

*State of Hawaii  
Department of  
Transportation—  
Highways Division*

*Single Audit Report  
for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006*

*Submitted by  
The Auditor  
State of Hawaii*

**STATE OF HAWAII  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—HIGHWAYS DIVISION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

	<b>Page</b>
Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards	1
Independent Auditors' Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards	2–3
Independent Auditors' Report on Internal Control over Compliance Applicable to Each Major Federal Award Program and on Compliance and Other Matters and on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards	4–5
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs	6–12

**STATE OF HAWAII**  
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—HIGHWAYS DIVISION**

**SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS**  
**YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2006**

---

<b>Grant/CFDA Grantor's Program Title</b>	<b>Federal CFDA Number</b>	<b>Federal Expenditures</b>
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION:		
Highway planning and construction	20.205	<u>\$ 120,513,051</u>
State and community highway safety program:		
NHTSA grant		2,478,666
Fatal accident reporting system grant		<u>48,041</u>
Total state and community highway safety program	20.600	2,526,707
National motor carrier safety program—		
Assistance program grant	20.218	<u>405,205</u>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<u><b>\$ 123,444,963</b></u>

Notes:

1. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards includes the federal grant activity of the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Highways Division (the "Highways Division") and is presented on the basis of cash disbursements made by the Highways Division. The information in this schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Therefore, some amounts presented in this schedule may differ from amounts presented in, or used in, the preparation of the financial statements.
2. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards does not include the amount of the Highways Division's matching funds that were expended during the year ended June 30, 2006.
3. Of the total federal expenditures, \$25,352,676 was provided to subrecipients.

## **INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS**

The Auditor  
State of Hawaii:

We have audited the financial statements of the Highways Division, Department of Transportation, State of Hawaii (the "Highways Division") as of and for the year ended June 30, 2006, and have issued our report thereon dated February 14, 2007. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

### **Internal Control over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Highways Division's internal control over financial reporting in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting. However, we noted certain matters involving the Highways Division's internal control over financial reporting and its operation that we consider to be reportable conditions. Reportable conditions involve matters coming to our attention relating to significant deficiencies in the design or operation of the Highways Division's internal control over financial reporting that, in our judgment, could adversely affect the Highways Division's ability to initiate, record, process, and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statements. Reportable conditions are described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as items 06-1 and 06-2.

A material weakness is a reportable condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that misstatements caused by error or fraud in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statements being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be reportable conditions and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all reportable conditions that are also considered to be material weaknesses. However, we consider the reportable conditions described above to be material weaknesses.

### **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Highways Division's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with

those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Highways Division's management, U.S. Department of Transportation, federal awarding agencies, and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

*DeBorja + Tach LLP*

February 14, 2007

## **INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE APPLICABLE TO EACH MAJOR FEDERAL AWARD PROGRAM AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS AND ON THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS**

The Auditor  
State of Hawaii:

### **Internal Control over Compliance**

The management of the Highways Division, Department of Transportation, State of Hawaii (the "Highways Division") is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to federal programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Highways Division's internal control over compliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.

We noted certain matters involving the internal control over compliance and its operation that we consider to be reportable conditions. Reportable conditions involve matters coming to our attention relating to significant deficiencies in the design or operation of the internal control over compliance that, in our judgment, could adversely affect the Highways Division's ability to administer a major federal program in accordance with applicable requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants. The reportable conditions are described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as items 06-1 and 06-2.

A material weakness is a reportable condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that noncompliance with the applicable requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants caused by error or fraud that would be material in relation to a major federal program being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. Our consideration of the internal control over compliance would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be reportable conditions and accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all reportable conditions that are also considered to be material weaknesses. However, we consider the reportable conditions described above to be material weaknesses.

### **Compliance and Other Matters**

We have audited the compliance of the Highways Division with the types of compliance requirements described in the *U.S. Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that are applicable to its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2006. The Highways Division's major federal program is identified in the summary of auditors' results section of the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. Compliance with the requirements of

laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to its major federal program is the responsibility of the Highways Division's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Highways Division's compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the Highways Division's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on the Highways Division's compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, the Highways Division complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that are applicable to its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2006.

