



**GREATER DAYTON REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
MONTGOMERY COUNTY**

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority
Montgomery County
4 South Main Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Board of Directors and the management of the Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority (the Authority) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), solely to assist the Authority in complying with the reporting requirements of the National Transit Database (NTD), *Uniform System of Accounts (USOA)* and *Records and Reporting System; Final Rule*, as specified in 49 CFR Part 630, Federal Register, dated January 15, 1993, and as presented in the *2017 Policy Manual*, for the year ended December 31, 2017. Management of the Authority is responsible for compliance with these requirements. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report.

Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below and in the attached appendix, either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

FTA has established the following standards with regard to the data reported to it in the Federal Funding Allocation Statistics Form (FFA-10) of the Authority's annual National Transit Database (NTD) report:

- A system is in place and maintained for recording data in accordance with NTD definitions. The correct data are being measured and no systematic errors exist.
- A system is in place to record data on a continuing basis, and the data gathering is an ongoing effort.
- Source documents are available to support the reported data and are maintained for FTA review and audit for a minimum of three years following FTA's receipt of the NTD report. The data are fully documented and securely stored.
- A system of internal controls is in place to ensure the data collection process is accurate and that the recording system and reported comments are not altered. Documents are reviewed and signed by a supervisor, as required.
- The data collection methods are those suggested by FTA or otherwise meet FTA requirements.
- The deadhead miles, computed as the difference between the reported total actual vehicle miles data and the reported total actual VRM data, appear to be accurate.
- Data are consistent with prior reporting periods and other facts known about Authority operations.

We have applied the procedures to the data contained in the accompanying FFA-10 form for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017. Such procedures, which were agreed to and specified by FTA in the Declarations and Requests section of the 2017 Policy Manual and were agreed to by the Authority, were applied to assist you in evaluating whether the Authority complied with the standards described in the first paragraph of this part and that the information included in the NTD report Federal Funding Allocation Statistics form for the year ended December 31, 2017 is presented in conformity with the requirements of the *Uniform System of Accounts (USOA)* and *Records and Reporting System; Final Rule*, as specified in 49 CFR Part 630, Federal Register, dated January 15, 1993, and as presented in the 2017 Policy Manual.

Additional procedures performed (if any), which are agreed to by the Authority but not by FTA, are described in a separate attachment to this report. The procedures were applied separately to each of the information systems used to develop the reported actual VRM, FG DRM, PMT, and OE of the Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority for the year ended December 31, 2017 for each of the following modes:

- Motor Bus
- Trolley Bus
- Demand Response

This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the *Comptroller General of the United States' Government Auditing Standards*. We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion on compliance with the specified requirements. Accordingly we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is to provide assistance in the evaluation of the Authority's compliance with the requirements described in the paragraphs above and listed in the appendix of this report for the year ended December 31, 2017 and is not suitable for any other purpose.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State
Columbus, Ohio

September 14, 2018

APPENDIX

Section 9 Certification – Agreed-Upon Procedures

The procedures below were applied to each applicable mode and type of service (TOS) (directly operated (DO) and purchased transportation (PT)) as listed below:

1. We obtained and read a copy of written system procedures for reporting and maintaining data in accordance with NTD requirements and definitions set forth in 49 CFR Part 630, Federal Register, dated January 15, 1993, and as presented in the 2017 Policy Manual. Written procedures are available for reporting and maintaining required data. We found no exceptions.
2. We inquired with the personnel assigned responsibility for supervising the preparation and maintenance of NTD data to determine the following:
 - The extent to which the Authority followed the procedures on a continuous basis. Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, responded that the procedures were followed on the continuous basis. We found no exceptions.
 - That procedures identified above resulted in the accumulation and reporting of data consistent with NTD definitions and requirements set forth in 49 CFR Part 630, Federal Register, dated January 15, 1993, and as presented in the 2017 Policy Manual. We observed the required reporting data was accumulated and available. We found no exceptions.
3. We obtained the retention policy that the Authority follows and agreed that source documents supporting NTD data reported on the Federal Funding Allocation Statistics form were included. NTD data is included in the Authority's retention policy. We found no exceptions.
4. Based on a description of the Authority's procedures from items (1) and (2) above, we identified all the source documents that the Authority must retain for a minimum of three years. For each type of source document, we selected three months (January, April, and July 2017) out of the year and inspected whether the document exists for each of these periods. We found no exceptions.
5. We inquired whether separate individuals (independent of the individuals preparing source documents and posting data summaries) inspected the source documents and data summaries for completeness, accuracy, and reasonableness and how often the individuals perform such reviews. Individuals independent of the preparing and posting data summaries compared the source documents to the data summaries on a monthly basis. We found no exceptions.
6. We randomly selected a sample of four source documents and inspected whether supervisors' signatures are present as required by the system of internal controls. We found no exceptions.
7. We obtained the worksheets used to prepare the final data that the Authority transcribes onto the Federal Funding Allocation Statistics form. We agreed the periodic data included on the worksheets to the periodic summaries prepared by the Authority. We recalculated the arithmetical accuracy of the summaries. We found no exceptions.
8. We inquired of the procedure for accumulating and recording passenger miles traveled (PMT) data in accordance with NTD requirements with Authority staff. We inspected the procedure and agreed it is one of the methods specifically approved in the 2017 Policy Manual. We found no exceptions.

9. We inquired of the Authority staff regarding the Authority's eligibility to conduct statistical sampling for PMT data every third year. We determined whether the Agency meets the NTD criteria that allow transit agencies to conduct statistical samples for accumulating PMT data every third year rather than annually. Specifically:
 - We agreed that according to the 2010 Census, the Authority serves an UZA with a population less than 500,000. We found no exceptions.
 - We inspected documentation that the authority directly operates fewer than 100 revenue vehicles in all modes in annual maximum revenue service (VOMS) (in any size UZA). We found no exceptions.
 - We agreed the services purchased from sellers were included in the Authority's NTD report. We found no exceptions.
 - The transit agency met one of the above criteria, we inspected the NTD documentation for the most recent mandatory sampling year (2017) and identified that statistical sampling was conducted and meets the 95 percent confidence and ± 10 percent precision requirements. We found no exceptions.
 - We inquired how the Authority estimated annual PMT for the current report year. Per discussion with Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, the Authority used Clever Devices APC Hardware and Ridecheck Plus Software to estimate PMT for the current report year. We found no exceptions.

10. We obtained a description of the sampling procedure for estimation of PMT data used by the Authority. We obtained a copy of the Authority's working papers or methodology used to select the actual sample of runs for recording PMT data. These documents were used to determine the following:
 - a. We observed the Authority used average trip length. We determined the universe of runs was the sampling frame and determined the methodology used to select specific runs from the universe resulted in a random selection of runs. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We observed the Authority did not miss a selected sample run. We found no exceptions.

11. We selected a random sample of four source documents for accumulating PMT data and inspected the data for completeness (all required data was recorded) and recalculated the computations. We found no exceptions. We selected a random sample of four accumulation periods and recalculated the accumulations for each of the selected periods. We selected the accumulation periods listed below for recalculation and recalculated the arithmetical accuracy of the summary. The following accumulation periods were selected for testing:
 - a. January 2017
 - b. April 2017
 - c. July 2017
 - d. October 2017We found no exceptions.

12. We inquired of Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, the procedures for systematic exclusion of charter, school bus, and other ineligible vehicle miles from the calculation of actual vehicle revenue miles with Authority staff. We agreed that they follow the stated procedures. We selected a random sample of four source documents used to record charter and school bus mileage and recalculated the arithmetical accuracy of the computations. We found no exceptions.

