



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Lawrence County Soil and Water Conservation District
Lawrence County
P.O. Box 144
5459 State Route 217
Willow Wood, Ohio 45696

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Lawrence County Soil and Water Conservation District (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 through 2015, 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. 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.

Depository Balances, Investments and Fund Balances

We applied the following procedures to each *Cash Basis Annual Financial Report* (the Reports) for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

1. We footed and cross-footed the amounts on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports, and compared the *Fund Cash Balances, December 31* to the *Fund Balances* on page 2. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the *Disbursements plus Other Financing Uses* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Disbursements reported on page 4. The amounts agreed with the exception of the 2012 and 2015 year reports. There was a \$2,000 and \$18,000 variance, respectively noted.
3. We compared the *Receipts plus Other Financing Sources* for the Special Fund on pages 3A and 3B of the Reports to the Actual Receipts reported on page 5. The amounts agreed with the exceptions of the 2012, 2013, and 2014 years where we noted the Actual Receipts' amounts were not recorded on page 5.
4. We recalculated the mathematical accuracy of the reconciliation on page 2. We found no exceptions.
5. We agreed the January 1 and December 31 fund cash balances reported in the District's Fund Ledger report to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. The amounts agreed with one exception. We noted a \$10 variance for the January 1, 2011 fund cash balance when comparing the Fund Ledger report to the corresponding Fund Cash Balances on page 3B of the Report of the same year.

We also applied the following procedures to the *Subtotals* and *Totals* reported on page 2 of the December 31, 2015 Report:

6. We confirmed the December 31 bank account depository balances for the District Fund and Envirothon Fund with the District's financial institutions. The balances agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the Statement of Cash Position as of December 31, 2015. We found no exceptions.
8. For the two checks comprising the Outstanding Checks, we applied the following procedures:
 - a. We footed the supporting outstanding check list and compared it to the Totals on the Report. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced each of the two checks to the subsequent July bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We traced the amounts and dates of each of the two checks to the check register, to determine the check was recorded for the same amount and dated and recorded prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

We applied the following procedures for the years ended December 31, 2011 through December 31, 2015:

1. We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the County Auditor's Revenue Transaction Ledger Report. The amounts agreed.

All Other Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected ten other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2014 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and:

1. Agreed the receipt amount to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
2. Agreed the amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We found no exceptions.
3. Inspected the Receipt Register Report to determine the receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for two employees for each of the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2014 from the Payroll Transmittal Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Transmittal Report to supporting documentation (timesheets, legislatively-approved rate). We found no exceptions.

- b. We inspected the Payroll Transmittal Report to determine whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We inspected the Payroll Transmittal Report to determine whether the check was classified as *salaries* and whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
 2. For the five employees selected in step 1 from 2015, we compared the following information in the employees' personnel files and minute record was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to the check:
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
 - c. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
 - d. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – e. above.

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) occurring between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2015, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll Transmittal Report:
 - a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The District's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected five disbursements from the *Special Fund* and five disbursements from the *District Fund* and other funds from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and two from the *Special Fund* and three from the *District Fund* and other funds for each of the years ended 2011 through 2014 and determined whether:
 - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - b. For *District Fund* and other funds disbursements, we determined whether:
 - i. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the similar data recorded in the Payment Register Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
 - c. For *Special Fund* disbursements, we determined whether:

- i. The payee name and amount recorded on the voucher submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the County Auditor's Expense Transaction Ledgers. We found no exceptions.
- ii. The names and amounts on the voucher agreed to supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
- iii. The voucher was signed by the fiscal officer and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

2015 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We inspected the District's Special Fund Budget Request submitted to the County Commissioners. We noted the request included the Special Fund's *Needs, Income* and *Balances* anticipated for carry over from the current year, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook, Chapter 5. We also compared the budget amounts to the budgetary schedules on pages 4 and 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report. The amounts did not agree. The budget request amount was \$247,500 versus the budgetary schedule amount on Page 4 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report of \$234,591.58.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the Report to the *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), and to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the Special Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Special Fund of \$234,591.58 for 2015 and the *Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$234,591.58. However, the total estimated receipts on Page 5 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report indicated \$247,500. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Board of Supervisors may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
3. We inspected the appropriation measures to determine whether the Supervisors appropriated separate amounts within the Special Fund 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.
4. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Expense Transaction Ledger Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. The amounts did not agree. We noted that page 4 of the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report had total appropriations of \$234,591.58 and the Expense Transaction Ledger Report had recorded appropriations of \$284,467.77. The fiscal officer should compare amounts recorded in the Cash Basis Annual Financial Report to amounts recorded in the Expense Transaction Ledger Report to assure they agree.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated revenue. We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2015. We noted appropriations did not exceed estimated revenues for the Special Fund.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus year-end certified commitments (i.e. encumbrances)) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total disbursements plus outstanding year-end encumbrances to total appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2015 for the "Special" Fund, as recorded in the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report. We noted expenditures did not exceed appropriations for the Special Fund.

7. We inspected the Annual Cash Basis Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

2015 Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and inspected the County Auditor's Expense Transaction Ledger and the Fund Ledger Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 to determine if the District purchased equipment and services allowed by ORC 1515.09 or purchased goods or services allowed by ORC 1515.08(H)(1) whose cost, other than personal service compensation or office space rent, exceeded \$50,000. We noted no purchases exceeding \$50,000.

2015 Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires Districts to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed the HINKLE system and noted the District filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the year ended December 31, 2015.

This agreed-upon procedures engagement followed 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*. We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion respectively on the District's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. 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 use of the District to assist in evaluating its receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2011 through 2015, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances and is not suitable for any other purpose.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

May 5, 2017

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

LAWRENCE COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

LAWRENCE 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 23, 2017