



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

North Central Ohio Solid Waste Management District
Allen County
815 Shawnee Road, Suite D
Lima, Ohio 45805

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of the North Central Ohio Solid Waste Management District, Allen County (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, 2012 and 2011, 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. Allen County is custodian for the District's deposits. We compared the District's fund balances reported on its December 31, 2012 Financial Statements to the balances reported in Allen County's accounting records. The amounts agreed.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the January YTD Cash Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.

Tipping Fees and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Wyandot County and Cherokee Run Landfills to the District during 2012 and 2011. They confirmed payment of the following amounts to the District:

<u>Company</u>	<u>2012 Payments</u>	<u>2011 Payments</u>
Wyandot County Landfill	\$496,011.15	\$350,978.77
Cherokee Run Landfill	\$368,953.90	\$331,956.16

- a. We compared the amount confirmed with the amount the District recorded in its receipt records. We found no exceptions.
- 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.

Tipping Fees and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts (Continued)

2. We obtained the May 2011 and February 2012 total tonnage reports from the landfill(s) in step 1.
 - a. We recalculated the dollar amount sent to the District based on the rates in force during the period and agreed to the amounts posted to the Districts ledgers. We found no exceptions.

Other Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the monthly Detail YTD Revenue Reports. The amounts agreed.
- b. 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, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Detail YTD Revenue Reports and Detail YTD Expense Reports for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2012 or 2011, no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Earnings and Deductions Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount recorded in the Earnings and Deductions Detail 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 minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 to determine whether remittances were timely charged by the fiscal agent Allen County, and if the amounts charged agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding, period of 2012. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 19, 2012	\$1,650.73	\$1,650.73
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 19, 2012	\$ 416.59	\$ 416.59
Local income tax	January 30, 2013	January 4, 2013	\$ 71.12	\$ 71.12
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 23, 2013	\$6,632.38	\$6,632.38

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Detail YTD Expense Reports for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 Detail YTD Expense 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.
 - e. The disbursement was allowable under Ohio Rev. Code Section 3734.57(G), and the Districts policies and procedures. 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 December Detail YTD Revenue Reports for the General and Shelby Recycling Center Funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General and Shelby Recycling Center funds, the Directors 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.
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 December Detail YTD Expense Reports for 2012 and 2011 for the general fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the December Detail YTD Expense reports.
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 and Shelby Recycling Center funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted no funds for which appropriations 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General fund, as recorded in the December Detail YTD Expense Reports. We noted that expenditures did not exceed appropriations.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the monthly Detail YTD Expense reports for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 for projects requiring the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We identified no projects subject to the aforementioned prevailing wage 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 3, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NORTH CENTRAL OHIO SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

ALLEN 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 9, 2013**