



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

PMP Joint Ambulance District
Hancock County
139 W. Main Street
P.O. Box 27
McComb, Ohio 45858-0027

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of PMP Joint Ambulance District, Hancock 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 Fund Ledger 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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Ledger Report. The January 1, 2012 General Fund balance was \$15 more than the December 31, 2011 balance. This was due to voiding a check issued during 2011 in 2012. We recommend voided checks be posted as negative expenditures.
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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balance 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.

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 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 receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above report 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.

Charges for Services

1. We read the Fiscal Year 2012 Patient Aging Report (First year District maintained the report).
 - a. We noted this report listed \$73,573 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$44,902 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
2. We noted the District does not maintain an Accounts Receivable Adjustment Report. We recommend the District develop and maintain an Accounts Receivable Adjustment Report.
3. We selected five run sheets from 2012 and five run sheets from 2011, and noted on each run sheet that the full billed amount was not collected. There were explanations why the full amounts were not collected, but there were no approvals by management. We recommend management approve any adjustments to outstanding receivable balances.

4. We haphazardly selected five run sheets, and agreed the patient name and service date to the related amounts billed, and the amount debited to accounts receivable, from the year ended December 31, 2012 (the only year with accounts receivable records). Per the table below, we noted no exceptions.

2012

	Amount Billed per the Billing / Run Report, 2012	Amount Debited to Accounts Receivable
1.	\$832.00	\$832.00
2.	737.00	737.00
3.	809.00	809.00
4.	856.00	856.00
5.	865.00	865.00

We also agreed the amounts billed above to the rates in force as of the service date. We noted no exceptions.

5. We haphazardly selected five receipts recorded in the cash receipts records from the year ended December 31, 2012 and five from the year ended December 31, 2011. We compared the receipt to the amount credited to accounts receivable records for 2012 and credited in the bank statement. We also compared the date the payment was recorded in the cash receipts records to the date deposited per the bank statement. Per the table below, the amounts agreed, and the cash was deposited timely.

2012

	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2012	Amount Credited to Accounts Receivable	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
1.	\$87.34	\$87.34	\$87.34	8/9/12	8/14/12
2.	87.34	87.34	87.34	9/12/12	9/18/12
3.	198.37	198.37	198.37	9/13/12	9/18/12
4.	327.14	327.14	327.14	12/31/12	1/18/13
5.	392.56	392.56	392.56	10/11/12	10/16/12

2011

	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2011	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
1.	\$345.78	\$345.78	7/5/11	7/8/11
2.	327.26	327.26	6/3/11	6/21/11
3.	848.00	848.00	11/15/11	11/15/11
4.	718.00	718.00	8/9/11	8/23/11
5.	624.00	624.00	10/6/11	10/13/11

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 Report and Payment Register Detail 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 five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the account code to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files and 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 and Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$2,823.18	\$2,817.17
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$550.08	\$550.08
Local income tax	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$597.72	\$596.54
School District income tax	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$159.84	\$158.95
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$4,616.02	\$4,627.53

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail 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 Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions. However, we noted the District paid \$2,080 in sales tax on two invoices on the same warrant in 2012. After we brought this to the District's attention they received a refund from the vendor in 2013. We recommend the officials review invoices to ensure sales tax is not paid.
- 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 no exceptions

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
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 Appropriation Status Report for 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status 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 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 as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. 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 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 scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports 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 Appropriation Status Reports 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 initial "D".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

October 11, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PMP JOINT AMBULANCE DISTRICT

HANCOCK 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
NOVEMBER 7, 2013**