



**BASIL JOINT FIRE DISTRICT
FAIRFIELD COUNTY**

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012-2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Basil Joint Fire District
Fairfield County
410 Washington Street
Baltimore, Ohio 43105

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Basil Joint Fire 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, 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Fund by Summary Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 investment bank account balances with the District's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website for the Commercial Checking, EMS Lock Box, and Sweep Account. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates 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 2012 and 2011 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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 2012 and one from 2011.
 - a) We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b) We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s) 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 Receipt Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipt Journal included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Detailed Expenditure Report (DER) from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a) We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b) We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - c) We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Charges for Services

1. We confirmed the amounts paid from MED3000, the service organization that performs the emergency medical billings, to the District during 2012 and 2011 with MED3000. We found no exceptions.
 - a) We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). 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 documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Journal and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Journal to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files or minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 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 2012. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare <u>(and social security for employees not enrolled in pension system)</u>	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$56,813	\$56,813
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$1,874	\$1,874
RITA	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$2,813	\$2,813
School District	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$1,222	\$1,222
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$664	\$664
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$14,640	\$14,640

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriation Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 Appropriation Ledger and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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 no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources, if there was an amendment, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Receipt Journal for the General, EMS and Reserve Balance funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund. The Receipt Journal recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$1,611,937 for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$1,590,037. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Receipt Journal to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, EMS and Reserve Balance funds, the Trustees 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, EMS, and Reserve Balance Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, EMS and Reserve Balance Funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, EMS, and Reserve Balance funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipt Register for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2012 and 2011. We also inquired of management regarding whether the District received new restricted receipts. We noted no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the District to establish a new fund.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Receipt Journal and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$500 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.

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

March 20, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

BASIL JOINT FIRE DISTRICT

FAIRFIELD 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
APRIL 16, 2013**