



OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE
KEITH FABER



OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE KEITH FABER



PO Box 828
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740) 594-3300 or (800) 441-1389
SoutheastRegion@ohioauditor.gov

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Muskingum Soil and Water Conservation District
Muskingum County
225 Underwood Street, Suite 100
Zanesville, Ohio 43701

We have performed the procedures enumerated below on the Muskingum Soil and Water Conservation District's (the District) receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in the cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019, and certain compliance requirements related to those transactions and balances, included in the information provided to us by the management of the District. The District is responsible for the receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in the cash basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019 and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances included in the information provided to us by the District.

The Board of Supervisors and the management of the District have agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate to meet the intended purpose of providing assistance in the evaluation of the District's receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. No other party acknowledged the appropriateness of the procedures. This report may not be suitable for any other purpose. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to a user of the report and may not meet the needs of all users of the report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in the 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.

For the purposes of performing these procedures, this report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

The procedures and the associated findings are as follows:

Cash and Investments

1. We recalculated the December 31, 2020 and December 31, 2019 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2019 beginning fund balances for each fund recorded in the District's financial statements filed in the Hinkle System to the December 31, 2018 balances in the prior year documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2020 beginning fund balances for each fund recorded in the District's financial statements filed in the Hinkle System to the December 31, 2019 balances in the District's financial statements filed in the Hinkle System. The Special Fund Balances agreed. However, the December 31, 2019 financial statements recorded a General Fund balance of \$427,661 while the January 1, 2020 financial statements recorded a General Fund balance of \$401,592, a difference of (\$26,069) and the December 31, 2019 financial statements did not have an Other Fund while the January 1, 2020 financial statements recorded an Other Fund balance of \$26,068.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

3. We agreed the totals per the District Fund and Other Fund bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2020 and 2019 fund cash balances reported in the District's Balance Sheet for the District Fund and Other Fund and the financial statements filed by the District in the Hinkle System. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2020 bank account depository balances for the District Fund and Other Fund with the District's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2020 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We compared the December 31, 2020 Special Fund depository balance from the *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* to the amount reported in the Muskingum County Trial Balance Report. We found no exceptions.
6. We selected the reconciling debit (such as outstanding check) from the December 31, 2020 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We footed the supporting outstanding check list and compared it to the cash reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We reviewed the subsequent January and February bank statements and noted the outstanding check did not clear during those months.
 - c. We traced the amount and date to the check register and determined the debit was dated prior to December 31. There were no exceptions.
7. We inspected investments held at December 31, 2020 and December 31, 2019 to determine that they:
 - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code § 135.13 or 135.14. We noted no exceptions.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

We selected a total of five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the County Auditor's Vendor Activity Reports from 2020 and a total of five from 2019:

- a. We compared the amounts from the above named reports to the amount recorded in the General Ledger Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. We inspected the General Ledger to determine whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Other Receipts

We selected 10 other receipts from the year ended December 31, 2020 and 10 other receipts from the year ended 2019 and:

- a. Agreed the receipt amount recorded in the General Ledger Report to supporting documentation. The amounts agreed.
- b. Confirmed the amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions.
- c. Inspected the General Ledger Report to determine the receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

We selected one payroll check for five employees from 2020 and one payroll check for five employees from 2019 from the Payroll Warrant Register and:

- a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Warrant Register to supporting documentation (timecard, approved rate or salary recorded in the minutes).
 - i. We inspected the Payroll Warrant Register for the Retirement system, Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization.
 - ii. We agreed these items to the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check.
We found no exceptions.
- b. We inspected the Payroll Warrant Register to determine whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We found no exceptions.
- c. We inspected the Payroll Warrant Register and District General Ledger to determine whether the check was classified as *salaries* and was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* and Other Fund from the Purchase Journal Report for the year ended December 31, 2020 and five from the *Special Fund* and five from the *District Fund* for the year ended 2019 and determined whether:

- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
- b. For *District Fund* and Other Fund 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 Purchase Journal Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - 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 voucher submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the District's Purchase Journal Report and Muskingum County Appropriation Ledger. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The names and amounts on the voucher agreed to supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - iii. The voucher was signed by the Treasurer and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We inspected the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019. 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 Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed for 2020. For 2019 we noted the budget amount was \$379,948 and the Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report was \$350,443, for a variance of \$29,505 which agreed to an amendment in the estimated receipts in 2019.

Special Fund Budgetary Compliance (Continued)

2. Ohio Rev. Code § 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 approved appropriations (Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.38 and 5705.40) plus any carryover appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2020 and 2019 for the "Special" Fund. Expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.
3. We inspected the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code § 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. No funds had negative cash fund balances.

