



**PORTER KINGSTON JOINT FIRE DISTRICT
DELAWARE COUNTY**

AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2009-2008



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Porter Kingston Joint Fire District
Delaware County
12844 Olive Green Road

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Porter Kingston Joint Fire 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, 2009 and 2008, 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 will only describe exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the financial statements and fund status report to the December 31, 2007 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the financial statements and fund status report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balances with the District's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January and February bank statement. We noted an exception; check number 10039, in the amount of \$26.71, was issued on November 30, 2007 but has not cleared the bank as of February, 2010. We recommend the District implement a policy to review long outstanding checks to determine if the checks need cancelled and/or re-issued.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We found no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2009 and 2008 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found 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 2009 and one from 2008.
 - 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 funds 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 includes the proper number of tax receipts for 2009 and 2008:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009 and all from 2008.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed. We found no exceptions. .
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. We inquired with management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2.
2. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to the debt service fund payments reported in the Expenditure Ledger. 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

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the payroll expense ledger and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files 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. 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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	\$3,463	\$3,63
State income taxes	January 31, 2010	\$4,822	\$4,822
Local Income tax	January 31, 2010	\$1,322	\$1,322
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 11, 2010	\$358	\$358

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the expenditure ledger report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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 expenditure ledger 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 no exceptions.
 - a. 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.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total 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 Status Report for the General and Debt Service Funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General and Debt Service funds, 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 Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2009 and 2008 for the General and Debt Service funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the appropriation status report.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General and Debt Service funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certificated 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, 2009 and 2008 for the General and Debt Service Funds as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$5,000 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.
7. We inquired with 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired with management and scanned the Expenditure detail report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under the following statute(s):
Ohio Rev. Code Sections 505.37 to 505.42 & 731.14 require a fire district to competitively bid purchases of fire apparatus, mechanical resuscitators, other fire equipment, appliances, materials, fire hydrants, buildings, or fire-alarm communications equipment or service costs exceeding \$25,000.

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion of 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 and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

July 26, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

PORTER KINGSTON JOINT FIRE DISTRICT
DELAWARE 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 24, 2010