



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Trumbull Soil and Water Conservation District
Trumbull County
520 W Main Street, Suite #3
Cortland, Ohio 44410

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Trumbull Soil and Water Conservation 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 through 2016, 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. 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 recomputed 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 Account Balances Reports and County Monthly Financial Reports to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. We noted the following variances in the District Fund:

Date	Annual Report Fund Balance	Account Balances Report	Variance
January 1, 2011	\$190,450	\$190,558	\$108
December 31, 2011	\$209,976	\$209,826	(\$150)
January 1, 2012	\$209,939	\$209,826	(\$113)
December 31, 2012	\$230,535	\$230,568	\$33
January 1, 2013	\$230,535	\$230,568	\$33
December 31, 2015	\$211,753	\$211,319	(\$434)

We also applied the following procedures to the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* in the *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* filed in the Hinkle System (the Report) at December 31, 2016:

6. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances*. We found one error in which the total cash disbursements for the district fund of \$46,982 and the total cash disbursements for the special fund of \$354,464 did not equal the cross-footing total. The reflected total was \$399,946 and the correct total should have been \$401,446 which is a difference of \$1,500. Further examination determined this be the "Payments to other Governments & Agencies" disbursement line item for the Special Fund which did not cross-foot into the total column.
7. We compared the *Disbursements plus Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* to the Budgetary Expenditures in the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote. The amounts agreed.
8. We compared the *Receipts plus Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances* to the Actual Receipts in the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote. The amounts agreed.
9. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's Quickbooks Balance Sheet Report and County Monthly Financial Report to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on the *Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Fund Balances*. We noted the following variance in the District Fund:

Date	Annual Report Fund Balance	Quickbooks Balance Sheet Report	Variance
December 31, 2016	\$200,344	\$200,547	\$203

10. We confirmed the December 31, 2016 bank account depository balance for the District Fund with the District's financial institution. We were able to successfully agree the District checking account, however, the District did not account for all interest earned for the Certificates of Deposit (CDs) during Fiscal Year 2016. The total balance of all CD's should have been \$193,895 and was reflected as \$193,511 in the annual report. This results in a variance of \$384.
11. We compared the December 31, 2016 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the County Receipts and Disbursements Summary Report. We found no exceptions.
12. 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 cash reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced each check to the subsequent January and March bank statements. 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.

13. We inspected investments held at December 31, 2016 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, 2016:

- 1 We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the County Auditor's Ten Year Disbursements Report to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Annual Report. The amounts agreed.

All Other Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2016 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended 2011 through 2015 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

1. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Transaction Report. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found one instance out of 35 transactions tested where the District did not retain supporting documentation for a receipt tested in order to verify amount was correctly charged. However, because we did not inspect all other cash receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
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 2016 and one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2015 from the County Payroll Earnings Registers and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the County Payroll Earnings Registers to supporting documentation (timecard and legislatively approved rate). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We inspected the County Accounting Code Reports to determine whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We inspected the County Payroll Earnings Registers to determine whether the check was classified as *salaries* and was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

2. For the five employees selected in step 1 from 2016, we inspected the following information in the employees' personnel files to determine it 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 & 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, 2016, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the County Payroll Earnings Register:
 - 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

1. We haphazardly selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* and other funds from the Check Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 and two from the *Special Fund* and three from the *District Fund* and other funds for each of the years ended 2011 through 2015 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 District Fund Check Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found one instance out of 35 transactions tested where a sales receipt was not retained to support a credit card payment, however, because we did not inspect all non-payroll disbursements, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
 - 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 invoice submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the Special Fund Check Detail Report and the County General Ledger. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The invoice was signed by the Fiscal Agent or District Administrator and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

2016 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We inspected the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners. The request included the Special Fund's *Needs, 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 Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report to the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the Journal of Receipts Report for the Special Fund. The amounts agreed.
3. We inspected 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 Appropriation Summary Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on the Special Fund Budgetary Activity footnote of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated resources. We compared total appropriations to total estimated resources for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2016. Appropriations did not exceed estimated resources for the Special Fund.
5. 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, 2016 for the "Special" Fund, as recorded in the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report. Expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.
7. We inspected the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 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. No funds had negative cash fund balances.

2016 Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and inspected the District Check Detail Report and County Disbursement Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2016 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. There were no purchases exceeding \$50,000.

2016 Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires entities to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We confirmed the District filed their complete financial statements, including notes to the financial statements, as defined by AOS Bulletin 2015-007 within the allotted timeframe for the year ended December 31, 2016. There were no exceptions.

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*. We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion respectively on the District's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is for the use of the District to assist in evaluating its receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2016, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances and is not suitable for any other purpose.

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

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

August 7, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

TRUMBULL COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

TRUMBULL 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 22, 2017