement of Duplicates in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Tax Collector's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the Tax Collector, if any, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the Settlement of Duplicates.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Continued...
Opinion

In our opinion, the Settlement of Duplicates referred to in the first paragraph present fairly, in all material respects, the total amount the Tax Collector is responsible to collect and the total amount reported by the Tax Collector, for the tax years ended January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014, in accordance with the cash basis of accounting as described in Note 1.D.

Emphasis of Matter and Basis of Accounting

We draw attention to Note 1.C. to the Settlement of Duplicates, which describes that the settlement is prepared to present a reconciliation between the amount of County real estate taxes the Tax Collector is responsible to collect and the reported collection, liened and non-lienable amounts, and is not intended to be a complete presentation of the Tax Collector’s financial activities. The County has accepted the Settlement of Duplicate format as a means for presenting this reconciliation.

We also draw attention to Note 1.D. to the Settlement of Duplicates, which describes the basis of accounting. The Settlement of Duplicates are prepared on the cash basis of accounting, which is a basis of accounting other than U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Our opinion is not modified with respect to either matter.

Restriction on Use

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Tax Collector and the County. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Kimberly S. Doran, CPA, Bucks County Deputy Controller
Doylestown, Pennsylvania

October 2, 2017
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Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Carried Forward from Prior Year</td>
<td>$ 13,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Tax Year - Original Duplicate</td>
<td>14,933,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>56,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>6,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 15,009,981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Reported by Tax Collector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Collected from Taxpayers as Reported to the County</td>
<td>$ 14,490,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Discounts taken by Taxpayers</td>
<td>271,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Penalties paid by Taxpayers</td>
<td>(30,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount Collected at Face Value of Tax Bills</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14,732,134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to the County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Tax Year - Original Duplicate/Interim Billings</td>
<td>260,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>5,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unpaid Taxes before Lien Removals</strong></td>
<td><strong>265,419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Lien Removals from January 16, 2016 to October 2, 2017</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to County</strong></td>
<td><strong>265,419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Refunds at Face Value made by Finance Department</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from January 16, 2015 to October 2, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Lienables Carried Forward:</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,428</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Reported by Tax Collector</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 15,009,981</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - Net Amount Under/(Over) Reported to the County</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Notes to the Settlement of Duplicates.
## Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect

**Amount to be Collected in Current Year:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Carried Forward from Prior Year</td>
<td>$3,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Original Duplicate</td>
<td>14,869,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>38,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>4,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,918,387</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Amount Reported by Tax Collector

**Amount Collected from Taxpayers as Reported to the County** | $14,378,437 |

Add: Discounts taken by Taxpayers | 267,356 |

Less: Penalties paid by Taxpayers | (27,776) |

**Amount Collected at Face Value of Tax Bills** | $14,618,017 |

**Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to the County:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Original Duplicate/Interim Billings</td>
<td>279,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unpaid Taxes before Lien Removals</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,844</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: Lien Removals from January 16, 2015 to October 2, 2017 | ( - ) |

**Net Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to the County** | 280,844 |

Less: Refunds at Face Value made by Finance Department from January 16, 2014 to October 2, 2017 | ( - ) |

**Total Non-Lienables Carried Forward:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year - Interim Billings</td>
<td>13,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Reported by Tax Collector</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,912,324</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variance - Net Amount Under/(Over) Reported to the County** | $6,063 |

See Notes to the Settlement of Duplicates.
Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect

Amount to be Collected in Current Year:

- Total Carried Forward from Prior Year: $13,815
- 2013 Tax Year - Original Duplicate: $14,537,305
- 2013 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $359,014
- 2012 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $9,882
- 2011 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $320

Total Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect: $14,920,336

Amount Reported by Tax Collector

Amount Collected from Taxpayers as Reported to the County: $14,300,945
Add: Discounts taken by Taxpayers: $267,089
Less: Penalties paid by Taxpayers: ($32,787)

Amount Collected at Face Value of Tax Bills: $14,535,247

Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to the County:
- 2013 Tax Year - Original Duplicate: $379,810
- 2013 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $1,478
- 2012 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $320

Total Unpaid Taxes before Lien Removals: $381,608
Less: Lien Removals from January 16, 2014 to October 2, 2017: ($-)

