



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**TUPPERS PLAINS REGIONAL SEWER DISTRICT
MEIGS 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

Tuppers Plains Regional Sewer District
Meigs County
P.O. Box 175
Tuppers Plains, Ohio 45783

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Tuppers Plains Regional Sewer District, Meigs 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, 2015 and 2014, 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We compared the January 1, 2014 beginning balance recorded in the General Ledger Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year audited. We noted the General Ledger showed \$53 more than was documented in the prior year audited reports. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the General Ledger Report to the December 31, 2014 balances in the General Ledger Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2015 and 2014 cash balances reported in the General Ledger Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2015 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, 2015 bank reconciliation with one exception. The carrying amount of the Farmers Bank Checking Account (Account No. 10201 in the General Ledger) was understated by \$300 at December 31, 2015 and 2014 when compared to confirmed amounts. The District adjusted its balance to record this additional amount.

Cash (Continued)

5. We selected all reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statements with one exception. Check No. 4547 for \$12,400 had not cleared the bank as of February 29, 2016. This check was voided June 10, 2016.
 - 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 investments held at December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 to determine that they were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code § 6119.16. We found no exceptions.

Charges for Services

1. We haphazardly selected 10 sewer collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and 10 sewer collection cash receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the Receipt Ledger Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Receipt Ledger Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Customer Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Aged Receivables Report agreed for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. Complied with rates in force during the audit. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Aged Receivables Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$60,795 and \$58,622 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in step 2a, \$57,308 and \$56,407 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
3. We read the Customer Ledger Report.
 - a. We noted no non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following bonds and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Districts January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
Rural Development Water Resource Revenue Bonds	\$686,569
Ohio Public Works Commission Note	45,375
Ohio Water Development Authority Loan	41,865

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger Report and Check Register Report for evidence of debt issued during 2015 or 2014 or debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

Debt (Continued)

3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and compared principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule, Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) confirmation, or Ohio Water Development Authority (OWDA) Loan confirmation to payments reported in the Check Register Report. During 2014, Rural Development Water Resource Revenue Bond Principal and Interest Payments varied \$30 (underpayment) from the amortization schedule. During 2015, Rural Development Water Resource Revenue Bond Principal and Interest Payments varied \$27 (underpayment) from the amortization schedule. No exception noted for OPWC or OWDA amounts. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the District made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and ten from the year ended 2014 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 Check Register 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.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We obtained the total estimated receipts from the Revised Budget required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.36(A)(1) for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The accounting system did not include these budgetary amounts. The Treasurer should record approved budgetary information in the District's accounting system or prepare budget to actual reports for periodic Trustee review for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the Revised Budget adopted for 2015 and 2014 to determine whether 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 §§ 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We obtained total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.28(B)(2), 5705.38 and 5705.40 from the Revised Budget for 2015 and 2014. These amounts were not recorded in the accounting system.
4. Ohio Rev. Code § 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 years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. Appropriations did not exceed estimated revenue.
5. Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.41(B) prohibit expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 as recorded in the Revised Budget. We noted expenditures for 2015 and 2014 exceeded total appropriations by \$160 and \$34, respectively, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.41(B).

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

6. We scanned the General Ledger for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code § 5705.10(l) 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. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code § 117.38 requires entities to file their financial information in the HINKLE system formerly known as the Annual Financial Data Reporting System (AFDRS) within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed AFDRS to verify the District filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. Financial information was filed on March 30, 2015 for the year ended December 31, 2014; however, a waiver was obtained. No exception noted for the year ended December 31, 2015.

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
Columbus, Ohio

August 1, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

TUPPERS PLAINS REGIONAL SEWER DISTRICT

MEIGS 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 30, 2016**