



#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

IIILE	PAGE
Cover Letter	1
Independent Accountants' Report	3
Statement of Cash Receipts, Cash Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balance - For the Year Ended December 31, 2006	5
Statement of Cash Receipts, Cash Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balance - For the Year Ended December 31, 2005	6
Notes to the Financial Statements	7
Independent Accountants' Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Required by Government Auditing Standards	13
Schedule of Findings	15
Schedule of Prior Audit Findings	19





# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point Belmont County 104 Mellott Street Powhatan Point, Ohio 43942

To the Board of Park Commissioners:

Mary Taylor

As you are aware, the Auditor of State's Office (AOS) must modify the *Independent Accountants' Report* we provide on your financial statements due to an interpretation from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). While AOS does not legally require your government to prepare financial statements pursuant to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), the AICPA interpretation requires auditors to formally acknowledge that you did not prepare your financial statements in accordance with GAAP. Our Report includes an adverse opinion relating to GAAP presentation and measurement requirements, but does not imply the amounts the statements present are misstated under the non-GAAP basis you follow. The AOS report also includes an opinion on the financial statements you prepared using the cash basis and financial statement format the AOS permits.

Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

January 11, 2008

This page intentionally left blank.



# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

#### **INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT**

Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point Belmont County 104 Mellott Street Powhatan Point, Ohio 43942

To the Board of Park Commissioners:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point, Belmont County, Ohio (the District), as of and for the years ended December 31, 2006 and 2005. These financial statements are the responsibility of the District's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

Except as discussed in the following paragraph, we conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to reasonably assure whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The District did not provide adequate supporting documentation for charges for services receipts to enable us to determine the completeness, occurrence, allocation, and rights and obligations of charges for services receipts recorded in the financial statements in 2006 and 2005, nor were we able to satisfy ourselves as to those receipts through the use of alternative procedures. These charges for services receipts represent 26 percent of the total receipts for the year ended December 31, 2006 and 28 percent of total receipts for the year ended December 31, 2005.

As described more fully in Note 1, the District has prepared these financial statements using accounting practices the Auditor of State prescribes or permits. These practices differ from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP). Although we cannot reasonably determine the effects on the financial statements of the variances between these regulatory accounting practices and GAAP, we presume they are material.

GAAP require presenting entity wide statements and also presenting the District's larger (i.e., major) funds separately. While the District does not follow GAAP, generally accepted auditing standards requires us to include the following paragraph if the statements do not substantially conform to GAAP presentation requirements. The Auditor of State permits, but does not require park districts to reformat their statements. The District has elected not to follow GAAP statement formatting requirements. The following paragraph does not imply the amounts reported are materially misstated under the accounting basis the Auditor of State permits. Our opinion on the fair presentation of the amounts reported pursuant to its non-GAAP basis is in the second following paragraph.

Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point Belmont County Independent Accountants' Report Page 2

In our opinion, because of the effects of the matter discussed in the preceding two paragraphs, the financial statements referred to above for the years ended December 31, 2006 and 2005 do not present fairly, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, the financial position of the District as of December 31, 2006 and 2005, or its changes in financial position for the years then ended.

Also, in our opinion, because of the effects of such adjustments, if any, as might have been determined to be necessary had we been able to obtain the information and documentation to support the completeness, occurrence, allocation, and rights and obligations of charges for services receipts for 2006 and 2005, the financial statements referred to above do not present fairly, in all material respects, the cash balances of the Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point, Belmont County, Ohio, as of December 31, 2006 and 2005, and its cash receipts and disbursements for the years then ended on the accounting basis Note 1 describes.

The District has not presented Management's Discussion and Analysis, which accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America has determined is necessary to supplement, although not required to be part of, the financial statements.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated January 11, 2008, on our consideration of the District's internal control over financial reporting and our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements and other matters. While we did not opine on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance, that report describes the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance, and the results of that testing. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*. You should read it in conjunction with this report in assessing the results of our audit.

Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

Mary Taylor

January 11, 2008

## STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS, CASH DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH BALANCE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2006

Cash Receipts:	
Charges for Services	\$12,415
Intergovernmental	32,911
Earnings on Investments	722
Miscellaneous	2,140
Total Cash Receipts	48,188
Cash Disbursements:	
Current Disbursements:	
Conservation/Recreation	42,878
Consolvation/Noorbation	12,010
Total Cash Disbursements	42,878
Total Cash Receipts Over/(Under) Cash Disbursements	5,310
0.151	0= 044
Cash Balance, January 1	27,344
Cash Balance, December 31	\$32.654
outil Bulailot, Bottilibol o l	Ψ <b>02</b> , <b>0</b> 0 <del>1</del>

The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of this statement.

## STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS, CASH DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH BALANCE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2005

Cash Receipts:	
Charges for Services	\$13,050
Intergovernmental	32,022
Earnings on Investments	446
Miscellaneous	1,842
Total Cash Receipts	47,360
Cash Disbursements:	
Current Disbursements:	50.054
Conservation/Recreation	53,654
Total Cash Disbursements	53,654
Total Cash Dispursements	55,054
Total Cash Receipts Over/(Under) Cash Disbursements	(6,294)
	(-,,
Cash Balance, January 1	33,638
Cash Balance, December 31	\$27,344

The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of this statement.

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005

#### 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

#### A. Description of the Entity

The constitution and laws of the State of Ohio establish the rights and privileges of the Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point, Belmont County, Ohio (the District), as a body corporate and politic. The probate judge of Belmont County appoints a three-member Board of Commissioners to govern the District. The Commissioners are also responsible for the general operations of the park district and pool.

The District's management believes these financial statements present all activities for which the District is financially accountable.

#### **B.** Accounting Basis

These financial statements follow the accounting basis the Auditor of State prescribes or permits. This basis is similar to the cash receipts and disbursements accounting basis. The District recognizes receipts when received in cash rather than when earned, and recognizes disbursements when paid rather than when a liability is incurred. Budgetary presentations report budgetary expenditures when a commitment is made (i.e., when an encumbrance is approved).

These statements include adequate disclosure of material matters, as the Auditor of State prescribes or permits.

#### C. Cash

The District values certificates of deposit at cost.

#### D. Budgetary Process

The Ohio Revised Code requires the Board of Park Commissioners to adopt an annual budget.

#### 1. Appropriations

Budgetary expenditures (that is, disbursements and encumbrances) may not exceed appropriations at the fund or function level of control, and appropriations may not exceed estimated resources. The District Board must annually approve appropriation measures and subsequent amendments. Appropriations lapse at year end.

#### 2. Estimated Resources

Estimated resources include estimates of cash to be received (budgeted receipts) plus cash as of January 1.

#### 3. Encumbrances

The Ohio Revised Code requires the District to reserve (encumber) appropriations when individual commitments are made. The District did not use the encumbrance method of accounting.

A summary of 2006 and 2005 budgetary activity appears in Note 3.

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

#### 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

#### E. Property, Plant, and Equipment

The District records disbursements for acquisitions of property, plant, and equipment when paid. The accompanying financial statements do not report these items as assets.

#### 2. Cash

The District maintains a cash pool all funds use. The Ohio Revised Code prescribes allowable deposits. The carrying amount of cash at December 31 was as follows:

	2006	2005
Demand deposits	\$11,428	\$6,828
Certificates of deposit	21,226_	20,516
Total deposits	\$32,654	\$27,344

**Deposits:** Deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

#### 3. Budgetary Activity

Budgetary activity for the years ending December 31, 2006 and 2005 follows:

Budgeted vs. Actual Receipts					
	Budgeted	Actual	_		
	Receipts Receipts Variance				
2006	\$100,000	\$48,188	(\$51,812)		
2005	100,000	47,360	(52,640)		

Budgeted vs. Actual Budgetary Basis Expenditures					
Appropriation Budgetary					
Authority Expenditures Variance					
2006	\$70,000	\$42,878	\$27,122		
2005	100,000	53,654	46,346		

#### 4. Retirement System

The District's employees belong to the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS). OPERS is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer plan. The Ohio Revised Code prescribes this plan's benefits, which include postretirement healthcare and survivor and disability benefits.

