



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Wyandot County Soil and Water Conservation District
Wyandot County
97 Houpt Drive, Suite A
Upper Sandusky, Ohio 43351-9201

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of Wyandot County Soil and Water Conservation District, Wyandot 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 Income Statement to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. The District Fund ending balance for 2012 and the District Fund beginning balance for 2013 reported on page 3B of the Annual Financial Reports were \$607 higher than amounts reported on the Income Statement. This was the result of corrections made in the accounting software in January 2013 to adjust prior year ending fund balances.

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 with the District's financial institutions. The amount recorded for First Citizens Checking in the Report was \$200 below the confirmation with the financial institution. This was due to a timing difference where the statements received by the District were dated December 24, 2015, but the confirmation was at December 31, 2015. We recommend management request the financial institution to adjust the statement end dates to coincide with the actual month end dates. The remaining balances agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the Wyandot County Fund Balance Report. 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 the December 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 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 Wyandot County Auditor's Appropriation History Report to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Revenue History Report. The amounts agreed.

- 2 We selected all other confirmable receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 in the Cash Receipts Journal from funds other than the *Special Fund* such as grants. We confirmed the amounts paid from the State to the District during 2015. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We confirmed the amounts paid from the State of Ohio to the District. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. 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 Cash Receipt Journal for the District Fund and the Revenue History Report for the Special Fund. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions except that in 2012, rain gauges were sold for \$15. This price was not set, by nor confirmed, by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend the Board approve the price of items made available for sale. However, because we did not test all other cash receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
3. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, 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 Gross Earnings Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate recorded in the Gross Earnings 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 Gross Earnings 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 Appropriation History Report 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 were unable to confirm the check date and payee name with the returned, cancelled checks for three expenditures paid out of the Star Ohio Tree Fund Account, as Star Ohio does not distribute copies of checks with their statements, and only retains the copies internally for two years. We were however able to confirm the check number and amount for the cleared checks in the bank statements for these expenditures. We recommend the District obtain and maintain copies of all cleared checks. We found no other 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 Appropriation History Report. 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, 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. The expenses listed on the budget request did not agree to Appropriations listed on page 4 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. Expenses per the budget request were \$324,462, or \$7,996 higher than Appropriations of \$316,466 listed on page 4 of the Report due to amendments made throughout the year. Estimated receipts per the budget request agreed with the Report.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the 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 Estimated Revenue Spreadsheet for the Special Fund. The Estimated Revenue Spreadsheet and the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Special fund of \$316,466 for 2015. However, page 5 of the Report reported \$295,400 of Estimated Revenue. Management should review the Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources to verify the correct amount is recorded in the Annual Report. If the amounts do not agree, the Board of Supervisors may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
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 Wyandot County Appropriations History Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. The amounts did not agree. Total Appropriations required by ORC 5705.38 and 5705.40 were \$362,269, Appropriations per the County Appropriations History Report were \$372,570, and Appropriations per page 5 of the Annual Report were \$316,466. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation History Report to the amounts approved by the Board and included on Page 4 of the Report to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Board of Supervisors may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
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 appropriations did not exceed estimated revenues 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, 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 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 fund having a negative cash fund balance.

2015 Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Check Register and Appropriation History 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

December 16, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

WYANDOT COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

WYANDOT 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
JANUARY 10, 2017