



**PLEASANT VALLEY JOINT FIRE DISTRICT  
UNION COUNTY**

**AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

**FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND 2011**



**Dave Yost • Auditor of State**



PLEASANT VALLEY JOINT FIRE DISTRICT  
UNION 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

Pleasant Valley Joint Fire District  
Union County  
650 W. Main Street  
Plain City, Ohio 43064

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Pleasant Valley Joint Fire District, Union 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 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Cash Balance Statement to the December 31, 2010 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, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Cash Balance Statement. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the District's financial institution for the Richwood Bank account. We found no exceptions. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website for the Huntington accounts. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 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.

### **Cash and Investments (Continued)**

6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2012 and 2011 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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 2012 and one from 2011.
  - a. We attempted to trace the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue Statement. We found that both property tax receipts tested were not posted at the gross amount stated on the *Statement*, rather they were posted net of deductions. Because we did not test all the property tax receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
  - 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 Revenue Statement to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Revenue Statement included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Revenue Statement. 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the District during 2011 with the Federal Emergency Management Agency. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined 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 audit report, we noted the following capital lease outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the District's January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

| <b>Issue</b>                           | <b>Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:</b> |
|--|---|
| Fire Station & Equipment Capital Lease | \$1,190,000   |

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Statement and Check Register Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances.
3. We obtained a summary of capital lease activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments invoiced by the bank to debt service fund payments reported in the Check Register 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

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Summary Journal and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Summary Journal to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the fund and account code to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel file. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we 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. Department and fund 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.)
  - g. Fund to which the check should be charged.

We found no exceptions related to the steps above.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 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 2012. We noted the following:

| <b>Withholding<br/>(plus employer<br/>share, where<br/>applicable)</b> | <b>Date Due</b>   | <b>Date Paid</b>  | <b>Amount Due</b> | <b>Amount<br/>Paid</b> |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Federal income<br>taxes & Medicare                                     | January 31, 2013  | October 4, 2012   | \$9,186           | \$9,186                |
|  |                   | October 18, 2012  | \$10,766          | \$10,766               |
|  |                   | November 1, 2012  | \$8,423           | \$8,423                |
|  |                   | November 15, 2012 | \$3,866           | \$3,866                |
|  |                   | November 29, 2012 | \$9,018           | \$9,018                |
|  |                   | December 13, 2012 | \$7,401           | \$7,401                |
|  |                   | December 27, 2012 | \$8,831           | \$8,831                |
| State income<br>taxes  | January 15, 2013  | December 13, 2012 | \$1,594           | \$1,594                |
|  |                   | December 27, 2012 | \$1,366           | \$1,366                |
| OPERS retirement   | January 31, 2013  | December 13, 2012 | \$52              | \$52                   |
|  |                   | December 27, 2012 | \$62              | \$62                   |
|  |                   | January 10, 2013  | \$1,589           | \$1,589                |
| OP&F retirement –<br>Employee Share                                    | January 31, 2013  | January 3, 2013   | \$5,015           | \$5,015                |
| OP&F retirement –<br>Employer Share                                    | December 31, 2012 | November 20, 2012 | \$37,831          | \$37,831               |

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 Summary Journal:
- Accumulated leave records
  - The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - 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 Check Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 and determined whether:
- The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
  - 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 Check Register Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - 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.



**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

- 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 one instance where a disbursement requiring certification was not certified and 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.

**Compliance – Budgetary**

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, if there was an amendment, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Statement for the General, Ambulance & Emergency Medical, and Assistance to Firefighters Grant funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Fund. The Revenue Statement recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant fund of \$331,670 for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$165,835. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Statement 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Ambulance & Emergency Medical, and Assistance to Firefighters Grant 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 Expense Statement for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Ambulance and Emergency Medical, and Assistance to Firefighters Grant funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Expense Statement.
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, Ambulance and Emergency Medical, and Assistance to Firefighters Grant funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Ambulance and Emergency Medical, and Assistance to Firefighters Grant funds, as recorded in the Expense Statement. 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 Revenue Statement for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2012 and 2011. We also inquired of management regarding whether the District received new restricted receipts. The District established the Assistance to Firefighters Grant fund during 2011 to segregate Federal Emergency Management Agency receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09 and 2 CFR Part 176.210.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Statement and Expense Statement for evidence of inter-fund transfers exceeding \$100,000 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.
8. We inquired of management and scan the Expense Statement 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 Check Register report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under 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 that the District awarded a contract for roof replacement for \$70,450 subject to Ohio Revised Code Sections 505.37 and 731.14. For this project, we noted the District advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

2. For the project described in step 1 above, we read the contract and noted that it required the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. The contract included the Ohio Department of Commerce's schedule of prevailing rates,

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

March 18, 2013



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PLEASANT VALLEY JOINT FIRE DISTRICT

UNION 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  
APRIL 11, 2013