



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Mantua Shalersville Fire District  
Portage County  
10303 State Route 44  
Mantua, Ohio 44255

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Mantua Shalersville Fire 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, 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 and Investments

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 balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Ledger 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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the District's financial institution. We found no exceptions. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
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.

### **Cash and Investments – (Continued)**

6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2012 and 2011 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 to determine that they:
  - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
  - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. 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 Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds 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 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all four from 2011. We also selected all four receipts from the County Auditor's "Vendor Invoice List" from 2012 and all three from 2011.
  - 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(s). 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 confirmed the amounts paid the District from the Life Force Management, the service organization that performs the emergency medical billings, to the District during 2012. We found no exceptions.
  - 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 audit documentation, we noted the following general obligation bonds in the amount of \$2,505,000 and Lease Obligation in the amount of \$239,000 outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Districts January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
Fire Station General Obligation Bonds, Series 2002	\$2,505,000
KME Pumper Lease	239,700

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted proceeds of debt in the Receipt Register Report but nothing in the Payment Register Report. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and Lease debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to the Building Fund Retirement Fund, and the Equipment, Buildings & Land 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.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2012:
Fire District Improvement Refunding Bonds, Series 2012	\$2,130,000
KME Pumper Lease	97,745

4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Building Fund Retirement Fund (Fund 3101) per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed. The District properly recorded the proceeds in a bond fund as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09(E).
5. For new debt issued during 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the District must use the proceeds to Refund the Fire Station General Obligation Bonds, Series 2002. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted no corresponding disbursements. The refunding disbursement was posted as a memo entry and was not reflected in the Payment Register Detail Report.

**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 Payroll Register Detail Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate to the salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record and contracts. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)**

2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files 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. Departments and funds 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.)
  - g. Fund to which the check should be charged.

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, 2012 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 2012. 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 (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2013	January 10, 2013	\$ 14,932.13	\$ 14,932.13
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	January 10, 2013	2,449.50	2,449.50
Local income tax	January 30, 2013	December 13, 2012	148.25	148.25
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	4,406.12	4,406.12
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	13,558.15	13,558.15

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report 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 Payment Register Detail 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. We found six instances where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a *Then and Now Certificate* was approved by the Board of Trustees for a purchase over \$3,000 on one of the six instances. 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 Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General Fund, Fire District Fund and the Equipment, Buildings and Land Fund 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 Fund, Fire District Fund and the Equipment, Buildings and Land Fund, 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 Appropriation Status Report for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: the General Fund, Fire District Fund and the Equipment, Buildings and Land Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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 following funds: the General Fund, Fire District Fund and the Equipment, Buildings and Land Fund for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 the General Fund, Fire District Fund and the Equipment, Buildings and Land Fund as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
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, 2012 and 2011. We also inquired of management regarding whether the District received new restricted receipts. The District established the State Fire Grant Fund during 2012 to segregate a State Fire Training Grant receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10,000 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 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.

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 style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

June 19, 2013



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**MANTUA-SHALERSVILLE FIRE DISTRICT**

**PORTAGE 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 30, 2013**