13. For actual vehicle revenue mile (VRM) data, we inquired and documented of the collection and recording methodology and documented that deadhead miles are systematically excluded from the computation. This is accomplished as follows:
- We documented the procedures used to subtract missed trips from schedules. We selected a random sample of four days that service was operated, and recalculated the daily total of missed trips and missed VRMs. We also recalculated the arithmetical accuracy of the summary. We found no exceptions.
 - Actual VRMs are not calculated from hubdomoters.
 - Actual VRMs are not calculated from vehicle logs.
14. We inspected the recording and accumulation sheets for four actual VRMs and agreed that locomotive miles are not included in the computation. We found no exceptions.
15. For fixed guideway or High Intensity Busway directional route miles (FG or HIB DRM) reported, we inquired of the person responsible for maintaining and reporting NTD data and agreed that the operations met the FTA definition of fixed guideway (FG) or High Intensity Busway (HIB) in that the service is:
- Rail, trolleybus (TB), ferryboat (FB), or aerial tramway (TR); or
 - Bus (MB, CB, or RB) service operating over exclusive or controlled access rights-of-way (ROW); and
 - Access is restricted;
 - Legitimate need for restricted access is demonstrated by peak period level of service D or worse on a parallel adjacent highway;
 - Restricted access is enforced for freeways; priority lanes used by other high occupancy vehicles (HOV) (i.e., vanpools (VP), carpools) must demonstrate safe operation; and
 - High Occupancy/Toll (HO/T) lanes meet FHWA requirements for traffic flow and use of toll revenues. The Authority has provided the NTD a copy of the State's certification to the U.S. Secretary of Transportation stating that it has established a program for monitoring, assessing, and reporting on the operation of the HOV facility with HO/T lanes.

We noted no exceptions.

16. We inquired of the person reporting NTD data as to the measurement of FG and HIB DRM and inspected that he or she computed mileage in accordance with FTA definitions of FG/HIB and DRM. We inquired of any service changes during the year that resulted in an increase or decrease in DRMs. There were no service changes during the year that resulted in an increase or decrease in DRMs. We found no exceptions.
17. We inquired of Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, if any temporary interruptions in transit service occurred during the report year. For interruptions, we inspected documentation to determine the following:
- The interruptions were due to maintenance or rehabilitation improvements to a FG segment(s).
 - Reported DRMs for the segment(s) was for the entire report year if the interruption is less than 12 months in duration. Reported months of operation on the FG/HIB segments form as 12. The Authority should document the interruption.
 - Improvements that caused a service interruption on the FG/HIB DRMs lasting more than 12 months were reported in accordance with guidance provided by the NTD validation analyst from the FTA.

We found no exceptions.

18. We recalculated measurements FG/HIB DRM from maps. We found no exceptions.
19. We inquired of Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, whether other public transit agencies operate service over the same FG/HIB as the Authority.

No other public transit agencies operate service over the same FG/HIB as the Authority.
20. We inspected the FG/HIB segments form and there were no segments added in 2017.
21. We compared operating expenses with audited financial data after reconciling items are removed. We found no exceptions.
22. We inquired of Capital Accountant Emily Miklasevich if the Authority purchases transportation services. The Authority did not purchase transportation services during 2017.
23. We inquired of the Capital Accountant Emily Miklasevich regarding PT service data and the required assurances. Required assurances were not obtained as the transit authority did not purchase any transportation services therefore PT services were not provided.
24. The Authority did not purchase transportation services during 2017; therefore there were no PT services provided.
25. We inquired of Michele Conley, Manager of Planning and Service Development, if the Authority provided service to more than one UZA or between an UZA and a non-UZA. The Authority did not provide these services during 2017.
26. We compared the data reported on the Federal Funding Allocation Statistics Form to data from the prior report year and calculated the percentage change from the prior year to the current year. For actual VRM, PMT or OE data that have increased or decreased by more than 10 percent, or FG DRM data that have increased or decreased, we inquired of Authority management regarding the specifics of operations that led to the increases or decreases in the data relative to the prior reporting period. We found no exceptions.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

GREATER DAYTON REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
OCTOBER 2, 2018**