Net Unpaid Taxes to be Liened as Reported to the County: $381,608
Less: Refunds at Face Value made by Finance Department from January 16, 2013 to October 2, 2017: ($-)

Total Non-Lienables Carried Forward:
- 2013 Tax Year - Interim Billings: $3,481

Total Amount Reported by Tax Collector: $14,920,336

Variance - Net Amount Under/(Over) Reported to the County: $-

See Notes to the Settlement of Duplicates.
NOTES TO THE SETTLEMENT OF DUPLICATES

1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

The major accounting principles and practices followed by the Tax Collector and the County are presented below to assist the reader in understanding the Settlement of Duplicates. The accounting principles and practices are presented in conformity with a comprehensive basis of accounting other than U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

A. Nature of Operations

The Tax Collector is an elected official designated to collect County real estate taxes as well as other taxes. In this jurisdiction, the Tax Collector is an elected official that serves a four (4) year term.

B. Reporting Entity

The accompanying Settlement of Duplicates are presented from only the financial transactions/records directly related to the County real estate taxes handled by the Tax Collector. The financial transactions consist primarily of real estate taxes collected, discounts taken and penalties paid. The Settlement of Duplicates do not present the financial activities of the Tax Collector or the County taken as a whole.

C. Basis of Presentation

The County requires Tax Collectors to settle County real estate taxes on or before January 15th of the succeeding year. As such, the County accepted the Settlement of Duplicate format to reflect the activities associated with the settlement of County real estate tax duplicates in the Tax Collector’s possession during the period under audit. Specifically, the Settlement of Duplicate presents a reconciliation between the amount of County real estate taxes the Tax Collector is responsible to collect and the collection, liened and non-lienable amounts reported by the Tax Collector.

Section 25 (Collection and Payment Over of Taxes) of the Local Tax Collection Law requires the Tax Collector to report the monthly real estate tax activities to the County on a standardized form commonly known as the MRTD sheet. Except for the “Refunds at Face Value made by Finance Department” amount, the amounts presented under the “Amount Reported by Tax Collector” section of the Settlement of Duplicate is an accumulation of information reported on the MRTD sheets for the given tax year.

D. Basis of Accounting

The Tax Collector prepares the required MRTD sheets in accordance with the financial reporting provisions prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, which is essentially the cash basis of accounting. Since the accompanying Settlement of Duplicates are primarily summaries of amounts reported on the MRTD sheets for the given tax years, the Settlement of Duplicates are prepared and presented on the same basis. Under the cash basis, the only asset recognized is

Continued...
NOTES TO THE SETTLEMENT OF DUPLICATES

1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

D. Basis of Accounting (Continued)

cash, and no liabilities are recognized. Unless otherwise noted, the County portion of the real estate tax revenue collected and disbursed by the Tax Collector during a given tax year is presented on the accompanying Settlement of Duplicates as the “Amount Collected from Taxpayers as Reported to the County”. The cash basis differs from U.S. generally accepted accounting principles primarily because the effects of accounts receivable and accounts payable are not reflected in the accompanying Settlement of Duplicates. The cash basis of accounting is an acceptable basis of accounting for the Settlement of Duplicates.

E. Amount to be Collected

Upon successful settlement of a prior year duplicate, on February 1st of each year the County issues to the Tax Collector the current year’s tax duplicate, which represents County real estate taxes to be collected. In addition to the duplicate, the County may issue, throughout the year, interim adjustments. Therefore, the total amount of County real estate taxes to be collected in a tax year is the duplicate amount plus and/or minus any interim adjustment amounts.

F. Cash

Deposits in the banking institutions are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and/or are fully collateralized by a pledge or assignment of assets pursuant to Act No. 72 of the General Assembly.

G. Original Duplicate/Interim Billings

The Original Duplicate/Interim Billings amounts presented under the “Amount the Tax Collector is Responsible to Collect” on the accompanying Settlement of Duplicates represent the total original duplicate plus and/or minus all applicable interim adjustments issued for the period indicated.

H. Date of Management’s Review

The Tax Collector has evaluated subsequent events through October 2, 2017, the date on which the Settlement of Duplicates were available to be issued. No events have taken place that affect the Settlement of Duplicates or require disclosure.

