



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Swiss Valley Joint Ambulance District
Tuscarawas County
410 S. Broadway Street
Sugarcreek, Ohio 44681

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Swiss Valley Joint Ambulance 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 Fund Cash Balance Statement 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 Fund Cash Balance Statement to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Cash Balance Statement. 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 Fund Cash Balance Statement. 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 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 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.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected one receipt from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and one from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the Revenue Statement Report. 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.
2. We agreed the amounts paid from Auburn Township to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the amounts paid from Bucks Township to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We agreed the amounts paid from Clark Township to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

5. We agreed the amounts paid from Sugarcreek Township to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
6. We agreed the amounts paid from Walnut Creek Township to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
7. We agreed the amounts paid from the Village of Baltic to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
8. We agreed the amounts paid from the Village of Sugarcreek to the District during 2012 and 2011 to supporting documentation and the Revenue History Reports. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. 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 Smith Ambulance Service, Inc., the service organization that performs the emergency medical billings, to the District during 2012 and 2011 with Smith Ambulance Service, Inc. We noted collection service fees for ambulance receipts are deducted from collections sent to the District. The District records the net collection rather than the gross collection.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. 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 Revenue History Report and Expense History 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 Payroll Journal Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Journal Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the 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 employee's personnel file 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 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 the steps 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:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$1,231.46	\$1,231.46
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 28, 2012	\$195.62	\$195.62
Local income tax – Village of Sugarcreek	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$300.75	\$300.75
Local income tax – Village of Baltic	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$148.50	\$148.50
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$4,450.83	\$4,450.83

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Check Register Report 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 Check 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 two instances where disbursements requiring certification were not certified and one instance 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 Revenue History 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 Expense Statement Report for 2012. We noted the appropriations recorded in the Expense Statement Report for 2012 exceeded the appropriation resolution by \$4,500. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Expense Statement Report to amounts recorded on the appropriation resolution to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Expense Statement Report for 2011. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Expense Statement 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 Expense Statement 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 Revenue History 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 Fund History 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 28, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SWISS VALLEY AMBULANCE DISTRICT

TUSCARAWAS 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 6, 2013**