



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Portage Joint Fire District
Ottawa County
242 West Water Street, P.O. Box 240
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449-0240

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Portage Joint Fire District, Ottawa 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.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

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 Ledger 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 Ledger Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected all reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. None of the debits had cleared as of February 29, 2012. These debits were included in the February, 2012 cash reconciliation as reconciling debits.
 - 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.

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected one property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2011 and one from 2010.
 - 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(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 Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and 2010. We also selected all receipts from the Ottawa County Auditor Confirmation (County Confirmation) from 2011 and 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and County Confirmation to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register 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.
4. We confirmed the amount paid from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to the District during 2010 with the FEMA Assistance to Firefighters Grant Disbursement Listing. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were 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 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 Payroll Item Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Item Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted were 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.
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 and Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)
 - g. Fund to which the check should be charged

We found no exceptions related to the steps 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. Because employees are paid twice per year the due dates and payment dates below have been limited to the third withholding period of 2011, the last period for which amounts would be due and payable to remitter agencies. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	October 31, 2011	July 11, 2011	\$3,846	\$3,846
State income taxes	October 15, 2011	July 11, 2011	257	257
Oak Harbor Local income tax	October 31, 2011	July 11, 2011	246	246
OPERS retirement	October 30, 2011	July 11, 2011	391	391

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 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 six instances where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a *Then and Now Certificate* was issued. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should be on or before the invoice date, unless a *Then and Now Certificate* is used. Because we did not test all disbursements requiring certification, our report provides no assurance whether or not additional similar errors occurred.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts 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 Ledger Report for the General and Permanent Improvement funds 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 and Permanent Improvement 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 no exceptions.

3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Payment Register Report for 2011 and 2010 for the General and Permanent Improvement funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Payment Register Report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General and Permanent Improvement funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General and Permanent Improvement funds, as recorded in the Payment Register Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
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, 2011 and December 31, 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 Revenue Ledger Reports and Payment Register Reports for evidence of interfund transfers 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 Payment Register 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 and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under the following statute(s):

Ohio Rev. Code Sections 505.37 to 505.42 and 731.14 require a fire district to competitively bid purchases of fire apparatus, mechanical resuscitators, other fire equipment, appliances, materials, fire hydrants, buildings, or fire-alarm communications equipment or service costs exceeding \$50,000.

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

Officials' Response:

The Fiscal Officer/Treasurer of the Portage Fire District will work with the Fire Chief to ensure purchases are properly certified at the time of purchase.

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.

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

April 25, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PORTAGE JOINT FIRE DISTRICT

OTTAWA 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 10, 2012