### **Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards**

We have audited the basic financial statements of the Highways Division as of and for the year ended June 30, 2006, and have issued our report thereon dated February 14, 2007. Our audit was performed for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards for the year ended June 30, 2006 is presented for the purpose of additional analysis as required by OMB Circular A-133 and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. This schedule is the responsibility of management of the Highways Division. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in our audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, when considered in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Highways Division's management, U.S. Department of Transportation, federal awarding agencies, and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

*Deloitte & Touche LLP*

February 14, 2007

**STATE OF HAWAII  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—HIGHWAYS DIVISION**

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
JUNE 30, 2006**

---

**Part I—Summary of Auditors' Results**

1. The independent auditors' report on the financial statements expressed an unqualified opinion.
2. Reportable conditions in internal control over financial reporting were identified, all of which were considered to be material weaknesses.
3. No instance of noncompliance considered material to the financial statements was disclosed by the audit.
4. Reportable conditions in internal control over compliance with requirements applicable to its major federal awards program were identified, all of which were considered to be material weaknesses.
5. The independent auditors' report on compliance with requirements applicable to its major federal awards program expressed an unqualified opinion.
6. The audit did not disclose findings required to be reported by OMB Circular A-133.
7. The Highways Division's major program was Highway Planning and Construction, CFDA Number 20.205.
8. A threshold of \$3,000,000 was used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs as those terms are defined by OMB Circular A-133.
9. The Highways Division did not qualify as a low-risk auditee as that term is defined in OMB Circular A-133.



## Part II—Financial Statement Findings Section

### Material Weakness

#### 06-1 CAPITAL ASSETS

**Observation:** The accounting policies and procedures for infrastructure assets should be improved. This condition was also noted in previous years.

**Background:** Effective from fiscal year 2002, with the implementation of Governmental Accounting Standards Board (“GASB”) Statement No. 34, *Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for State and Local Governments*, the Highways Division has been required to capitalize all of its capital assets, including infrastructure assets. In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, the Highways Division contracted with a consulting firm to assist with the initial valuation and recording of the infrastructure assets. Subsequent to fiscal year 2003, the Highways Division assumed full responsibility for the accounting of infrastructure assets.

Because the plans for transitioning from the consulting firm were never formalized, and with the limitations of the Highways Division’s accounting system as to the tracking and depreciating of infrastructure assets, a comprehensive detail of the infrastructure assets cost and accumulated depreciation has not been maintained. In fiscal years 2005 and 2006, the Highways Division was able to only identify and track those year’s capital additions. At June 30, 2006, the unreconciled difference between the information in the Department of Accounting and General Services’ (“DAGS”) fixed asset system and the Highways Division’s accounting records approximated \$425 million.

**Recommendation:** Continue the process of identifying and correcting the unreconciled differences between the DAGS fixed asset system and the Highways Division’s detail of infrastructure assets.

#### 06-2 CAPITAL ASSET ACCOUNTING RECORDS AND INTERNAL REPORTING PROCEDURES

**Observation:** Except for the 2006 capital asset additions, the Highways Division did not reconcile its capital asset accounting records for capital asset additions for fiscal years 2005 and prior with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis. This condition was also noted in previous years.

**Background:** The Highways Division maintains its own accounting system, which is independent of the State of Hawaii’s accounting system, called “FAMIS.” Since FAMIS is the official accounting system of the State, the Highways Division’s accounting records must be reconciled to the State’s records. State law requires that this reconciliation take place at least on an annual basis.

Failure to reconcile the accounting records accurately and on a timely basis may result in undetected errors or irregularities.

**Recommendation:** Develop procedures to ensure that the Highways Division’s capital asset accounting records are reconciled with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis. We understand that the Highways Division’s long-standing request for the funding for the development and implementation of a new accounting system still has not been approved.

**Observation:** The Highways Division does not maintain accounting records that support the amounts included in its audited financial statements, which are made available to the public.

**Background:** With its adoption of GASB Statement No. 34, the Highways Division must prepare both fund financial statements and government-wide financial statements. However, the Highways Division's accounting system is not capable of recording those entries required to prepare government-wide financial statements. As a result, the required journal entries are not recorded by the Highways Division, and the details are maintained only by its auditors.

**Recommendation:** Maintain trial balances on electronic spreadsheets that reflect those journal entries and accounts that are necessary to prepare government-wide financial statements. Reconcile the spreadsheet amounts with the audited financial statements on an annual basis.

### **Part III—Federal Award Findings and Questioned Cost Section**

#### **Material Weakness**

##### **06-1 CAPITAL ASSETS**

The material weakness in internal control over proper accounting for infrastructure assets also applies to the Highways Division's major federal awards program.

