



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Mid-County Ambulance District
Wood County
P.O. Box 262
Portage, Ohio 43451-0262

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Mid-County Ambulance District, Wood 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 client-prepared Financial Report to the December 31, 2010 balances documented 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 client-prepared Financial Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the client-prepared Financial Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 fund cash balances reported in the client-prepared Financial Report. The amounts agreed. The totals per the bank reconciliations for December 31, 2012 did not agree to the fund cash balance reported in the client prepared Financial Report due to a timing issue between the date the reconciliations were prepared and fiscal year end. As a result, transactions that had not yet cleared at December 31, 2012 were not included on the Uncleared Transaction Detail. This resulted in a variance of \$348 between the total per the bank reconciliations and the December 31, 2012 fund cash balance reported in the client prepared Financial Report. We recommend the Fiscal Officer perform timely bank reconciliations to avoid this occurring in the future.
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 reconciliation without exception.

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 2011 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each reconciliation. We found 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 Receipt Register Report. 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 Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and from 2011. We also selected all of the receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were 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 Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Report 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 all employees from 2012 and one payroll check for all employees from 2011 from the Payment Register Report and:
 - a. We compared the number of meetings attended and pay rate, or salary recorded in the record of meetings attended to supporting documentation (Minutes). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Payment Register Report. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the account code to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the 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
Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$92.80	\$92.80
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$348.00	\$348.00

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Payment Register Report, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for *contractual services (EMS contract)*, for 2012. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Payment Register Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - c. 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 ten instances where the certification date was after the obligation date and/or 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 Budget Report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts reported for 2012 and 2011 did not agree to the amounts reported on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*. The Budget Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources of \$151,424 and \$152,476 for 2012 and 2011, respectively. However the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$145,673 and \$151,424 for 2012 and 2011, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budget Report 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 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 Budget Report for 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Budget 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 years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted no instances in 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 as recorded in the Budget Report. We noted no instances in 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 Report 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 inquired of management and scanned the client prepared Annual Financial Report 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.

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

May 3, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MID-COUNTY AMBULANCE DISTRICT

WOOD 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 23, 2013**