The Ohio Revised Code also prescribes contribution rates. For 2006 and 2005, OPERS members contributed 9% and 8.5%, respectively, of their gross salaries and the District contributed an amount equaling 13.7% and 13.55%, respectively, of participants' gross salaries. The District has paid all contributions required through December 31, 2006.

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

#### 5. Risk Management

The District is exposed to various risks of property and casualty losses, and injuries to employees.

The District insures against injuries to employees through the Ohio Bureau of Worker's Compensation.

The District belongs to the Public Entities Pool of Ohio (PEP), a risk-sharing pool available to Ohio local governments. PEP provides property and casualty coverage for its members. PEP is a member of the American Public Entity Excess Pool (APEEP). Member governments pay annual contributions to fund PEP. PEP pays judgments, settlements and other expenses resulting from covered claims that exceed the members' deductibles.

#### Casualty Coverage

For an occurrence prior to January 1, 2006 PEP retains casualty risks up to \$250,000 per occurrence, including claim adjustment expenses. PEP pays a percentage of its contributions to APEEP. APEEP reinsures claims exceeding \$250,000, up to \$1,750,000 per claim and \$10,000,000 in the aggregate per year. For an occurrence on or subsequent to January 1, 2006, the Pool retains casualty risk up to \$350,000 per occurrence, including loss adjustment expenses. Claims exceeding \$350,000 are reinsured with APEEP in an amount not to exceed \$2,650,000 for each claim and \$10,000,000 in the aggregate per year. Governments can elect up to \$10,000,000 in additional coverage with the General Reinsurance Corporation, through contracts with PEP.

If losses exhaust PEP's retained earnings, APEEP provides excess of funds available coverage up to \$5,000,000 per year, subject to a per-claim limit of \$2,000,000 (for claims prior to January 1, 2006) or \$3,000,000 (for claims on or after January 1, 2006) as noted above.

#### **Property Coverage**

Through 2004, PEP retained property risks, including automobile physical damage, up to \$100,000 on any specific loss in any one occurrence. The Travelers Indemnity Company reinsured losses exceeding \$100,000 up to \$500 million per occurrence.

Beginning in 2005, Travelers reinsures specific losses exceeding \$250,000 up to \$600 million per occurrence. APEEP reinsures members for specific losses exceeding \$100,000 up to \$250,000 per occurrence, subject to an annual aggregate loss payment. Travelers provides aggregate stoploss coverage based upon the combined members' total insurable values. If the stop loss is reached by payment of losses between \$100,000 and \$250,000, Travelers will reinsure specific losses exceeding \$100,000 up to their \$600 million per occurrence limit. The aggregate stop-loss limit for 2006 was \$1,901,127.

The aforementioned casualty and property reinsurance agreements do not discharge PEP's primary liability for claims payments on covered losses. Claims exceeding coverage limits are the obligation of the respective government.

Property and casualty settlements did not exceed insurance coverage for the past three fiscal years.

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

#### 5. Risk Management (Continued)

#### Financial Position

PEP's financial statements (audited by other accountants) conform with generally accepted accounting principles, and reported the following assets, liabilities and retained earnings at December 31, 2006 and 2005.

