



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Hancock Park District  
Hancock County  
1424 East Main Cross Street  
Findlay, Ohio 45840-7066

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hancock Park District, Hancock 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, 2012 and 2011, 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. Hancock County is custodian for the District's deposits, and therefore the County's deposit and investment pool holds the District's assets. We compared the District's fund balance reported on its December 31, 2012 Cash and Free Balance Report and Cashbook to the balance reported in Hancock County's accounting records. The amounts agreed.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balance recorded in the Account Summary Trial Balance to the December 31, 2010 balance in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balance recorded in the Account Summary Trial Balance to the December 31, 2011 balance in the Account Summary Trial Balance. We found no exceptions.

### Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2012 and one from 2011:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Year to Date Revenue Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Year to Date Revenue Report. 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 Year to Date Revenue Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts, plus 11 advances for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Year to Date Revenue Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the Hancock County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Year to Date Revenue Report. 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 agreed the amount paid from the Ohio Department of Transportation to the District during 2011 with documentation supporting the amount received. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether this receipt was allocated to the proper fund. We found no exception.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exception.

#### **Debt**

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Year to Date Revenue Report and Year to Date Expense Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011.

#### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Final Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Final Report to supporting documentation (timecard, or legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the fund and account code to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:

- a. Name
- b. Authorized salary or pay rate
- c. Department to which the check should be charged
- d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
- e. Federal, State and Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
- f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 to determine whether remittances were timely charged by the fiscal agent (Hancock County), and if the amounts charged agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2012. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 21, 2012	\$15,789.67	\$15,789.67
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 18, 2012	\$3,146.79	\$3,146.79
City of Findlay income tax	January 31, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$283.95	\$283.95
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 21, 2012	\$5,625.15	\$5,625.15

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 Final Report:
  - a. Accumulated leave records
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - c. The District's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

#### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Year to Date Expense Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2011 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 Year to Date Expense Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
- c. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the restricted purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
- d. 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 no exceptions.

### **Compliance – Budgetary**

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Year to Date Revenue Report for the General fund for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amounts recorded in the accounting system for 2012 and 2011. The Year to Date Revenue Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$1,423,043 for 2012 and \$1,886,179 for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$1,587,928 and \$1,905,509, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Year to Date Revenue Report 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 2012 and 2011 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Year to Date Expense Report for 2012 and 2011 for the General fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Year to Date Expense report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 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, 2012 and 2011. We noted no fund 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General fund, as recorded in the Year to Date Expense Report. We noted no fund for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. We inquired of management and scanned the Year to Date Expense Reports 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.

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, those charged with governance, and others within the District, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

May 16, 2013

**This page intentionally left blank.**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

HANCOCK PARK DISTRICT

HANCOCK 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  
JUNE 4, 2013