



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Seneca County Soil and Water Conservation District  
Seneca County  
3140 South State Route 100, Suite D  
Tiffin, Ohio 44883

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Seneca County Soil and Water Conservation District, Seneca 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, 2011 through 2015, 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 followed 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.

### Depository Balances, Investments and Fund Balances

We applied the following procedures to each *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* (the Reports) for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

1. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports, and compared the *Fund Cash Balances, December 31* to the *Fund Balances* on page 2. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the *Disbursements* plus *Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Disbursements reported on page 4. The amounts agreed.
3. We compared the *Receipts* plus *Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Actual Receipts reported on page 5. The amounts agreed.
4. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the reconciliation on page 2. We found no exceptions.
5. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's Balance Sheet and the County's Statement of Cash Position reports to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. The January 1, 2011, 2013, 2014, and the December 31, 2012 and 2013 fund balances reported in the District's Balance Sheet were \$50 lower and the December 31, 2011 and January 1, 2012 fund balances were \$70 lower than the amounts reported on page 3B of the annual reports due to a petty cash account that was not included in the accounting system. The District corrected this in 2014.

We also applied the following procedures to the *Subtotals* and *Totals* reported on page 2 of the December 31, 2015 Report:

6. We confirmed the December 31 bank account depository balances for the District Fund and MNM fund with the District's financial institutions. The balances agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the Seneca County Statement of Cash Position. We found no exceptions.
8. For the checks comprising the Outstanding Checks, we applied the following procedures:
  - a. We footed the supporting outstanding check list and compared it to the Totals on the Report. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced each check to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - c. We traced the amounts and dates of each check to the check register, to determine the check was recorded for the same amount and dated and recorded prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
9. For amounts comprising the Cash in Transit to Depository, we applied the following procedures:
  - a. We compared the Cash in Transit to Depository from the Report to corresponding credits recorded in subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We agreed the Cash in Transit to Depository from the Report to the Cash Receipts Journal. The credit was recorded as a December receipt and for the same amount in the Cash Receipts Journal. We found no exceptions.
10. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
11. We tested investments held at December 31 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.

#### **Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts**

We applied the following procedures for the years ended December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

1. We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the Seneca County Auditor's Expense Audit Trail Report to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Revenue Audit Trail Report. The amounts agreed.

2. We haphazardly selected five other confirmable receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and three other confirmable receipts from each of the years ended December 31 2011 through 2014 in the Cash Receipts Journal from funds other than the *Special Fund* such as grants.
  - a. We agreed to supporting documentation the amounts paid from the entities to the District. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.

### **All Other Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

1. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Audit Trail for Special Fund receipts, and the Cash Receipts Journal for all other receipts. . The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions.
3. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2014 from the Register for Pay Period Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Register for Pay Period Report to supporting documentation (timecard and legislatively approved rate). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We noted no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the check was classified as *salaries*. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For the five employees tested in step 1 from 2015, we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and minute record was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to the check:
  - a. Name
  - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
  - c. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
  - d. Federal, State and 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.

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) occurring between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2015, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Register for Pay Period Report:
  - a. Accumulated leave records
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - c. The District's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* and other funds from the Expense Audit Trail and the Check Register, respectively, for the year ended December 31, 2015 and two from the *Special Fund* and three from the *District Fund* and other funds for each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 and determined whether:

- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
- b. For *District Fund* and other funds disbursements, we determined whether:
  - i. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the similar data recorded in the Check Register and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - ii. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
- c. For *Special Fund* disbursements, we determined whether:
  - i. The payee name and amount recorded on the voucher submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the Expense Audit Trail. We found no exceptions.
  - ii. The names and amounts on the voucher agreed to supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - iii. The voucher was signed by the fiscal officer and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

### **2015 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance**

1. We read the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners. We noted the request included the Special Fund's *Needs*, but did not include the *Income* and *Balances* anticipated for carry over from the current year, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook, Chapter 5. We also compared the budget amounts to the budgetary schedules on pages 4 and 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. Expenses of \$616,190 per the Budget

Request were \$45,097 higher than appropriations of \$571,093 listed on page 4 of the Annual Report due to amendments made throughout the year. Estimated receipts were not included in the Budget Request, therefore they did not agree with those listed on page 5 of the Annual Report. We recommend the Board review the SWCD Administrative Handbook and complete budget requests per Chapter 5 guidelines.

2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the Report to the *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Report for the Special Fund. The amounts agreed.
3. We scanned the appropriation measures to determine whether the Supervisors appropriated separate amounts within the Special Fund 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.
4. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Expense Audit Trail for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. Total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40 exceeded the amounts recorded in the Expense Audit Trail and page 4 of the report by \$86,647. This was a result of appropriation reductions being recorded that were not approved by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend the Board approve all supplemental appropriation activity.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated revenue. We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2015. We noted that Special Fund appropriations for 2015 exceeded estimated revenue by \$86,647, contrary to the aforementioned Ohio Rev. Code Sections. The Supervisors should not pass appropriations exceeding estimated revenue. Allowing this to occur could cause the District to incur fund balance deficits.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus year-end certified commitments (i.e. encumbrances)) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total disbursements plus outstanding year-end encumbrances to total appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2015 for the "Special" Fund, as recorded in the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report. We noted expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.
7. We determined that interfund transfers-in equaled transfers-out and were approved by the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.
8. We scanned the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) 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.

### **2015 Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures**

We inquired of management and scanned the Check Register and Expense Audit Trail Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 to determine if the District purchased equipment and services allowed by ORC 1515.09 or purchased goods or services allowed by ORC 1515.08(H)(1) whose cost, other than personal service compensation or office space rent, exceeded \$50,000. We noted no purchases exceeding \$50,000.

## 2015 Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires Districts to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed the HINKLE system and noted the District filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "D".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

January 19, 2017





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**SENECA COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**SENECA 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  
FEBRUARY 9, 2017**