



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Lucas Soil and Water Conservation District
Lucas County
130-A West Dudley Street
Maumee, Ohio 43537

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Lucas Soil and Water Conservation District, Lucas 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 through 2016, 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. 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.

Depository Balances, Investments and Fund Balances

We applied the following procedures to each *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* (the Reports) for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2012 through December 31, 2015:

1. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports, and compared the *Fund Cash Balances, December 31* to the *Fund Balances* on page 2. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the *Disbursements plus Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Disbursements reported on page 4. The amounts agreed, except in 2013 where the disbursements on page 3A and 3B exceeded disbursements on page 4 by \$343,201. This is because no budgetary information was presented for 2013. We recommend the District report all budgetary activity, including actual disbursements, on page 4 of the annual financial report.
3. We compared the *Receipts plus Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Actual Receipts reported on page 5. The amounts agreed, except in 2013 where the receipts on page 3A and 3B exceeded receipts on page 5 by \$300,723. This is because no budgetary information was presented for 2013. We recommend the District report all budgetary activity, including actual receipts, on page 5 of the annual report.
4. We recomputed the mathematical accuracy of the reconciliation on page 2. We found no exceptions.

5. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's monthly financial report to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. The amounts agreed, except for 2015, when the Ditch Fund ending balance of \$14,776 was included in District Fund total on the Fund Cash Balances on page 3B of the Reports. We recommend that each fund be segregated on page 3B of the Reports.

We also applied the following procedures to the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* in the *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* filed in the Hinkle System (the Report) at December 31, 2016:

6. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* provided by the District. We found no exceptions.
7. We compared the *Disbursements plus Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* to the Budgetary Expenditures in the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote. The amounts agreed.
8. We compared the *Receipts plus Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* to the Actual Receipts in the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote. The amounts did not agree, actual receipts entered in the Special Fund Budgetary Activity note when compared to the Receipts plus Other Financing Sources for the Special Fund on the Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances were understated by \$2,354, due to not including the "Other Revenue" line item amount number in the footnote. We recommend the District include all receipt activity for the Special Fund in the Budgetary Activity footnote.
9. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's monthly financial report to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances*. The amounts agreed.
10. We confirmed the December 31, 2016 bank account depository balances for the District Fund and Ditch Fund with the District's financial institutions. The balances agreed.
11. We compared the December 31, 2016 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the Lucas County Fund Report. We found no exceptions.
12. For the checks comprising the Outstanding Checks, we applied the following procedures:
 - a. We footed the supporting outstanding check list and compared it to the cash reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced each check to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We traced the amounts and dates of each check to the check register, to determine the check was recorded for the same amount and dated and recorded prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
13. We inspected investments held at December 31, 2016 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

We applied the following procedures for the years ended December 31, 2012 through December 31, 2016:

We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Payment Report to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Receipts and Revenue Adjustments Listing Report. The amounts agreed except for 2015, when \$12,500 in State monies were posted as Grants - Local in the District Fund. This error was corrected in 2016. Also, in 2015, \$75,000 and \$32,600 in County monies were incorrectly classified as Other Receipts and Intergovernmental, respectively, in the Special Fund and should have been posted to Grants - Local in the Special Fund. We recommend the District post all State and County monies in the correct fund and classification.

All Other Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2016 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended 2012 through 2015 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

1. Receipt amount support agreed to the amount recorded in the General Ledger. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions.
3. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for all the employees from 2016 and one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2012 through 2015 from the Payroll Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to the legislatively-approved rate. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We inspected the Payroll Register to determine whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We inspected the Payroll Register to determine whether the check was classified as *salaries* and was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For the all the employees selected in step 1 from 2016, we inspected the following information in the employees' personnel files to determine it was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to the check:
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
 - c. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
 - d. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – e. above.

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) occurring between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2016, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll Register:
 - 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

We haphazardly selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* and other funds from the Transaction Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 and two from the *Special Fund* and three from the *District Fund* and other funds for each of the years ended 2012 through 2015 and determined whether:

- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
- b. For *District Fund* and other funds disbursements, we determined whether:
 - i. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the similar data recorded in the Transaction Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
- c. For *Special Fund* disbursements, we determined whether:
 - i. The payee name and amount recorded on the voucher submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the Transaction Detail Report and County Accounts Payable Expense Listing. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The names and amounts on the voucher agreed to supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - iii. The voucher was signed by the District Manager and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

2016 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We inspected the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners. The request included the Special Fund's *Needs*, *Income* and *Balances* anticipated for carry over from the current year, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook, Chapter 5. We also compared the budget amounts to the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report to the *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Report for the Special Fund. The amounts agreed.
3. We inspected the appropriation measures to determine whether the Supervisors appropriated separate amounts within the Special Fund 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.

4. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Budget Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated resources. We compared total appropriations to total estimated resources for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2016. Appropriations did not exceed estimated resources for the Special Fund.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus year-end certified commitments (i.e. encumbrances)) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total disbursements plus outstanding year-end encumbrances to total appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2016 for the "Special" Fund, as recorded in the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report. Expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.
7. We inspected the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 for negative cash fund balances. 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. No funds had negative cash fund balances.

2016 Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and inspected the Transaction Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 to determine if the District purchased equipment and services allowed by ORC 1515.09 or purchased goods or services allowed by ORC 1515.08(H)(1) whose cost, other than personal service compensation or office space rent, exceeded \$50,000. There were no purchases exceeding \$50,000.

2016 Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires Districts to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. This statute also permits the Auditor of State to extend the deadline for filing a financial report and establish terms and conditions for any such extension. Auditor of State established policies, in addition to filing extensions granted for extenuating circumstances, allow for refile complete financial statements, as defined in AOS Bulletin 2015-007 in the Hinkle System for December 31, 2017 and 2016 fiscal year ends included in 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 agreed up on procedure engagements, subsequent to the District's deadline where the initial filing was filed on time but incomplete. Financial information was filed on June 26, 2017 which was not within the allotted timeframe.

This agreed-upon procedures engagement followed 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*. We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion respectively on the District's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Lucas Soil and Water Conservation District
Lucas County
Independent Accountants' Report on
Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures
Page 6

This report is for the use of the District to assist in evaluating its receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2012 through 2016, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances and is not suitable for any other purpose

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

Columbus, Ohio

August 14, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

LUCAS COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

LUCAS 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 29, 2017**