Sunshine Law Compliance

1. We obtained and inspected the District's Public Records Policy to determine the policy was in accordance with Ohio Rev. Code §§ 149.43(E)(2) and 149.43(B)(7(c) and did not limit the number of responses that may be made to a particular person, limit the number of responses during a specified period of time, or establish a fixed period of time before it will respond unless that period is less than eight hours. We found no exceptions.
2. We selected the public records request from the engagement period and inspected the request to determine the following:
 - a. The District was compliant and responded to the request in accordance with their adopted policy as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(B)(1). We found no exceptions.
 - b. The District did not have any denied public records requests during the engagement period.
 - c. The District did not have any public records requests with redactions during the engagement period.
3. We inquired whether the District had a records retention schedule, and observed that it was readily available to the public as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(B)(2). We found no exceptions.
4. We inspected written evidence that the Public Records Policy was provided to the records custodian/manager as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(E)(2). We found no exceptions.
5. We inspected the District's policy manual and determined the public records policy was included as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(E)(2). We found no exceptions.
6. We observed that the District's poster describing their Public Records Policy was displayed conspicuously in all branches of the District as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(E)(2). We found no exceptions.
7. We selected the application submitted to the Records Commission for one-time disposal of obsolete records, and management's review of the schedules of records retention and dispositions for the engagement period. We inspected the approval by the Records Commission for the one selected and the review of the schedules. This was required by Ohio Rev. Code § 149.412. (Note: the records retention schedule is not the same policy as the public records policy.) We found no exceptions.

Sunshine Law Compliance (Continued)

8. We inquired with District management and determined that the District did not have any elected officials subject to the Public Records Training requirements during the engagement period as required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 149.43(E)(1) and 109.43(B). However, we noted that the Administrator attended training during the period.
9. We inspected the public notices for the public meetings held during the engagement period and determined the District notified the general public and news media of when and where meetings during the engagement period were to be held as required by Ohio Rev. Code § 121.22(F). We found no exceptions.
10. We inspected the minutes of public meetings during the engagement period in accordance with Ohio Rev. Code § 121.22(C) and determined whether they were:
 - a. Prepared – a file is created following the date of the meeting
 - b. Filed – placed with similar documents in an organized manner
 - c. Maintained - retained, at a minimum, for the engagement period
 - d. Open to public inspection – available for public viewing or request.We found no exceptions.
11. We inspected the minutes from the engagement period in accordance with Ohio Rev. Code § 121.22(G) and determined the following:
 - a. Executive sessions were only held at regular or special meetings.
 - b. The purpose for the meetings and going into an executive session (when applicable) correlated with one of the matters listed in Ohio Rev. Code § 121.22(G).
 - c. Formal governing board actions were adopted in open meetings.We found no exceptions.

Other Compliance

1. Ohio Rev. Code § 117.38 requires Districts to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. This statute also permits the Auditor of State to extend the deadline for filing a financial report and establish terms and conditions for any such extension. Auditor of State established policies, regarding the filing of complete financial statements, as defined in AOS Bulletin 2015-007 in the Hinkle System. We confirmed the District filed their complete financial statements, as defined by AOS Bulletin 2015-007 and Auditor of State established policy, within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2020 and 2019 in the Hinkle system. There were no exceptions.
2. For all credit card accounts we obtained:
 - copies of existing internal control policies,
 - a list(s) of authorized users, and
 - a list of all credit card account transactions.
 - a. We inspected the established policy(ies) obtained above and determined it is:
 - i. in compliance with the HB 312 statutory requirements, and
 - ii. implemented by the entity.We found no exceptions.
 - b. We selected 1 credit card transaction from each credit card account for testing. For selected transactions we inspected documentation to determine that:
 - i. Use was by an authorized user within the guidelines established in the policy, and
 - ii. Each transaction was supported with original invoices and for a proper public purpose.We found no exceptions.

Other Compliance (Continued)

- c. We selected 3 credit card statements from two credit card accounts and 2 credit card statements (card only used twice) from two credit card accounts for testing. For selected statements we inspected documentation to determine that:
 - i. No unpaid beginning balance was carried forward to the current billing cycle,
 - ii. Ending statement balance was paid in full, and
 - iii. Statement contained no interest or late fees.We found no exceptions.

We were engaged by the District to perform this agreed-upon procedures engagement and conducted our engagement in accordance with the attestation standards established by the AICPA and the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination or review engagement, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the District's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

We are required to be independent of the District and to meet our ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the ethical requirements established by the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards* related to our agreed upon procedures engagement.



Keith Faber
Auditor of State
Columbus, Ohio

October 5, 2021

OHIO AUDITOR OF STATE KEITH FABER



MUSKINGUM COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

MUSKINGUM COUNTY

AUDITOR OF STATE OF OHIO CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report, which is required to be filed pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in the Office of the Ohio Auditor of State in Columbus, Ohio.



Certified for Release 11/4/2021

88 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215
Phone: 614-466-4514 or 800-282-0370

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at
www.ohioauditor.gov