**Questioned Costs:** None

##### **06-2 ACCOUNTING RECORDS AND INTERNAL REPORTING PROCEDURES**

The material weakness in internal control over the reconciling of the Highways Division's accounting records with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis also applies to the Highways Division's major federal awards program.

**Questioned Costs:** None

### **Part IV—Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings**

#### **Financial Statement Findings Section**

#### **Material Weakness**

##### **05-1 CAPITAL ASSETS**

**Observation:** Reconciliation of capital asset (non-infrastructure) activity was not performed accurately or timely. This condition was also noted in previous years.

**Background:** The Highways Division utilizes the State's fixed asset reporting system maintained by DAGS to account for its capital assets. The district offices initiate forms to update the inventory and submit them to the fiscal office, which then forwards the forms to DAGS for processing. The fiscal office performs, on a quarterly basis, an analysis of capital asset (non-infrastructure) additions. Such analysis notes capital expenditures recorded in its accounting system (called "HWYAC"), and identifies the page and line of the DAGS fixed asset edit report in which the asset is entered into the DAGS fixed asset system.

The reconciliation for fiscal year 2005 was revised to include all payments made in the fiscal year, but did not include all amounts that were paid subsequent to June 30, 2005, but for which the goods were received prior to June 30, 2005.

**Recommendation:** Improve the capital asset reconciliation procedure to include all appropriate reconciling items.

**Status:** Recommendation has been implemented.

**Observation:** The accounting policies and procedures for infrastructure assets should be improved. This condition was also noted in previous years.

**Background:** Effective from fiscal year 2002, the Highways Division has been required to capitalize and depreciate all capital assets, including infrastructure assets. In this endeavor, the Highways Division contracted with a consulting firm to perform a valuation of the infrastructure assets as of June 30, 2002. During fiscal year 2003, the consulting firm was again contracted to capitalize all of that year's transactions. However, during the fiscal year 2003 audit, we noted several errors in computations performed by the consulting firm.

During fiscal year 2004, the Highways Division performed the work internally to capitalize that year's capital asset transactions. During that year's audit, we noted the following:

- The Highways Division did not sufficiently review the contractor's work. Accordingly, the June 30, 2003 balance of infrastructure assets per the audited financial statements did not agree to the final 2003 report issued by the consultant by \$552 million. The Highways Division tried to have the consultant reconcile the amounts, but was unsuccessful.
- The Highways Division still had not formalized plans as to how or when it would assume full responsibility for accounting for infrastructure assets. The procedures manual developed by the consultant to implement an asset management system proved to be insufficient for the Highways Division's needs and no training was provided by the consultant.
- The Highways Division did not have a comprehensive detail of all infrastructure assets at June 30, 2004. The Highways Division had attempted to utilize the DAGS fixed asset system to track infrastructure assets; however, the amounts in the DAGS fixed asset system did not reconcile to the June 30, 2004 audited balance by \$228 million (which was corrected by an audit journal entry.)

During fiscal year 2005, the Highways Division again performed the work internally to capitalize the year's capital asset transactions. During this year's audit, we noted the following:

- The Highways Division addressed only the current year's activity, and did not attempt to reconcile the differences noted in the previous years.
- The Highways Division has started to develop policies and procedures regarding the implementation of an asset management system. However, the recommendation to modify the existing financial system to automate the infrastructure assets valuation work was not implemented in fiscal year 2005.

- The information in the DAGS fixed asset system still does not reconcile to the information in the Highways Division's accounting records. At June 30, 2005, the unreconciled difference approximated \$700 million.

**Recommendation:** Develop policies and procedures to properly account for the infrastructure assets.

**Status:** Recommendation has not been implemented. See current year's comment.

### **Reportable Condition**

#### 05-2 ACCOUNTING AND INTERNAL REPORTING PROCEDURES

**Observation:** The Highways Division did not reconcile its accounting records with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis. This condition was also noted in prior years.

**Background:** The Highways Division maintains its own accounting system, which is independent of the State of Hawaii's accounting system, called "FAMIS." Since FAMIS is the official accounting system of the State, the Highways Division's accounting records must be reconciled to the State's records. State law requires that this reconciliation take place at least on an annual basis.

Failure to reconcile the accounting records accurately and on a timely basis may result in undetected errors or irregularities.

