



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MARTINS FERRY PARK DISTRICT
BELMONT COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Martins Ferry Park District
Belmont County
510 Orchid Drive
Martins Ferry, Ohio 43935

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Commissioners and the management of the Martins Ferry Park District, Belmont 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 and 2010, 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. The District processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the District because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2009 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, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

We selected the total receipts from the County Auditor's Cross Reference Report by Vendor from 2011 and from 2010.

- a. We compared the amount from the above 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.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard, or legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files or minute record or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files 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.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	1/31/12	1/3/12	\$158.61	\$158.61
State income taxes	1/15/12	12/30/11	\$11.84	\$11.84
Local income tax	1/31/12	12/30/11	\$14.13	\$14.13
OPERS retirement	1/30/12	1/6/12	\$172.94	\$172.94

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General fund for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General fund, the Commissioners appropriated separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services," as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2), 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the General Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.28(B)(2)(c) prohibits appropriations from exceeding the estimated revenue available for expenditure (receipts plus beginning unencumbered cash). We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the General Fund for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We noted no appropriations which exceeded estimated revenue.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.41(B) prohibit expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for the General Fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted expenditures did not exceed appropriations.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under Article XI of the Districts Bylaws, adopted pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code Section 1545.09(A), which states the District will obtain three quotes for expenditures exceeding \$25,000, but less than \$50,000. Competitive bidding is required purchases exceeding \$50,000.

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

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

March 26, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MARTINS FERRY PARK DISTRICT

BELMONT 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
APRIL 12, 2012**