2. Net Amount Under Report

As indicated on the accompanying Settlement of Duplicate for the tax year ended January 15, 2015, the Tax Collector under reported $6,063 to the County. The specific cause of this variance is discussed further in the Report to Management.
REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES
AND MATERIAL WEAKNESSES

To Commissioner Charles H. Martin, Chairman
County of Bucks
Commissioners' Office
55 East Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901

In planning and performing our audit of the Settlement of Duplicates, for the tax years ended
January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014, in accordance with U.S. generally accepted auditing standards, we
considered the Tax Collector's internal control over the financial reporting (internal control) as a basis
for designing auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of
expressing our opinion on the Settlement of Duplicates, but not for the purpose of expressing an
opinion on the effectiveness of the Tax Collector's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an
opinion on the effectiveness of the Tax Collector's internal control.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph
and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses
or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist
that were not identified. In addition, because of inherent limitations in internal control, including the
possibility of management's override of controls, misstatements due to error or fraud may occur and
not be detected by such controls. However, as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in
internal control that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow
management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or
detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or a
combination of deficiencies in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a
material misstatement of the Tax Collector's Settlement of Duplicates will not be prevented, or
detected and corrected, on a timely basis. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that
we consider to be material weaknesses.

A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less
severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with
governance. We consider the deficiencies described in F1. of the Internal Control section, F1.- F3. of
the Cash – Bank Analysis section, F1. and F2. of the Receipts Analysis section and F1. of the
Settlement of Duplicate section of the Report to Management to be significant deficiencies.

The Tax Collector's written response to the findings identified in our audit and presented in the Report
to Management was not subjected to the audit procedures applied in the audit of the Settlement of
Duplicates and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

Continued…
This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Tax Collector and the County. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Kimberly S. Doran, CPA, Bucks County Deputy Controller
Doylestown, Pennsylvania

October 2, 2017
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Bensalem Township Tax Collector

REPORT TO MANAGEMENT

COVER LETTER

We have audited the Settlement of Duplicates, applicable to County real estate taxes of the Tax Collector, for the tax years ended January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014. Professional standards require that we provide the Tax Collector with information about our responsibilities under U.S. generally accepted auditing standards, as well as certain information related to the planned scope and timing of our audit. We have communicated such information in our letter to the Tax Collector dated December 27, 2016. Professional standards also require that we communicate the following information related to our audit.

Audit Findings Overview

Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

The Tax Collector is responsible for the selection and use of appropriate accounting policies. The significant accounting policies used by the Tax Collector are described in Note 1 to the Settlement of Duplicates. No new accounting policies were adopted and the application of existing policies was not changed during the audit period. We noted no transactions entered into by the Tax Collector during the audit period for which there is a lack of authoritative guidance or consensus. All significant transactions have been recognized in the Settlement of Duplicates in the proper period.

The Settlement of Duplicate disclosures are neutral, consistent and clear.

Difficulties Encountered in Performing the Audit

We encountered no significant difficulties in dealing with the Tax Collector in performing and completing our audit.

Corrected and Uncorrected Misstatements

Professional standards require us to accumulate all known and likely misstatements identified during the audit, other than those that are clearly trivial, and communicate them to the appropriate level of management. As a result of the audit procedures, we did not detect any misstatements that required correction by management.

Disagreements with the Tax Collector

For purposes of this letter, a disagreement with the Tax Collector is a financial accounting, reporting or auditing matter, whether or not resolved to our satisfaction, that could be significant to the Settlement of Duplicates or the auditors' report. We are pleased to report that no such disagreements arose during the course of our audit.

Representations from the Tax Collector

We have requested certain representations from the Tax Collector that are included in the management representation letter dated October 2, 2017.

Continued...
Bensalem Township Tax Collector

REPORT TO MANAGEMENT

COVER LETTER

Purpose

In reviewing this report, it is important to remember that this letter addresses those conditions that we believe should be brought to the attention of the Tax Collector, and accordingly, does not recite the other sound controls that presently exist. Furthermore, our suggestions should not be construed as a criticism of or a reflection on the integrity of the Tax Collector.

Report Distribution

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Tax Collector and the County. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.
Findings and Recommendations

Legend:

F – Finding
R – Recommendation

The Tax Collector's Office consisted of one (1) Tax Collector, one (1) Deputy Tax Collector and one (1) Assistant.

