



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Logan County Soil and Water Conservation District  
Logan County  
324 CR 11  
Bellefontaine, Ohio 43311

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Logan 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, Investments 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. The amounts agreed.
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. The amounts agreed for all years with exception of 2013. The total reported on page 4 was overstated by \$162. To improve financial reporting, the District should implement procedures to ensure all amounts agree on the annual reports.
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 for all years with exception of 2014. The total reported on page 4 was understated by \$500. To improve financial reporting, the District should implement procedures to ensure all amounts agree on the annual reports.
4. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the reconciliation on page 2. We found no exceptions.

### **Depository Balances, Investments and Fund Balances (Continued)**

5. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's General Ledger Report to the corresponding Fund Cash Balances on page 3B of the Reports. The January 1 and December 31 amounts agreed for 2015. The January 1 amounts did not agree for 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 as the reports did not include the beginning balance. The December 31 amount did not agree for the Change Fund in 2014 as the amount was not included. To accurately report the financial reports, the District should include all beginning and ending balances, receipts, and expenditures in the annual reports.

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

6. We confirmed the December 31 bank account depository balances for the District Fund with the District's financial institutions. The balances agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the Report to the amount calculated from the County Fund Summary, Revenue and Expense Reports. 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 no exceptions.
  - 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.
9. We tested investments held at December 31 to determine that they:
  - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions
  - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. 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:

- 1 We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the County Auditor's Detail Revenue Report and Detail Vendor Expense Report to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Profit and Loss Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
- 2 We haphazardly selected five other confirmable receipts from the year ended December 31, 2014 in the Profit and Loss Detail Report from the District Fund, as it was the only fund other than the Special Fund. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We agreed to supporting documentation the amounts paid from the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife to the District. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.

### **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 General Ledger Report. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions.
3. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for all three employees from 2015 and one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2014 from the Payroll Warrant Register Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Warrant Register Report to supporting documentation (timecard and legislatively approved rate). 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 three 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 Payroll Warrant Register 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 five disbursements from the Special Fund and five disbursements from the District Fund from the General Ledger Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and two from the Special Fund and three from the District Fund for each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 (except 2012 where there were no Special Fund disbursements and 2011 where there was only one Special Fund disbursement) and determined whether:

### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

1. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
2. For District Fund and other funds disbursements, we determined whether:
  - a. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the similar data recorded in the General Ledger Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - b. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
3. For Special Fund disbursements, we determined whether:
  - a. The payee name and amount recorded on the voucher and invoice submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the General Ledger Report and County Detail Expense Report. We found no exceptions.
  - b. The names and amounts on the voucher agreed to supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - c. The voucher and 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 included 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. We also compared the budget amounts to the budgetary schedules on pages 4 and 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts reported on the Needs, Income and Balances Request including carryover agreed to the amounts reported on the County permanent appropriations, County Revenue and Expense Reports and District Profit and Loss Budget Performance Reports for the beginning of the year. The amounts did not agree to the year-end amounts on page 4 and 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report due to approved amendments throughout the year. See #2 and #4 below.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the Report to the Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the County Revenue Report and Profit and Loss Budget Performance Report for the Special Fund. The Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources reported estimated revenues of \$160,000 for the Special Fund, which agreed to the County Revenue Report. The District Profit and Loss Budget Performance Report reported estimated receipts of \$130,000. The estimated receipts on Page 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report were \$80,000. To improve financial reporting and to help prevent overspending, the District should implement procedures to ensure the estimated receipts agree to the final Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources.
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 County Summary Expense Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. The amount reported on Page 4 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report was \$144,096; however the amount in the County Summary Expense Report and District Profit and Loss Budget Performance Report was \$220,795. The final approved appropriations were also \$220,795.

### **2015 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance (Continued)**

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 resources 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 Profit and Loss Detail 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

October 24, 2016

**This page intentionally left blank.**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**LOGAN COUNTY SEWER AND WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT**

**LOGAN 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  
NOVEMBER 10, 2016**