

**SPENCER COMMUNITY
FIRE DISTRICT
MEDINA COUNTY
Agreed-Upon Procedures
For the Years Ended December 31, 2012 and 2011**

Perry & Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Spencer Community Fire District
105 East Lorain Road
Spencer, Ohio 44275

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Spencer Community Fire District, Medina County, prepared by Perry & Associates, Certified Public Accountants, A.C., for the period January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report 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. Spencer Community Fire 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

July 24, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.

**SPENCER COMMUNITY FIRE DISTRICT
MEDINA COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Perry & Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.
www.perrycpas.com

MARIETTA
428 Second Street
Marietta, OH 45750
(740) 373-0056
(740) 373-2402 Fax

PARKERSBURG
1035 Murdoch Avenue
Parkersburg, WV 26101
(304) 422-2203
(304) 428-5587 Fax

ST. CLAIRSVILLE
121 E. Main Street
St. Clairsville, OH 43950
(740) 695-1569
(740) 695-5775 Fax

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

June 14, 2013

Spencer Community Fire District
Medina County
105 East Lorain Road
Spencer, Ohio 44275

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the **Spencer Community Fire District**, Medina County, Ohio (the District) and the 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, 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. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balance recorded in the Annual Financial Report to the December 31, 2010 balance in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balance recorded in the Annual Financial Report to the December 31, 2011 balance in the Annual Financial Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 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.

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 2012 and one from 2011:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the General Ledger. It was noted that the amounts were posted at net rather than at gross in 2012 and 2011. We recommend that the entity post the tax receipts at gross and then post a "memo" expenditure for the county auditor/treasurer fees. We found no other exceptions.
 - 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 General Ledger to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the General Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Cross Reference Report from 2012 and all from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the General Ledger. The amounts agreed. However, we noted that various intergovernmental receipts were recorded as property tax receipts in 2012 and 2011. We also noted an intergovernmental receipt recorded as a miscellaneous receipt in 2012, and an intergovernmental receipt recorded as a charges for services receipt in 2011.
 - 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.

Charges for Services

1. We haphazardly selected five receipts recorded in the cash receipts records from the year ended December 31, 2012 and five from the year ended December 31, 2011. We compared the receipt to the amount credited in the bank statement. We also compared the date the payment was recorded in the cash receipts records to the date deposited per the bank statement. Per the table below, the amounts agreed, and the cash was deposited timely.

Charges for Services (Continued)

2012

	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2012	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
1.	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.00	3/10/2012	3/10/2012
2.	\$ 445.82	\$ 445.82	3/20/2012	3/20/2012
3.	\$ 313.60	\$ 313.60	3/27/2012	3/27/2012
4.	\$ 548.00	\$ 548.00	3/27/2012	3/27/2012
5.	\$ 449.60	\$ 449.60	3/28/2012	3/28/2012

2011

	Amount Recorded in Cash Receipts Records, 2011	Amount Deposited per Bank Statement	Date Recorded in Cash Receipts Records	Date Deposited per Bank Statement
1.	\$ 100.57	\$ 100.57	8/5/2011	8/5/2011
2.	\$ 488.00	\$ 488.00	8/12/2011	8/12/2011
3.	\$ 320.81	\$ 320.81	8/23/2011	8/23/2011
4.	\$ 561.00	\$ 561.00	8/23/2011	8/23/2011
5.	\$ 351.00	\$ 351.00	9/8/2011	9/8/2011

2. We confirmed the amounts paid from Life Force Management, the service organization that performs the emergency medical billings, to the District during 2012 and 2011 with Life Force Management. We noted the service organization bills for the services; however, all payments for these services are made directly to the District. We determined the District does not perform a reconciliation between amounts billed versus amounts collected. We recommend the District reconcile each month between amounts billed versus amounts collected. The District should also receive a detailed accounts receivable report to review each month and implement procedures for collecting these amounts.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. 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, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the General Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

Debt (Continued)

3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to General Fund payments recorded in the General Ledger. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the District made the payments. We found no exceptions.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the General Fund per the General Ledger. The amount recorded on the debt note showed \$100,115; however, the amount recorded in the 2011 General Ledger was \$100,000. Also, the debt proceeds were recorded as a reduction in Tools & Equipment expenses instead of Debt Proceeds.
5. For new debt issued during 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the District must use the proceeds to purchase a rescue vehicle. We scanned the General Ledger and noted the District purchased a rescue vehicle in March of 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 General Ledger and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the General Ledger to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the manual payroll register. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record or as required by statute. 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 the remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employers share, where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2012. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2013	January 8, 2013	\$ 478.80	\$ 478.80
State income taxes	January 31, 2013	December 28, 2012	\$ 380.64	\$ 380.64
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 10, 2013	\$ 1,998.48	\$ 1,998.48

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the General Ledger 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 General Ledger 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 five instances in 2012 and one instance in 2011 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 Expense Budget Report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amounts recorded on the Report. The Expense Budget Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources of \$200,000 for 2012 and \$197,500 for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$199,781 for 2012 and \$201,919 for 2011. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Expense Budget 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether 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 Budget Report for 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts recorded on the Budget Report. The Budget Report recorded appropriations of \$223,995 for 2012 and \$395,892 for 2011. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$193,680 for 2012 and \$198,180 for 2011. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budget Report to the amounts recorded on the appropriation resolution 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 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 years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted no fund 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, 2012 and 2011 as recorded in the Budget Report. We noted that expenditures for 2011 exceeded total appropriations by \$134,389, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). The fiscal officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The fiscal officer may request the Trustees to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary, and if resources are available.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the General Ledger for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and 2011 Expense Budget Reports and Budget 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 Budget 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.

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

Respectfully Submitted,



Perry and Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SPENCER COMMUNITY FIRE DISTRICT

MEDINA 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
AUGUST 6, 2013**