During our audit, we became aware of significant deficiencies in internal control that have been identified as such in the separate report titled "Report on Significant Deficiencies and Material Weaknesses" dated October 2, 2017. The Internal Control, Cash – Bank Analysis, Receipts Analysis and Settlement of Duplicate sections of the Report to Management detail the significant deficiencies noted in the Tax Collector's control environment and our recommendations for improvement. The Report to Management does not affect our "Independent Auditors' Report" dated October 2, 2017, on the Tax Collector's Settlement of Duplicates.

Internal Control

A review of the internal control environment disclosed the following:

F1. A review of the financial transactions recorded and the procedures performed by the Deputy Tax Collector revealed that there was a general lack of segregation of duties among the authorization, execution and recording of the County real estate tax transactions and the related assets.

R1. Although the small size of the office staff limits the extent of separation of duties, certain steps should be taken to separate incompatible duties. The basic premise to any internal control structure is that no one (1) individual should have access to both physical assets and the related accounting records or to all phases of a transaction.

Auditee's Response:

F1. The Audit findings are true and we will review procedures and attempt to meet to the Auditors findings.

Cash – Bank Analysis

Included within the audit were procedures to verify, through random selection of monthly bank statements, that the Tax Collector made only appropriate disbursements, maintained up-to-date checkbook balances, prepared monthly bank reconciliations and utilized the account for only tax collection activities.

Continued...
F1. As a part of the audit, we reviewed a sample of the bank statements for both the primary tax and the transfer bank accounts utilized by the Tax Collector during the audit period. This analysis disclosed that the Tax Collector did not prepare written monthly bank reconciliations or maintain checkbook balances for either account. Consequently, the auditors were unable to draw any conclusions about the Tax Collector’s ability to reconcile the bank account balances to the tax collection records for the audit period.

R1. On a monthly basis, the Tax Collector should prepare written bank reconciliations listing deposits-in-transit, outstanding checks, adjustments and reconciling items. In order to provide up-to-date bank balance information, all deposits, disbursements, and adjustments should be posted to the checkbook on a daily basis. Furthermore, the maintenance of an up-to-date checkbook balance would provide the Tax Collector with a basis for preparing monthly bank reconciliations.

F2. Since the Tax Collector did not prepare monthly bank reconciliations, we computed the net cash balances as of the January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014 settlement dates based on the balances per the primary tax bank statement plus/minus the known deposits-in-transit, outstanding checks and pending adjustments. In addition, in order to determine whether the Tax Collector maintained adequate accounting records to support the source of the funds that made up the $32,359, $41,917 and $1,775 adjusted bank statement balances as of January 15, 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively, we reviewed documents and inquired as to the composition of these balances. This analysis disclosed that the Tax Collector could not determine the source of $1,233, $1,617 and $1,616 of the net cash balances, respectively.

R2. If this condition still exists, the Tax Collector should immediately take the necessary steps to determine and document the composition of all bank accounts that County real estate tax collections pass through.

F3. The analysis of the service charges assessed to the primary tax bank account utilized for County real estate tax activities disclosed that there was $624 of unreimbursed charges that had accumulated as of the January 15, 2016 audit period ending date that were not reversed by the bank or reimbursed by the Tax Collector as of the audit fieldwork date.

R3. To rectify this condition, the Tax Collector should contact the bank to request the reversal of the unreimbursed service charges accrued during the audit period and/or reimburse the bank account using the Tax Collector’s personal funds.

F4. The analysis of the January 15, 2015 composition disclosed that one (1) refund check was not issued to the affected taxpayer in a timely manner.

R4. The Tax Collector should be reminded of the importance of refunding duplicate/overpayments to the proper recipients within a reasonable time period not to exceed thirty (30) days.

Continued…
Bensalem Township Tax Collector

REPORT TO MANAGEMENT

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Cash – Bank Analysis (Continued)

Auditee’s Response:

F1. This will be corrected.
F2. We will follow through.
F3. We are still looking into this situation.
F4. This will be corrected.

Receipts Analysis

As a part of the audit, we reviewed a sample of paid tax notices and deposits to determine whether payments were properly recorded and deposited intact and in a timely manner.

F1. An analysis of a sample of County real estate tax payments revealed that 45% of the one hundred twenty-five (125) applicable payments examined were not deposited by the next business day.

