

TRI-DIVISION AMBULANCE DISTRICT

STARK COUNTY

JULY 1, 2008 TO JUNE 30, 2009

REGULAR AUDIT



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Tri-Division Ambulance District
P.O. Box 352
East Sparta, Ohio 44626

We have reviewed the Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures of the Tri-Division Ambulance District, Stark County, prepared by Kevin L. Penn, Inc., for the period January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2009. Based upon this review, we have accepted these reports in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. The Tri-Division Ambulance District is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

February 8, 2011



Certified Public Accountant
11811 Shaker Boulevard, Suite 421
Cleveland, Ohio 44120
(216)421-1000
Fax:(216)421-1001
Email: klpenncpa@aol.com

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Tri-Division Ambulance District
Stark County
East Sparta, Ohio

I have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Tri-Division Ambulance District (the District) and Auditor of State 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, 2008 and 2009, 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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2008 and December 31, 2009 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 amount agreed as December 31, 2008. The amount per the bank reconciliation as of December 31, 2009 was \$493,458.17 and the amount per the Fund Status Report was \$491,591.06, representing a difference of \$1,867.11.

4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balance with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 and 2008 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement(s). 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.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2008 and one from 2009.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s) 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 Journal 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 receiptsWe noted the Receipts Journal report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2008.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Charges for Services

We haphazardly selected five receipts recorded in the Cash Receipts Records from the year ended December 31, 2009 and five from the year ended December 31, 2008. We compared the amount billed and debited to accounts receivable for the service to the amount received per the cash receipts records, to the amount credited to accounts receivable, and to the amount deposited to the bank. We also compared the date the payment was recorded in the cash receipts records to the date deposited per the bank statement. The amounts agreed, except for receipts 329; 270; 403; 256; 208; 199; 283 and 289 which were partial payments.

	Amount Billed and Debited to Accounts Receivable	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2009	Amount Credited to Accounts Receivable	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
329	\$117.20	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$2,542.44	2/10/2009	2/10/2009
336	\$517.70	\$517.70	\$517.70	\$1,606.01	2/11/2009	2/11/2009
270	\$523.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$6,944.25	5/12/2009	5/12/2009
403	\$73.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$275.00	8/5/2009	8/5/2009
474	\$111.01	\$111.01	\$111.01	\$728.51	11/30/2009	11/30/2009

	Amount Billed and Debited to Accounts Receivable	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2008	Amount Credited to Accounts Receivable	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
256	\$473.14	\$157.71	\$157.71	\$605.31	2/20/2008	2/20/2008
208	\$337.50	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$1,019.40	3/24/2008	3/24/2008
199	\$366.00	\$166.00	\$166.00	\$241.00	4/9/2008	4/9/2008
283	\$402.14	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$677.94	9/5/2008	9/5/2008
289	\$818.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$1,808.00	11/13/2008	11/13/2008

We also agreed the amounts billed above to the rates in force as of the service date. We noted 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. I noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during the 2009 or 2008 calendar year.

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 Payroll Register and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and the approved board minutes 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. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
 - d. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
 - e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)
 - f. Fund to which the check should be charged.

We found no exceptions related to the steps above, except the fund was not indicated, to which the check should be charged. We recommend the District indicate the fund to which the check should be charged, within the personnel file.

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, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009 and 2008. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2009	11/6/08; 12/8/08; 1/5/09	\$6,734.00	\$6,734.00
State income taxes	January 15, 2009	12/9/09	\$634.00	\$634.00
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2009	1/5/09	\$4,787.98	\$4,787.98

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	11/5/09; 12/8/09; 1/4/10	\$6,191.00	\$6,191.00
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	1/5/10	\$623.00	\$623.00
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2010	1/5/10	\$4,754.04	\$4,754.04

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 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.
 - a. 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 compared the total from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources for 2009 and 2008, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Receipt Journal Report for the General, and Special Revenue funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The Receipt Journal Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and Special Revenue funds of \$-0- for 2009. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$774,147.54 for the General Fund and \$56,058.96 for the Special Revenue Fund. The Receipt Journal Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$400,350 and Special Revenue Fund was \$34,250 for 2008. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$759,414.81 for the General Fund and \$42,865.45 for the Special Revenue Fund. 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 and Special Revenue funds, 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 that the appropriation measures for 2009 and 2008 were not adopted 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).
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 following funds: General and Special Revenue Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report for 2009. However, the total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38 and 5705.40 for 2008, did not agree to the 2008 Appropriation Status report. The amount of the total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38 and 5705.40 was \$759,414.81 for the General Fund and \$42,865.45 for the Special Revenue Fund. The amount per the Appropriation Status report for the General Fund was \$665,120 and \$42,000 for the Special Revenue Fund.
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 and Special Revenue funds 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 and Special Revenue Funds as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

6. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Receipt Journal Report and Appropriation Status Report for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$500.00 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.

We inquired of management and scanned the 2009 and 2008 Appropriation Status Report 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 the following statute(s):

Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.376 requires a fire and ambulance district to competitively bid purchases exceeding \$50,000 (other than compensation).

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

Officials' Response:

Exception Noted:

The amount agreed as December 31, 2008. The amount per the bank reconciliation as of December 31, 2009 was \$493,458.17 and the amount per the Fund Status Report was \$491,591.06, representing a difference of \$1,867.11.

Response:

The cash balance has been corrected as of January 31, 2010.

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 the Auditor of State and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Kevin L. Penn, Inc.

June 11, 2010

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

TRI-DIVISION AMBULANCE DISTRICT

STARK 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 22, 2011**