



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Carroll County Soil and Water Conservation District
Carroll County
613 North High Street
Carrollton, OH 44615

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Carroll County Soil and Water Conservation District (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, 2011 through 2015, 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 followed 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.

Depository Balances and Fund Balances

We applied the following procedures to each *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* (the Reports) for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

1. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports, and compared the *Fund Cash Balances, December 31* to the *Fund Balances* on page 2. We noted the following exceptions:

Fund	Fund Balance on pg. 2	Fund Balance on pg. 3B
District - 2015	\$150,184.17	\$146,905.44
District - 2014	\$160,900.17	\$160,873.61

2. We compared the *Disbursements plus Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Disbursements reported on page 4. We noted the following exception:

Fund	Disbursements on pg. 4	Disbursements on pg. 3A
Special - 2012	\$105,637.56	\$89,297.00

3. We compared the *Receipts plus Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Actual Receipts reported on page 5. The amounts agreed.

4. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the reconciliation on page 2. We found no exceptions.
5. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's Reconciliation Summary to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. Noted the following exception:

Fund	Annual Report Fund Balance	Reconciliation Summary
District - 2015	\$146,905.44	\$147,080.67

We also applied the following procedures to the *Subtotals* and *Totals* reported on page 2 of the December 31, 2015 Report:

6. We observed the December 31 balance for the District Fund on the financial institution's website. The balance agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the Carroll County Transaction History Report. We found no exceptions.
8. For the checks comprising the Outstanding Checks, we applied the following procedures:
 - a. We footed the supporting outstanding check list and compared it to the Totals on the Report. We found an exception of the amounts on the reconciliation exceeding the outstanding check list by \$404.30.
 - b. We traced each check to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We traced the amounts and dates of each check to the check register, to determine the check was recorded for the same amount and dated and recorded prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

We applied the following procedures for the years ended December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the Carroll County Transaction Report or County Pay-ins to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Transaction Detail by Account. The amounts agreed.

All Other Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

1. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the District Transaction Detail by Account. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found 3 transactions where the District did not retain supporting documentation to support the rates charged.
3. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for four employees from 2015, one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2012 through 2014, and one payroll check for the only employee for the year ended December 31, 2011 from the County Payroll Check Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the County Payroll Check Register to supporting documentation (County Payroll Transmittal Reports and SWIMS Timesheets). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We noted no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the check was classified as *salaries*. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For the four employees tested in step 1 from 2015, 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 the check:
 - 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 steps a. – e. above.

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) occurring between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2015, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the County Payroll Check 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 amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* from the Transaction Detail by Account Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and two from the *Special Fund* and three from the *District Fund* and other funds for each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 and determined whether:

- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.

- b. For *District Fund* and other funds disbursements, we determined whether:
 - i. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the similar data recorded in the Transaction Detail by Account Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We noted the District did not retain the canceled checks for 11 of the 17 disbursements tested. No exceptions were noted for the 6 disbursements we were able to test.
 - ii. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
- c. For *Special Fund* disbursements, we determined whether:
 - i. The payee name and amount recorded on the submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the Transaction Detail by Account Report and County Transaction Report. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The invoice was signed by the fiscal officer and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

2015 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We read the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners. We noted the request did not include the Special Fund's *Needs, Income* and *Balances* anticipated for carry over from the current year, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook, Chapter 5. Instead the request was limited to the District submitting a request for the County Appropriation for the year.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the Report to the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the County Budget Report for the Special Fund. The Annual Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) receipts for the Special Fund of \$181,454 which agreed to the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*. However, the County Budget Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Special fund of \$163,860 for 2015. The District Administrator should periodically compare amounts recorded in the County Budget Report to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Board of Supervisors may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
3. We scanned the appropriation measures to determine whether the Supervisors appropriated separate amounts within the Special Fund 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.
4. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Budget Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. The amounts agreed.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated resources. We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2015. We noted appropriations did not exceed estimated resources for the Special Fund.

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus year-end certified commitments (i.e. encumbrances)) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total disbursements plus outstanding year-end encumbrances to total appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2015 for the "Special" Fund, as recorded in the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report. We noted expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.
7. We scanned the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

2015 Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Transaction Detail by Account Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 to determine if the District purchased equipment and services allowed by ORC 1515.09 or purchased goods or services allowed by ORC 1515.08(H)(1) whose cost, other than personal service compensation or office space rent, exceeded \$50,000. We noted no purchases exceeding \$50,000.

2015 Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires Districts to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed the HINKLE system and noted the District filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the year ended December 31, 2015.

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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

November 29, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CARROLL COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CARROLL 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
DECEMBER 27, 2016**