



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Bascom Joint Ambulance District
Seneca County
P.O. Box 119
Bascom, Ohio 44809-0119

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Bascom Joint Ambulance District, Seneca 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, 2014 and 2013, 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, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Balance Sheet Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Balance Sheet Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the Balance Sheet Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2014 and 2013 fund cash balances reported in the Balance Sheet Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2014 bank account balance with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balance to the amount appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February bank statements. 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 and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the *Statement*) for 2014 and one from 2013.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Profit and Loss Detail Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2014 and 2013. We noted the Profit and Loss Detail Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2014 and all from 2013. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2014 and five from 2013.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
 - 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, 2012.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Profit and Loss Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for all employees from 2014 and one payroll check for all employees from 2013 from the Profit and Loss Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail Report. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the account code to which the check was posted was 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, 2014 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 2014. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2015	January 22, 2015	\$484.74	\$484.74
State income taxes	January 31, 2015	January 22, 2015	46.07	46.07
Ohio school district income tax	January 31, 2015	January 22, 2015	15.35	15.35
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2015	January 19, 2015	324.72	324.72

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Profit and Loss Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2014 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2013 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 Profit and Loss 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.

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 accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. The amounts did not agree as the District does not integrate budgetary data into their accounting system. Failure to integrate budgetary data into the accounting system can result in inadequate and inefficient monitoring by the Board. We recommend the Fiscal Officer integrate budgetary data into the accounting system.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2014 and 2013 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the accounting records for 2014 and 2013. The amounts did not agree as the District does not integrate budgetary data into the accounting system. Failure to integrate budgetary data into the accounting system can result in inadequate and inefficient monitoring by the Board. We recommend the Fiscal Officer integrate budgetary data into the accounting system.

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, 2014 and 2013. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded estimated 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, 2014 and 2013 as recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail Report. We noted that expenditures for 2014 exceeded total appropriations by \$28,037, 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.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Profit and Loss Detail Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2014 and 2013. 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 inquired of management and scanned the accounting records 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, 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

Columbus, Ohio

June 18, 2015



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

BASCOM JOINT AMBULANCE DISTRICT

SENECA 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
JULY 7, 2015**