



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Boardman Township Park District
Mahoning County
375 Boardman-Poland Road
Boardman, Ohio 44512-4943

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Boardman Township Park 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, 2015 and 2014, 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Combined Statement to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year Combined Statement. We noted a \$30 difference. The difference was due to a dormant bank account erroneously not included in the beginning fund balance of the Fenton Meredith (FBO) St. James Account. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Combined Statement to the December 31, 2014 balances in the Combined Statement. We noted a \$30 difference. The difference was due to a dormant bank account erroneously not included in the beginning fund balance of the Fenton Meredith (FBO) St. James Account. On April 7, 2016, the Executive Director/Clerk provided AOS a new 2015 Combined Statement with the correction of the \$30 that was not placed in the beginning balance.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2015 and 2014 fund cash balances reported in the Combined Statements. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed two December 31, 2015 bank account balances with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also observed the remaining year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments – (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 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 2015 and 2014 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 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 2015 and one from 2014:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to 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, plus 9 advances for 2015 and 9 advances for 2014. 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 2015 and all from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor History Report from 2015 and five from 2014.
 - 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 funds. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts – (Continued)

4. The District received \$446,273 from a donor's Trust, as described in the donor's Attorney's three letters dated May 11, 2015, October 30, 2015, and December 17, 2015. We agreed these amounts to the Receipt Register Report, copy of check and deposit on bank statement. We noted the donor restricted the donation to be used for the planting and caring of trees honoring the Donor. The District did not spend any money during 2015.

Charges for Services

We haphazardly selected 10 charges for services receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and 10 charges for services receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

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

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following Cortland Banks Revenue Notes outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Districts January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
Cortland Banks Revenue Note (2012-1)	\$ 384,515
Cortland Banks Revenue Note (2013-1)	\$ 252,158

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2015 or 2014 or debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014. We noted no new debt issuances. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of Revenue Note debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Capital Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the District made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

- a. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for five employees from 2014 from the Payroll Register and:
- b. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to supporting documentation (timecard, or legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
- c. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
- d. 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 and minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and minute record 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(s) and fund(s) 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, 2015 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 2015. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2016	January 6, 2016	\$ 2,545.26	\$ 2,545.26
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	January 19, 2016	\$ 952.90	\$ 952.90
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	January 25, 2016	\$ 9,511.28	\$ 9,511.28

4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll leave reports:
- a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The District's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and ten from the year ended 2014 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 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 four 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 Revenue Report for the General and Capital funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2015 and 2014 to determine whether, for the General and Capital 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 Appropriation Report for 2015 and 2014 for the following funds: General and Capital funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation 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 and Capital funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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, 2015 and 2014 for the General and Capital funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Report. We noted that the Capital Fund expenditures for 2014 exceeded total appropriations by \$192, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). The Executive Director / Clerk should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Executive Director / Clerk may request the Commissioners to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary, and if resources are available.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

6. We scanned the 2015 and 2014 Combined Statement, Revenue Reports and Appropriation Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 - .16 restrict. During 2015 we noted the District transferred \$7,000 from the SP Jenkins Stables Fund to the General Fund and \$6,800 from the SP Jenkins Stables Fund to the Capital Fund. We also noted that the District transferred \$5,800 from the Fenton Meredith - St James Fund to the General Fund. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.14 does not permit this transfer without approval of the Tax Commissioner and the Court of Common Pleas. The District did not obtain this approval. In this situation the District was reimbursing the General Fund for disbursements made on its behalf through the General Checking Account which is tied to the General Fund alone as the computer software does not permit the checking account to disburse across funds. The Executive Director/ Clerk does maintain a detailed ledger for each of the funds above and does maintain them by Fund/Function/Object. He also maintains the expenditures in the General Fund and reimburses the General Fund at year end for all expenditures made on behalf of each fund through a bank transfer from the respective funds bank accounts separately to the general checking account. He in turn reflects the expenditures as transfers out to the general fund, as opposed to reflecting the expenditures in the appropriate object level within each of the above funds. We therefore requested management remove the transfers noted above, reduce General Fund expenditures and the transfers in to the General Fund increase the respective funds expenditures and decrease the respective funds transfers out noted above by fund/function/object code and represent the combined statement for 2015. We noted the Clerk corrected the Combined Statement for 2015 on April 7, 2016.
7. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation 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.
8. We scanned the Leger Reports for each fund for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

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
Columbus, Ohio

May 10, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

BOARDMAN TOWNSHIP PARK DISTRICT

MAHONING 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
JUNE 2, 2016**