



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PORTER KINGSTON JOINT FIRE DISTRICT
DELAWARE COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
-------	------

Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1
---	---

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Porter Kingston Joint Fire District
Delaware County
12844 Olive Green Road
Sunbury, Ohio 43074

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of 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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Summary of Cash Balances, Receipts, and Expenditures Report to the December 31, 2009 balances documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Summary of Cash Balances, Receipts, and Expenditures Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 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, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We noted two exceptions; check number 12900 issued on February 5, 2011 for the amount of \$87.80 and check number 13267 issued on July 15, 2011 for the amount of \$169.71 have not cleared the bank as of February 2012. We recommend the District implement a policy to review long outstanding checks to determine if the checks need cancelled and/or re-issued.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

- 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 2011 and 2010 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 2011 and one from 2010.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Transaction Detail 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 Transaction Detail Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Transaction Detail Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the Transaction Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
 - 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Brandon Volunteer Fire Department to the District during 2011 with the Brandon Volunteer Fire Department. 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.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following bond outstanding as of December 31, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Districts January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
General Obligation Bond	\$20,000

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Transaction Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt service fund payments reported in the Transaction 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.
4. For new capital lease agreement entered into during 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the District must use the lease to purchase a fire truck. We scanned the Transaction Detail Report and noted the District purchased a fire truck in July of 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Transaction Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Transaction Detail 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 minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 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 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$3,248	\$3,248
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$453	\$453
Local income tax	January 15, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$114	\$114
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$312	\$312
OP & F retirement	January 31, 2012	January 17, 2012	\$2,820	\$2,820

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Transaction Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 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 no exceptions.

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 Budget versus Actual Report for the General and Debt Service funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* were not recorded in the accounting system as required by Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-2-02(A). The fiscal officer should ensure amounts are recorded from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to its' accounting system. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budget versus Actual Report to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Budget versus Actual Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General Fund and Debt Service Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Budget versus Actual 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 Debt Service funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We noted that Debt Service Fund appropriations for 2010 exceeded certified resources by \$1,451, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Trustees should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the District to incur fund balance deficits.
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, 2011 and 2010 for the General and Debt Service funds, as recorded in the Budget versus Actual Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Transaction Detail Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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 scanned the 2011 and 2010 Transaction Detail Reports for evidence of interfund transfers 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.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Budget versus Actual 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Transaction Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 \$50,000.

We identified a purchase of a used truck exceeding \$50,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37. For this purchase, we noted that the Board did not advertise in a local newspaper prior to the purchase and therefore, a lowest responsible bidder could not be determined. We recommend the District to follow competitive bid procedures under Ohio Revised Code for purchases exceeding \$50,000.

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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.



Robert R. Hinkle, CPA, CGFM
Chief Deputy Auditor

July 30, 2012

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • 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 28, 2012**