



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Cover Letter .....	1
Independent Accountants' Report.....	3
Statement of Cash Receipts, Cash Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances - For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 .....	5
Notes to the Financial Statements .....	7
Independent Accountants' Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Required by <i>Government Auditing Standards</i> .....	11
Schedule of Findings.....	13
Schedule of Prior Audit Findings.....	15

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Georgetown Water District  
Harrison County  
77075 Zitko Road  
Cadiz, Ohio 43907

To the Board of Trustees:

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

February 28, 2012

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT

Georgetown Water District  
Harrison County  
77075 Zitko Road  
Cadiz, Ohio 43907

To the Board of Trustees:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Georgetown Water District, Harrison County, (the District) as of and for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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, 2011 and 2010 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, 2011 and 2010, or its changes in financial position for the years then ended.

Also, in our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the fund cash balances as of December 31, 2011 and 2010 of Georgetown Water District, Harrison County, and its cash receipts and disbursements for the years then ended on the accounting basis Note 1 describes.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated February 28, 2012, 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

February 28, 2012

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS, CASH DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES  
FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010**

	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Operating Cash Receipts:</b>		
Charges for Services	\$34,892	\$34,692
Miscellaneous		(2)
	<u>34,892</u>	<u>34,690</u>
Total Operating Cash Receipts		
<b>Operating Cash Disbursements:</b>		
Personal Services	7,308	7,078
Repairs and Maintenance	6,276	6,407
Testing and Licenses	676	316
Other Contractual Services	521	3,013
Chemicals and Operating Supplies	21,241	17,959
Office Supplies and Materials	755	922
Insurance	950	850
	<u>37,727</u>	<u>36,545</u>
Total Operating Cash Disbursements		
Operating Income/(Loss)	<u>(2,835)</u>	<u>(1,855)</u>
<b>Non-Operating Cash Disbursements:</b>		
Other Non-Operating Cash Disbursements	619	202
	<u>619</u>	<u>202</u>
Total Non-Operating Cash Disbursements		
Net Receipts Over/(Under) Disbursements	<u>(3,454)</u>	<u>(2,057)</u>
Cash Balances, January 1	<u>26,633</u>	<u>28,690</u>
<b>Cash Balances, December 31</b>	<b><u>\$23,179</u></b>	<b><u>\$26,633</u></b>

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

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010**

**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 for the Georgetown Water District, Harrison County, (the District) as a body corporate and politic. The Board Members are appointed by the Harrison County Common Pleas Judge. There are 5 Board members. The District provides water services to residents of the District.

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.

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

**C. Deposits and Investments**

The District's accounting basis includes investments as assets. This basis does not record disbursements for investment purchases or receipts for investment sales. This basis records gains or losses at the time of sale as receipts or disbursements, respectively.

The District values certificates of deposit at cost.

**D. Budgetary Process**

The Ohio Revised Code requires the Board to budget annually.

**1. Appropriations**

Budgetary expenditures (that is, disbursements and encumbrances) may not exceed appropriations at the object level of control, and appropriations may not exceed estimated resources. Appropriation Authority includes current year appropriations plus encumbrances carried over from the prior year (if any). The 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 commitments are made. Encumbrances outstanding at year end are carried over, and need not be reappropriated. The District did not use the encumbrance method of accounting.

A summary of 2011 and 2010 budgetary activity appears in Note 3.

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010  
(Continued)**

**1. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES - (Continued)**

**D. 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. DEPOSITS**

The carrying amount of deposits at December 31 was as follows:

	2011	2010
Demand deposits	\$23,179	\$26,633

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

**3. BUDGETARY ACTIVITY**

Budgetary activity for the years ending December 31, 2011 and 2010 follows:

Budgeted vs. Actual Receipts		
	2010	2011
Actual Receipts	\$34,690	\$34,892
Budgeted Receipts		35,000
Variance	\$34,690	(\$108)

  

Appropriation Authority vs. Actual Budgetary Expenditures		
	2010	2011
Appropriation Authority		\$37,000
Budgetary Expenditures	36,747	38,346
Variance	(\$36,747)	(\$1,346)

Contrary to Ohio law, budgetary expenditures exceeded appropriation by \$36,747 for the year ended December 31, 2011 and \$1,346 for the year ended December 31, 2010.

**4. RETIREMENT SYSTEMS**

The District's full-time employees belong to the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS). OPERS is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer plan. The Ohio Revised Code prescribes the Plan's retirement benefits, including postretirement healthcare and survivor and disability benefits to participants.

The Ohio Revised Code also prescribes contribution rates. For 2011 and 2010, OPERS members contributed 10% of their gross salaries and the District contributed an amount equaling 14% of participants' gross salaries. The District has paid all contributions required through December 31, 2011.

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010  
(Continued)**

**5. RISK MANAGEMENT**

**Commercial Insurance**

The District has obtained commercial insurance for the following risks:

- Comprehensive property and general liability;
- Vehicles; and
- Errors and omissions.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Georgetown Water District  
Harrison County  
77075 Zitko Road  
Cadiz, Ohio 43907

To the Board of Trustees:

We have audited the financial statements of Georgetown Water District, Harrison County, (the District) as of and for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, and have issued our report thereon dated February 28, 2012, wherein we noted the District followed accounting practices the Auditor of State prescribes rather than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. 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 the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of opining 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.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, when performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and timely correct misstatements. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or combination of internal control deficiencies resulting in more than a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the District's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and timely corrected.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider material weaknesses, as defined above.