R1. All tax payments should be processed, posted, reconciled and deposited intact on the day of payment or by the next business day.

F2. A sample of deposit transactions posted to the bank accounts, including credit/debit card transactions, during the audit period disclosed the following:

- 78% of the eighteen (18) credit/debit card transactions examined were not processed in a timely manner. Furthermore, in three (3) instances, the untimely processing resulted in the funds not being forwarded to the County by the tenth day of the following month.

- One (1) interim tax payment processed and deposited on January 15, 2016 was not forwarded to the County until March 3, 2016.

R2. The Tax Collector should be reminded of the following:

- All credit/debit card transactions should be processed, posted and reconciled within one (1) business day from the date it appears in the Tax Collector’s bank account.

- In accordance with Section 25 of the Local Tax Collection Law, “The collector shall pay over on or before the tenth day of each month... all monies collected as taxes during the previous month...”

F3. A comparison between the payment date stamped on the paid tax bill to the payment date recorded on the computerized Assessment Roll Book disclosed discrepancies in these dates in 67% of the forty-three (43) applicable payments examined.

Continued...
Receipts Analysis (Continued)

R3. The Tax Collector should be reminded of the importance of accurately recording the date on which a tax bill is paid.

Auditee’s Response:

F1. We will attempt to correct this finding.

F2. We will attempt to correct this finding.

F3. There should be no problem to correct.

Settlement of Duplicate

In order to determine whether the Settlement of Duplicates were accurately presented, we reviewed the MRTD sheets submitted to the Finance Department. The review included a verification of the cash collected, discounts taken, penalties paid and debit and credit interims including lienable and non-liable amounts.

F1. Although we determined that the combined Settlement of Duplicate for the tax year ended January 15, 2015 was fairly presented, in all material respects, we noted the following variances within the individual settlements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be Settled</th>
<th>Under/(Over) Reported to the County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Tax Year – Interim Billings</td>
<td>$ 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Tax Year – Interim Billings</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Tax Year – Interim Billings</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Tax Year – Interim Billings</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Tax Year – Interim Billings</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Tax Year – Original Duplicate/Interim Billings</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance – Net Amount Under Reported to the County</td>
<td>$ 6,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon analyzing the net under reported variance, we believe that the following conditions attributed to the variances:

Variance – Net Amount Under Reported to the County $ 6,063

Less: Six (6) Debit Interim Adjustments resulting from a Court Stipulation covering Tax Years 2009 through 2014 were not accounted for by the Tax Collector

(6,063) (a)

Unidentified Net Variance $ -
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Settlement of Duplicate (Continued)

(a) The Tax Collector did not bill, report or remit real estate taxes applicable to six (6) debit interim adjustments, which were applicable to a court stipulation issued affecting 2009 through 2014 Tax Years – Interim Billings. The effect of this condition on the accompanying Settlement of Duplicate for the tax year ended January 15, 2015 was an understatement to the “Total Amount Reported by Tax Collector”. Upon notification of this oversight, the Tax Collector took the necessary corrective action by generating and mailing the interim tax notices.

R1. It is the Tax Collector's responsibility to prepare and maintain accurate accounting records to support all transactions involving the collection and disbursement of County real estate taxes and to settle all duplicates to zero. The Tax Collector should be reminded of the importance of filing all necessary additional MRTD sheets with the County.

F2. A review of a sample of interim debit and credit adjustments issued to the Tax Collector disclosed the following conditions:

- The Tax Collector did not issue the interim tax notices in a timely manner in 10% of the thirty (30) debit interim adjustments examined.
- The Tax Collector did not prepare adjusted tax notices for two (2) credit interim adjustments when applicable.

R2. The Tax Collector should be reminded of the importance of issuing interim and adjusted tax notices to the affected taxpayers in a timely manner.

Auditee's Response:

F1. This was an unusual situation and was beyond our control.

F2. We will attempt to correct the finding.
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SUMMARY OF THE EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on September 19, 2017. Those in attendance were:

**Bensalem Township Tax Office**
Ray Wall, Tax Collector
Kathleen Stahl, Deputy Tax Collector

**Controller's Office**
Denise Rimby, CPA, Audit Supervisor
Eugene J. Lyall, Auditor

The results of the audit were presented and discussed in their entirety.