Casualty Coverage	<u>2006</u>	<u>2005</u>
Assets	\$30,997,868	\$29,719,675
Liabilities	(15,875,741)	(15,994,168)
Retained earnings	<u>\$15,122,127</u>	<u>\$13,725,507</u>

Property Coverage	2006	<u>2005</u>
Assets	\$5,125,326	\$4,443,332
Liabilities	(863,163)	(1,068,245)
Retained earnings	<u>\$4,262,163</u>	\$3,375,087

At December 31, 2006 and 2005, respectively, casualty coverage liabilities noted above include approximately \$14.4 million and \$14.3 million of estimated incurred claims payable. The Casualty Coverage assets and retained earnings above also include approximately \$14.4 million and \$14.3 million of unpaid claims to be billed to approximately 447 member governments in the future, as of December 31, 2006 and 2005, respectively. These amounts will be included in future contributions from members when the related claims are due for payment. The District's share of these unpaid claims collectible in future years is approximately \$2,800. This payable includes the subsequent year's contribution due if the District terminates participation, as described in the last paragraph below.

Based on discussions with PEP, the expected rates PEP charges to compute member contributions, which are used to pay claims as they become due, are not expected to change significantly from those used to determine the historical contributions detailed below. By contract, the annual liability of each member is limited to the amount of financial contributions required to be made to PEP for each year of membership.

	Contributions to PEP	
2005		\$1,375
2006		\$1,395

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

#### 5. Risk Management (Continued)

After completing one year of membership, members may withdraw on each anniversary of the date they joined PEP provided they give written notice to PEP 60 days in advance of the anniversary date. Upon withdrawal, members are eligible for a full or partial refund of their capital contributions, minus the subsequent year's budgetary contribution. Withdrawing members have no other future obligation to the pool. Also upon withdrawal, payments for all casualty claims and claim expenses become the sole responsibility of the withdrawing member, regardless of whether a claim occurred or was reported prior to the withdrawal.

This page intentionally left blank.



# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS REQUIRED BY GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point Belmont County 104 Mellott Street Powhatan Point, Ohio 43942

To the Board of Park Commissioners:

We have audited the financial statements of the Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point, Belmont County, Ohio (the District), as of and for the year ended December 31, 2006 and 2005, and have issued our report thereon dated January 11, 2008, wherein we qualified our opinion because we were unable to satisfy ourselves to the completeness, occurrence, allocation, and rights and obligations of the charges for services receipts. Also, we noted the District followed accounting practices the Auditor of State prescribes rather than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Except as discussed above, we conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*.

#### **Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the District's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our audit procedures for expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not to opine on the effectiveness of the District's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we have not opined on the effectiveness of the District's internal control over financial reporting.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However, as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider significant deficiencies.

A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the District's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with its applicable accounting basis, such that there is more than a remote likelihood that the District's internal control will not prevent or detect a more-than-inconsequential financial statement misstatement.

We consider the following deficiencies described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings to be significant deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting: 2006-003 and 2006-004.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies resulting in more than a remote likelihood that the District's internal control will not prevent or detect a material financial statement misstatement.

Municipal Park District of Powhatan Point
Belmont County
Independent Accountants' Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting
and on Compliance and Other Matters Required by *Government Auditing Standards*Page 2

Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in the internal control that might be significant deficiencies and accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all significant deficiencies that are also material weaknesses. However, of the significant deficiencies described above, we believe finding numbers 2006-003 and 20006-004 are also material weaknesses.

We also noted certain internal control matters that we reported to the District's management in a separate letter dated January 11, 2008.

#### **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of reasonably assuring whether the District's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we tested its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could directly and materially affect the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and accordingly, we do not express an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed instances of noncompliance or other matters that we must report under *Government Auditing Standards*, which are described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings as items 2006-001 and 2006-002.

We also noted certain noncompliance or other matters not requiring inclusion in this report that we reported to the District's management in a separate letter dated January 11, 2008.

We intend this report solely for the information and use of management and Board of Park Commissioners. We intend it for no one other than these specified parties.

Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

Mary Taylor

January 11, 2008

#### SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005

## FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS

#### **FINDING NUMBER 2006-001**

#### **Noncompliance Citation**

Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D)(1) prohibits a subdivision or taxing authority from making any contract or ordering any expenditure of money unless a certificate signed by the fiscal officer is attached thereto. The fiscal officer must certify that the amount required to meet any such contract or expenditure has been lawfully appropriated and is in the treasury, or is in the process of collection to the credit of an appropriate fund free from any previous encumbrance.

There are several exceptions to the standard requirement stated above that a fiscal officer's certificate must be obtained prior to a subdivision or taxing authority entering into a contract or order involving the expenditure of money. The main exceptions are "then and now" certificates, blanket certificates, and super blanket certificates, which are provided for in Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.41(D)(1) and 5705.41(D)(3), respectively, of the Ohio Rev. Code:

<u>Then and Now Certificate</u> - If the fiscal officer can certify that both at the time the contract or order was made and at the time that he/she is completing his/her certification, sufficient funds were available or in the process of collection, to the credit of a proper fund, properly appropriated and free from any encumbrance, the taxing authority can authorize the drawing of a warrant for the payment of the amount due. The taxing authority has 30 days from the receipt of such certificate to approve payment by resolution or ordinance.

Amounts of less than \$3,000, may be paid by the fiscal officer without such affirmation of the taxing authority upon completion of the "then and now" certificate, provided that the expenditure is otherwise lawful. This does not eliminate any otherwise applicable requirement for approval of expenditures by the taxing authority.

<u>Blanket Certificate</u> - Fiscal officers may prepare "blanket" certificates not exceeding an amount established by resolution or ordinance of the legislative authority against any specific line item account and cannot extend beyond the end of the fiscal year. The blanket certificate may, but need not, be limited to a specific vendor. Only one blanket certificate may be outstanding at one particular time for any one particular line item appropriation. Blanket certificates cannot be issued unless there has been an amount approved by the legislative authority for the blanket.

<u>Super Blanket Certificate</u> - The taxing authority may also make expenditures and contracts for any amount from a specific line-item appropriation account in a specified fund upon certification of the fiscal officer for most professional services, fuel, oil, food items, and any other specific recurring and reasonably predictable operating expense. This certification is not to extend beyond the current year. More than one super blanket certificate may be outstanding at a particular time for any line-item appropriation.

During our testing of 2006 and 2005 non-payroll disbursements, we noted that 100% of the tested disbursements were not properly certified. Failure to properly certify the availability of funds can result in overspending funds and negative cash fund balances.

#### SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

## FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS (Continued)

## FINDING NUMBER 2006-001 (Continued)

#### Noncompliance Citation - Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D)(1) (Continued)

Unless the exceptions noted above are used, prior certification is not only required by statute, but is a key control in the disbursement process to assure that purchase commitments receive prior approval. To improve controls over disbursements and to help reduce the possibility of the District's fund exceeding budgetary spending limitations, we recommend that the Clerk/Treasurer certify that the funds are or will be available prior to an obligation being incurred by the District. When prior certification is not possible, "then and now" certification should be used. Only one blanket certification should be used for a particular line item appropriation. The Board should adopt a resolution to indicate an amount that blanket certificates cannot exceed.

We recommend the District certify purchases to which Section 5705.41(D) applies. The most convenient certification method is to use purchase orders that include certification language Section 5705.41(D) requires to authorize disbursements. The Clerk/Treasurer should sign the certification at the time the District incurs a commitment, and only when the requirements of Section 5705.41(D) are satisfied. The Clerk/Treasurer should post approved purchase commitments to the appropriation code, to reduce the available appropriation.

#### Official's Response:

We did not receive a response from the Park District.

#### **FINDING NUMBER 2006-002**

#### **Noncompliance Citation**

Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-2-02(C)(1) states that all local public offices should integrate the budgetary accounts, at the legal level of control or lower, into the financial accounting system. This means designing an accounting system to provide ongoing and timely information on unrealized budgetary receipts and remaining uncommitted balances of appropriations.

