



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



**MEMORIAL PARK DISTRICT OF THE ST. CLAIRSVILLE CITY AND RICHLAND TOWNSHIP  
BELMONT COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
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

Memorial Park District of St. Clairsville City and Richland Township  
Belmont County  
P.O. Box 513  
St. Clairsville, Ohio 43950

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Commissioners and the management of the Memorial Park District of St. Clairsville City and Richland Township, Belmont 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, 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

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 General Ledger to the December 31, 2010 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the General Ledger to the December 31, 2011 balances in the General Ledger. 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 Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations without exception.
5. We selected all three outstanding checks from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:

### **Cash (Continued)**

- a. We traced one outstanding check to the subsequent January bank statement. Two checks remain outstanding.
- b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the outstanding checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

### **Property Taxes and Intergovernmental 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 General Ledger. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund 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 General Ledger to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the General Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Cross Reference Report by Vendor Number from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the General Ledger. 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.

### **Over-the-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the General Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. The prior agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the General Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Levy Fund payments reported in the General Ledger. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the District made the payments. We found no exceptions.

**Debt (Continued)**

4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Levy Fund per the General Ledger. The amounts agreed.
5. For new debt issued during 2012 and 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the District must use the proceeds for pool improvements. We scanned the General Ledger and noted the District made expenditures for pool improvements throughout 2012 and 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 (timesheets, minutes, or legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. 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. Department 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, 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:

<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	1/31/13	1/16/13	\$315.26	\$315.26
State income taxes	1/15/13	1/16/13	74.00	74.00
OPERS retirement	1/30/13	1/16/13	258.46	258.46
Local income tax	1/31/13	1/16/13	34.73	34.73

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the General 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 General 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.

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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 eight instances where disbursements requiring certification were not certified and two 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 estimated receipts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the General and Levy 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 Levy Fund. The Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements recorded budgeted (i.e., certified) resources for the Levy Fund of \$316,000 for 2012. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$156,000. The Fiscal Officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Commissioners 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 and Levy Funds, the Commissioners 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 Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General and Levy Funds. For 2011, the amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements report. For 2012, the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements recorded appropriations for the General Fund of \$123,465 and the Levy Fund of \$448,790. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$118,575 for the General Fund and \$218,190 for the Levy Fund. The Fiscal Officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements to amounts reflected on the appropriation resolutions to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Commissioners may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
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 and Levy Funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted that Levy Fund appropriations for 2011 exceeded certified resources by \$8,800, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Commissioners should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the District to incur fund balance deficits.

**Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)**

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 and Levy Funds, as recorded in the Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements. We noted that Levy Fund expenditures for 2012 exceeded total appropriations by \$158,000, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). The Fiscal Officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Fiscal Officer may request the Commissioners to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary, and if resources are available.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the General Ledger 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.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 General Ledger for evidence of interfund transfers 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 General Ledger and Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements 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

June 17, 2013

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**MEMORIAL PARK DISTRICT OF ST. CLAIRSVILLE AND RICHLAND TOWNSHIP  
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.**

*Susan Babbitt*

**CLERK OF THE BUREAU**

**CERTIFIED  
AUGUST 8, 2013**