



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Bellbrook-Sugarcreek Park District
Greene County
2751 Washington Mill Road
Bellbrook, Ohio 45305

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Bellbrook-Sugarcreek Park 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, 2009 and 2008, 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, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2007 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, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2009 and 2008 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.

One First National Plaza / 130 W. Second St. / Suite 2040 / Dayton, OH 45402
Telephone: (937) 285-6677 (800) 443-9274 Fax: (937) 285-6688
www.auditor.state.oh.us

Cash and Investments

7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 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 and Intergovernmental Revenue

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2009 and one from 2008:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - 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 Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2009 and 2008:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected all four receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009 and all four from 2008. We also selected five receipts from the Greene County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2009 and five from 2008:
 - a. We compared the amount from the State Distribution Transaction List (DTL) and the Greene County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. We noted no new debt issuances; however we did note debt payment activity during 2009 and 2008 for a loan issued in 2001.
2. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal payments from the related debt amortization schedule to general fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail 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 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and 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 this check:
 - a. Name.
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate.
 - c. Department(s) and fund(s) 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.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard and board approved employee data sheets for 2008 and minutes for 2009). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	November 13, 2009	\$2,798.04	\$2,798.04
		November 30, 2009	1,723.69	1,723.69
		December 30, 2009	1,693.03	1,693.03
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	December 30, 2009	606.42	606.42
OPERS retirement (with-holding plus employee share)	January 30, 2010	December 30, 2009	3,801.21	3,801.21
		December 24, 2009	3,838.44	3,838.44

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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 Payment Register Detail Report 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.
 - 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 no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the accounting system.

2009:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Amount per Certificate</u>	<u>Amount per Revenue Status Report</u>	<u>Variance</u>
General	\$553,670.80	\$543,277.80	\$10,393.00

2008:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Amount per Certificate</u>	<u>Amount per Revenue Status Report</u>	<u>Variance</u>
General	\$577,872.80	\$555,877.80	\$21,995.00

The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report 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 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General Fund, 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 Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2009 and 2008 for the General fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report during 2009.

2009:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Amount per Appropriation Certificate</u>	<u>Amount per Appropriation Status Report</u>	<u>Variance</u>
General	\$555,872.80	\$552,872.80	\$3,000.00

The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts recorded on the Permanent Appropriations to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.

4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. 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, 2009 and 2008 for the General Fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. 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 Receipt Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2009 and 2008. We also inquired of management regarding whether the District received new restricted receipts. We noted no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the District to establish a new fund.
7. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$100 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 scanned the Appropriation Status Reports 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 Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under Article VI and Article VII of the Districts Bylaws, adopted pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code Section 1545.09(A), which states that the procuring of goods and awarding of contracts shall be done in accordance with the procedures established in Ohio Rev. Code Section 511.23. Additionally any contract entered into on behalf of the Park District shall be approved by resolution and signed by at least two Trustees.

We identified a Berryhill Park Improvement project exceeding \$25,000 in 2008, subject to competitive bidding requirements. For this project, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder. We also identified a dump truck purchase in 2008 exceeding \$25,000, subject to competitive bidding requirements. For this project, we noted that the Board approved the purchase through the State of Ohio Purchasing Program.

2. For the Berryhill Park Improvement 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.

Officials' Response: In 2009 we scheduled \$3,400 in revenues and appropriations for the SkyHawks Sports Camp. Due to the size of the camp, we reduced both the revenues and appropriations by \$3,000 in UAN in order to not overestimate expected revenues. That is why the estimated revenues did not agree to the County Auditor's documents. For any similar situations that occur in the future we will notify the County Auditor with proper documentation for changes in estimated revenues and appropriations.

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 and those charged with governance 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 "Mary Taylor". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

April 12, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

BELLBROOK-SUGARCREEK PARK DISTRICT

GREENE 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
MAY 11, 2010**