**Recommendation:** Develop procedures to ensure that the Highways Division's accounting records are reconciled with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis. We understand that the Highways Division's request for the funding for the development and implementation of a new accounting system was not approved by the State Comptroller.

**Status:** Recommendation has not been implemented. See current year's comment.

### **Other Matters**

#### 05-3 APPLICATION OF INDIRECT COST RATE

**Program:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Highway Planning and Construction, CFDA No. 20.205

**Observation:** The indirect cost rate was applied to the wrong base. This condition was also noted in the prior year.

**Background:** The grant with the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") allows the Highways Division to charge indirect costs, as well as direct costs. The indirect costs are based on an indirect cost rate proposal ("ICRP") that was approved by the FHWA in fiscal year 2002. The ICRP calculated the indirect cost rate using direct payroll as the base.

In fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the Highways Division inadvertently applied the indirect cost rate to both direct payroll and fringe benefits, instead of direct payroll only. The use of a larger base had the effect of overcharging the FHWA for indirect costs by \$1,333,723 in fiscal year 2003 and by \$1,407,414 in fiscal year 2004.

In fiscal year 2005, the Highways Division had made a decision to stop the charging of indirect costs to the federal grants; however, the HWYAC accounting system was not programmed to stop the charges. Thus, during fiscal year 2005, indirect costs of \$1,830,898 were charged to the grants. At year-end, an accounting entry was made to record a payable to the FHWA for this amount.

***Recommendation:*** Reimburse the FHWA for the over-allocated indirect costs for the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005, and make an adjustment to the HWYAC accounting system to stop the charging of indirect costs.

***Status:*** Recommendation has been implemented.

## **Federal Award Findings and Questioned Cost**

### **Material Weakness**

#### **05-1 CAPITAL ASSETS**

The material weakness in internal control over proper accounting of capital assets, both infrastructure and non-infrastructure, also applies to the Highways Division's major federal awards program.

***Questioned Costs:*** None

***Status:*** Recommendation has not been implemented. Comment is still applicable.

### **Reportable Condition**

#### **05-2 ACCOUNTING AND INTERNAL REPORTING PROCEDURES**

The reportable condition in internal control over financial reporting relating to the Highways Division's failure to reconcile its accounting records with those of the State of Hawaii on a timely basis also applies to the Highways Division's major federal awards program.

***Questioned Costs:*** None

***Status:*** Recommendation has not been implemented. Comment is still applicable.

### **Other Matters**

#### **05-3 APPLICATION OF INDIRECT COST RATE**

The finding relating to the application of the indirect cost rate also applies to the Highways Division's major federal awards program.

***Questioned Costs:*** \$1,830,898

***Status:*** Recommendation has been implemented.

#### 05-4 SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

**Program:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Highway Planning and Construction, CFDA No. 20.205

**Observation:** The Highways Division did not adequately monitor its subrecipients. This comment was also noted in previous years.

**Questioned Costs:** None

**Background:** The counties of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai are the primary subrecipients of federal awards received by the Highways Division. As a pass-through entity, the Highways Division's responsibilities include:

- Identifying to the subrecipient the federal award information and applicable compliance requirements,
- Monitoring the subrecipient's activities to provide reasonable assurance that the subrecipient administers federal awards in compliance with federal requirements,
- Ensuring required audits are performed and proper corrective action is taken on audit findings, and
- Evaluating the impact of subrecipient activities on the Highways Division's ability to comply with applicable federal regulations.

The Highways Division's monitoring activities of subrecipients take place at a high level, primarily through the review of single audit reports that are filed with the Highways Division. However, the Highways Division does not always follow up on any findings reported in the single audit reports or always ensure that the appropriate corrective action is implemented.

Failure to adequately monitor the activities of subrecipients may result in a delay in discovering that federal funds that the Highways Division is responsible for are not being expended in accordance with their intended purposes. (However, this potential problem is somewhat mitigated, in that the Highways Division's district engineers do monitor the progress of the projects, including the approval of reimbursement requests from the counties.)

**Recommendation:** Take a more active role in monitoring the subrecipients' compliance with federal requirements and perform such monitoring activities on a timely basis. Such activities may include regularly scheduled discussions with subrecipients, regular site visits to review financial or programmatic records and observe operations, review of subrecipient budgets for federal expenditures, and the review of single audit reports and corrective action plans in a timely manner. We were informed that the Highways Division will conduct site visits to various county projects in fiscal year 2006.

**Status:** Recommendation has been implemented.

\* \* \* \* \*