No documentation was provided to indicate estimated receipts or appropriation amounts were entered into the District's ledgers. Because the information was not entered into the accounting system, District officials were unable to effectively monitor budgetary activity throughout the year.

We recommend the Clerk/Treasurer post the appropriations which have been approved by the Commissioners to the Appropriations Ledger. The Certificate of Estimated Resources passed by the County Budget Commission should be entered into the receipt ledger. The accompanying budgetary presentation includes the appropriations as approved by the Commissioners.

#### Official's Response:

We did not receive a response from the Park District.

#### SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

## FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS (Continued)

#### **FINDING NUMBER 2006-003**

#### Material Weakness - Charges for Services Receipts

The District's internal control procedures at the swimming the pool indicated the use of a cash register to account for swimming pool collections. The cash register was used to account for collections from pool admissions, pool passes, and concessions receipts for a particular day. In addition, the pool manager reviewed and reconciled the cash register tapes to the amount of cash collected and deposited in the bank.

Although the District maintained manual daily cash sheets, these daily cash sheets were not reconciled to the cash register tapes or deposit ticket. There was no formal indication that the pool manager reviewed and reconciled the cash register tapes to the actual cash collected. Further, numerous instances were noted when significant variances existed between the cash register tape and the amount deposited. Some cash register tapes were not available or in a readable format. Most of the cash register tapes attached to the daily cash sheets were daily recaps, not the detailed cash register tape.

We recommend the pool manager and/or employees reconcile the daily cash collected to the cash register tapes on a daily basis. Any variances should be reconciled and approved by someone other than the preparer. In addition, the pool manager should date and initial the daily cash sheets to indicate the cash collected agreed to the cash register tape. The supporting documentation (detailed cash register tape or manually prepared sheet that documents number of participants at the pool) that supports the cash register recap tape should be maintained until the audit is performed.

#### Official's Response:

We did not receive a response from the Park District.

#### **FINDING NUMBER 2006-004**

#### **Material Weakness - Charge for Services Receipts**

Concession sales receipts were recorded separately on the daily deposit record for the pool. For concession sales, no itemized listing was presented for audit to document the number of concession items sold at a stated price. A detailed inventory of concession stand items was not presented for audit.

There was no record of the number and type of concession items sold on a daily basis. Also, no inventory records were kept of concession stand items which did not allow the District to prepare a cost of goods sold. These weaknesses could result in possible theft, errors, irregularities and/or omissions occurring and not being detected in a timely manner.

We recommend a form or tally sheet be implemented to record the number and type of items sold in the concession stand each day. The total dollar amount of the items sold should be reconciled to the total collected on the cash register tape before the daily deposit is made. Also, a detailed inventory of concession stand items should be maintained to allow a cost of goods sold to be performed. The preparation of the cost of goods sold will allow the District to determine if the concession stand items are properly priced and control theft of inventory items.

#### SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005 (Continued)

## FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS (Continued)

#### FINDING NUMBER 2006-004 (Con tinued)

**Material Weakness - Charge for Services Receipts (Continued)** 

#### Official's Response:

We did not receive a response from the Park District.

#### SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND 2005

Finding Number	Finding Summary	Fully Corrected?	Not Corrected, Partially Corrected; Significantly Different Corrective Action Taken; or Finding No Longer Valid; <i>Explain</i>
2004-001	Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D)(1) for not properly encumbering.	No	Not Corrected; Repeated as Finding 2006-001
2004-002	Including budgeted amounts in the accounting system.	No	Not Corrected; Repeated as Finding 2006-002
2004-003	Reconciling cash register tapes to the deposit amount each day.	No	Not Corrected; Repeated as Findings 2006-003 and 2006-004



# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

#### MUNICIPAL PARK DISTRICT OF POWHATAN POINT

#### **BELMONT 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.

**CLERK OF THE BUREAU** 

Susan Babbitt

**CERTIFIED FEBRUARY 12, 2008**