### **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 we must report under *Government Auditing Standards* which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings as items 2011-01 and 2011-02.

We also noted certain matters not requiring inclusion in this report that we reported to the District's management in a separate letter dated February 28, 2012.

We intend this report solely for the information and use of management, Board of Trustees, and others within the District. We intend it for no one other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

February 28, 2012

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS  
DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010**

<b>FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS</b>
--

**Finding Number 2011-01**

**Noncompliance Citation**

**Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(D)** provides that no subdivision shall make any contract or give any order involving the expenditure of money unless there is attached thereto a certificate of the fiscal officer of the subdivision that the amount required to meet the obligation has been lawfully appropriated for such purpose and is in the treasury or in the process of collection to the credit of an appropriate fund free from any previous encumbrances. This certificate need be signed only by the subdivision's fiscal officer. Every contract made without such a certificate shall be void, and no warrant shall be issued in payment of any amount due thereon.

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 Sections 5705.41(D) (1) and 5705.41(D) (3), respectively of the Ohio Revised Code.

- 1. Then and Now Certificate** - If no certificate is furnished as required, upon receipt of the fiscal officer's certificate that a sufficient sum was, both at the time of the contract or order and at the time of the certificate, appropriated and free of any previous encumbrances, the District may authorize the issuance of a warrant in payment of the amount due upon such contract or order by resolution within 30 days from the receipt of such certificate, if such expenditure is otherwise valid.

If the amount involved is less than \$3,000 the fiscal officer may authorize payment through a Then and Now Certificate without affirmation of the Board of Trustees if such expenditure is otherwise valid.

- 2. Blanket Certificate** - Fiscal officers may prepare "blanket" certificates for a certain sum or money not in excess of an amount established by resolution or ordinance adopted by a majority of the members of the legislative authority against any specific line item account over a period not running beyond the end of the current fiscal year. The blanket certificates 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.
- 3. Super Blanket Certificate** - The District may also make expenditures and contracts for any amount from a specific line item appropriation 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 may be outstanding at a particular time for any line item appropriation.

The Fiscal Officer did not certify or record the amount against the applicable appropriation accounts for 100% of tested expenditures in both 2010 and 2011. The Fiscal Officer did not properly utilize the certification exceptions described above for those expenditures lacking prior certification. Failure to certify the availability of funds and encumber appropriations for the full amount of the expenditure could result in overspending and in negative cash balances. 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 funds exceeding budgetary spending limitations, the Fiscal Officer should certify that the funds are or will be available prior to obligation by the District. When prior certification is not possible, "then and now" certification should be used.

The Fiscal Officer should certify the full purchase amounts to which section Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(D) applies. The most convenient certification method is to use purchase orders that include the certification language which Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(D) requires the authorization of disbursements. The Fiscal Officer should sign the certification prior to incurring a commitment, and only when the requirements of Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(D) are satisfied. The Fiscal Officer should post approved purchase commitments to the proper appropriation code, to reduce the available appropriation.

### **Finding Number 2011-02**

#### **Noncompliance Citation**

**Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.28(2)(b)** states that, except for this section and other sections of Chapter 5705, including Section 5705.41, a taxing unit that does not levy a tax is not a taxing unit for purposes of Chapter 5705. **Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(B)** states that no subdivision or taxing unit is to expend money unless it has been appropriated.

It was noted in the minutes that the District adopted an appropriation measure for 2010, however, appropriation amounts were not included in the minute record and documentation to support the appropriation measure was not presented. As appropriation amounts could not be established and as expenditures are limited by the appropriations established for each fund; all expenditures made by the District in 2010 (\$36,746) were not in compliance with the Ohio Revised Code.

For 2011, expenditures exceeded appropriations by \$1,346.

When the District approves an appropriation measure, the amounts should be listed in the minutes or a copy of the appropriation measure should be attached to the minute record. Expenditures should then be monitored to assure that expenditures do not exceed appropriations.

#### **Officials' Response**

We did not receive a response from officials to the findings reported above.

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT  
HARRISON COUNTY**

**SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS  
DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010**

<b>Finding Number</b>	<b>Finding Summary</b>	<b>Fully Corrected?</b>	Not Corrected, Partially Corrected; Significantly Different Corrective Action Taken; or Finding No Longer Valid; <b><i>Explain</i></b>
2009-001	Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.28(B)(2) – Adoption of an Operating Budget Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.36 – Certificate of Available Resources	Yes	Fully Corrected
2009-002	Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.38 – Adoption of Appropriation Measure Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(B) – Expenditures Exceed Appropriations	No	Partial Corrected  Reissued as Finding Number 2011-002
2009-003	Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.41(D) – Certification of Expenditures	No	Reissued as Finding Number 2011-001
2009-004	Posting of Receipts and Disbursements	Yes	Fully Corrected

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**GEORGETOWN WATER DISTRICT**

**HARRISON 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  
MAY 8, 2012**