



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



**SCIOTO AMBULANCE DISTRICT  
SCIOTO COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Scioto Ambulance District  
Scioto County  
P.O. Box 137  
McDermott, Ohio 45652

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Scioto Ambulance District, Scioto 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. The District processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the District because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

### Cash

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 Status Report to the December 31, 2009 balances in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. 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 Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

**Cash (Continued)**

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February 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 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 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 three receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and all three from 2010.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
  - 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Medical Agencies to the District during 2011 and 2010 by agreeing them to supporting documentation such as remittance slip and/or invoice. We found the following exception: 9.8% of receipts tested in 2010 did not have the proper support attached to the receipt.
  - 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. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2009. This amount agreed to the District's January 1, 2010 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Wesbanco Loan for two ambulances	\$13,685

**Debt (Continued)**

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to general fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. 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. The amounts agreed, however, the debt proceeds were not recorded as Debt Proceeds on the District's financial statement.
5. For new debt issued during 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the District must use the proceeds to purchase a new ambulance. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the District purchased an ambulance in October of 2011.

**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 Register and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the account code 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. For the one new employee selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the minute record 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 to which the check should be charged.
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
  - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
  - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.).

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, during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare	01/31/12	12/31/11	\$8,474	\$8,474
State income taxes	01/15/12	12/31/11	\$566	\$566
OPERS retirement	01/30/12	12/31/11	\$6,215	\$6,215

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 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 Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. There was one item tested where the check number entered on the UAN system did not match the check number on the copy of the check on the bank statement.
- 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 six instances where disbursements requiring certification were not certified and five instances where there was not enough supporting documentation to determine if the items were properly certified. 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 for 2010 and the Official Certificate of Estimated Resources for 2011, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 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 exception for 2011; however, the District did not adopt an appropriation measure for 2010.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010. The amounts on the appropriations resolution for 2011 agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report. The District did not adopt an appropriation measure for 2010; however, amounts were included in the Appropriation Status report for 2010.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibit appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources 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 as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted that expenditures for 2010 exceeded total appropriations by \$502,500, 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 Receipt Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2011 and 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 inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Status 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.

**Officials' Response** – We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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

July 30, 2012

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**SCIOTO AMBULANCE DISTRICT**

**SCIOTO 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 14, 2012**