



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

**SCIOTO AMBULANCE DISTRICT
SCIOTO COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Scioto Ambulance District
Scioto County
24 Maple Street
P.O. Box 137
McDermott, Ohio 45652

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Scioto Ambulance District, Scioto County, Ohio (the District), agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transactions, and management and the Board are responsible for complying with the compliance requirements. 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*. The sufficiency of the 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 either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger to the December 31, 2007 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Ledger. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balance with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2009 and one from 2008.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the Statement to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Revenue Ledger to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2009 and 2008:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts.
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts.We noted the Revenue Ledger included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009 and five from 2008.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Medical Agencies to the District during 2009 and 2008 with the remittance slip and/or invoice. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger and Payment Detail Register for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2.
2. We obtained a summary of debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to general fund payments reported in the Payment Detail Register. We also compared the date the debt payments were due to the date the District made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Payroll Register and determined whether the following information in the minute record was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- a. Name.
- b. Authorized salary or pay rate.
- c. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
- d. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
- e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.).

We found no exceptions related to the steps above.

- 2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
- 3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	1/31/10	12/31/09	\$4,779.94	\$4,779.94
State income taxes	1/15/10	12/31/09	\$437.55	\$437.55
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	1/30/10	12/31/09	\$5,197.47	\$5,197.47

- 4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll Register:
 - a. Accumulated leave records.
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date.
 - c. The District's payout policy.

The District vacation policy stated that should an employee leave the company, whether by discharge or by employees' choice, no vacation time is owed or paid.

On May 21, 2008 during an open meeting of the District Board, the Board terminated Gregory Hubbard from his employment with the District. Mr. Hubbard was subsequently paid for 40 hours of vacation on May 30, 2008 via check number 3350 in the amount of \$316, contrary to the vacation policy.

In accordance with the foregoing facts, and pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 117.28, a finding for recovery for monies illegally expended is hereby issued against Gregory Hubbard, former employee, in the amount of \$316, and in favor of the Scioto Ambulance District General Fund.

Additionally, under Ohio law, any public official who either authorizes an illegal expenditure of public funds or supervises the accounts of a public office from which such illegal expenditure is made is liable for the amount of the expenditure. Seward v. National Surety Corp. (1929), 120 Ohio St. 47; 1980 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 80-074; Ohio Rev. Code Section 9.39; State ex. Rel. Village of Linndale v. Masten (1985), 18 Ohio St. 3d 228. Public officials controlling public funds or property are liable to the extent that recovery or restitution is not obtained from the persons who unlawfully obtained such funds or property, 1980 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 80-074.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

Fiscal Officer Joyce Burriss approved the check resulting in the improper payment. Fiscal Officer Joyce Burriss and her bonding company, State Auto Insurance Company, will be jointly and severally liable in the amount of \$316, and in favor of the Scioto Ambulance District General Fund to the extent the recovery is not obtained from Gregory Hubbard.

This finding for recovery was repaid on August 6, 2010 by check number 619 from Joyce Burriss payable to the Scioto Ambulance District. The receipt was posted to the Scioto Ambulance District on August 9, 2010.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Detail Register for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2008 and determined whether:

- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
- b. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the check number, date, payee name and amount recorded in the Payment Detail Register and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found three instances in 2008 and one instance in 2009 where disbursements did not contain the proper supporting documentation.
- c. The Fiscal Officer certified disbursements requiring certification or issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D). We found three instances in 2008 and one in 2009 where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should precede the invoice date.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the *Amended Official Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Ledger for the General Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The Revenue Ledger recorded budgeted (i.e., certified) resources for the General Fund of \$416,663 for 2009. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$526,883. Additionally, the Revenue Ledger recorded budgeted (i.e., certified) resources for the General Fund of \$370,199 for 2008. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$369,680. The Fiscal Officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Ledger to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General Fund, the Trustees appropriated separately for “each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services,” as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger for 2009 and 2008 for the General Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger report.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for the General fund as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger to determine whether the District elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. We noted the District did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Detail Register report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under the following statute(s):

Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.376 requires a fire and ambulance district to competitively bid purchases exceeding \$50,000 (other than compensation).

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the District's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

August 5, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

SCIOTO AMBULANCE DISTRICT

SCIOTO 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
AUGUST 26, 2010**