



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Four County Solid Waste District
Defiance County
500 Court Street, Suite E
Defiance, Ohio 43512-2171

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of the Four County Solid Waste District, Defiance 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, 2010 and 2009, 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. Williams County is custodian for the District's deposits and investments. We compared the District's fund balance reported on its December 31, 2010 Transaction History Listing Report to the balance reported in Williams County's accounting records. The amounts agreed.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balance recorded in the Transaction History Listing Report to the December 31, 2008 balance in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.

Tipping Fees

1. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Archbold Refuse Service, Allied Waste Services, and the Defiance County Landfill to the District during 2010 and 2009. They confirmed payment of the following amounts to the District:

Company	2010 Payments	2009 Payments
ARS Refuse Service	\$20,995	\$16,188
Allied Waste Services	272,052	179,119
Defiance County Landfill	80,484	85,244

- a. We compared the amount confirmed with the amount the District recorded in its receipt records. We found no exceptions.
- 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.
2. We obtained the March 2009 and October 2010 total tonnage reports from the landfills in step 1.
 - a. We recalculated the dollar amount sent to the District based on the rates in force during the period and agreed to the amounts posted to the Districts ledgers. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Transaction Detail Listing Report for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Transaction Detail Listing Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2009 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 Transaction Detail Listing 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. We found 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.
 - e. The disbursement was allowable under Ohio Rev. Code, Section 3734.57(G), and the Districts policies and procedures. We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Transaction History Listing Report for the General fund for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General fund, the Directors appropriated separately for “each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services,” as is required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.

3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.28(B)(2), 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Department Budget Report for 2010 and 2009 for the general fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Department Budget Report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code, Section 5705.28(B)(2)(c), prohibits appropriations from exceeding the estimated revenue available for expenditure (receipts plus beginning unencumbered cash). We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the General fund for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded estimated revenue.
5. Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General fund, as recorded in the Department Budget Report. We noted that expenditures did not exceed appropriations.

Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Transaction Detail Listing Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 for projects requiring the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We identified no projects subject to the aforementioned prevailing wage requirements.

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 and 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

November 10, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

FOUR COUNTY SOLID WASTE DISTRICT

DEFIANCE 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 29, 2011**