



**FREDERICKTOWN RECREATION DISTRICT  
KNOX COUNTY**

**AGREED-UPON PROCEDURE**

**FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010-2009**



**Dave Yost • Auditor of State**



FREDERICKTOWN RECREATION DISTRICT  
KNOX COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Fredericktown Recreation District  
Knox County  
P.O. Box 86  
Fredericktown, Ohio 43019

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Park Commissioners and the management of Fredericktown Recreation District, Knox 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, 2010 and 2009, 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 and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2010 and 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2008 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 bank account balances with the District's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statements. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and dates written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2010 and 2009 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.

### **Cash and Investments (Continued)**

7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 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.

### **Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2010 and one from 2009:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the Statement to the amount recorded in the Receipts Journal. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds 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 Receipts Journal to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010 and 2009:
  - a. Two personal property tax receipts
  - b. Two real estate tax receiptsWe noted the Receipts Journal included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and five from 2009. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Detailed Expense Transactions Reports from 2010 and five from 2009.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and Detailed Expense Transactions Reports to the amount recorded in the Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Ohio Public Works Commission to the District during 2009 with the Commission. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Journal and Appropriation Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Register and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to supporting documentation (timecard, or legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the fund and account codes 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. Departments and funds to which the check should be charged
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
  - e. Federal, State & 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, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2010. 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 & Medicare	January 31, 2011	12/21/2010	\$ 639	\$ 639
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	1/3/2011	333	333
Local income tax	January 30, 2011	1/3/2011	158	158
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	1/3/2011	\$1,181	\$1,181

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Appropriations Ledger, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for equipment, and checks recorded as equipment in the Capital Projects Fund for 2010. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriations Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 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 Appropriations Ledger 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 three instances where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a *Then and Now Certificate* was issued. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should be on or before the invoice date, unless a *Then and Now Certificate* is used. Because we did not test all disbursements requiring certification, our report provides no assurance whether or not additional similar errors occurred.

### Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total amounts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Receipts Journal for the General and Capital Project funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General and Capital Project funds, the Board 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 Appropriation Ledger for 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General and Capital Project funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General and Capital Project funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General and Capital Project funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.



**Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)**

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipts Journal for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2010 and 2009. We also inquired of management regarding whether the District received new restricted receipts. The District established the Senior Center fund during 2009 to segregate Senior Citizen Levy receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09.
7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Receipts Journal and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 -- .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which Section 5705.16 would require approval by the Tax Commissioner and Court of Common Pleas.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger 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.

**Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 for projects requiring the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We identified no projects subject to the aforementioned prevailing wage requirements.

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exception reported above.

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

September 19, 2011

**This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**FREDERICKTOWN RECREATION DISTRICT**

**KNOX 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  
OCTOBER 11, 2011**