



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Stark County Soil and Water Conservation District
Stark County
2650 Richville Drive S.E.
Massillon, Ohio 44646

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Supervisors (the Board) and the management of the Stark 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, 2010 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. 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*. 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, 2010 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. We noted the following exceptions:

Fund	Disbursements on pg. 4	Disbursements on pg. 3A
Special - 2015	\$0	\$281,909
Special - 2012	\$178,845	\$217,631

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. We noted the following exception:

Fund	Receipts on pg. 5	Receipts on pg. 3A
Special - 2015	\$0	\$348,735

4. We tested 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 Quickbooks Total Bank Accounts on the Balance Sheet to the corresponding *Fund Cash Balances* on page 3B of the Reports. We noted the following variances in the District Fund:

Date	Annual Report Fund Balance	Balance Sheet Total Bank Accounts	Variance
December 31, 2010	\$239,602	\$239,707	\$105
January 1, 2011	\$239,602	\$239,707	\$105
December 31, 2011	\$304,582	\$304,725	(\$143)
January 1, 2012	\$304,582	\$304,725	(\$143)
January 1, 2013	\$0	\$409,936	(\$409,936)
December 31, 2013	\$116,813	\$445,616	(\$328,803)
January 1, 2014	\$446,606	\$445,616	(\$990)

We also noted the following variances in the Special Fund:

Date	Annual Report Fund Balance	County Fund Balance by Date Report	Variance
January 1, 2015	\$86,493	\$87,234	(\$741)
December 31, 2015	\$153,319	\$81,060	\$72,259

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 balance for the District Fund with the District's financial institution. The balances agreed.
7. We compared the December 31 Special Fund depository balance from the *Report* to the amount reported in the County Fund Balance by Date Report. The amounts differed by \$72,259. We noted the District recorded \$73,000 as Other Revenue but also recorded it as a Transfer In resulting in an overstatement of the Fund Balance on the Report of \$73,000.
8. For the 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 check to the subsequent January bank statement. We noted that seven of the outstanding checks totaling \$3,015 did not clear the bank as of the date of this report. These checks were issued between August of 2014 and October of 2015. No other exceptions were noted.
 - c. We traced the amounts and dates of each check 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.
9. For amounts comprising the Cash in Transit to Depository, we applied the following procedures:
 - a. We compared the Cash in Transit to Depository from the Report to corresponding credits recorded in subsequent January bank statement. We noted all five deposits in transit totaling \$1,433 were still outstanding as of the report date.
 - b. We agreed the Cash in Transit to Depository from the Report to the District Check Register. The credit was recorded as a January or February receipt and for the same amount in the District Check Register. We found no exceptions.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

We applied the following procedures for the years ended December 31, 2010 through December 31, 2015:

- 1 We agreed the total of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and the total of the receipts from the County Auditor's General Ledger to the total amounts recorded in the respective receipt classification in the Special Fund in the Annual Report. The amounts agreed.
- 2 We haphazardly selected five other confirmable receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and three other confirmable receipts from each of the years ended December 31, 2010 through 2014 in the District Check Register from funds other than the *Special Fund* such as grants, municipal and township funds.
 - a. We agreed the amounts paid from the municipalities and townships to the District to the copy of the check or the check stub from the municipality or township. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.

All Other Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 other cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and five other cash receipts from each of the years ended 2010 through 2014 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

1. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the District Check Register. The amounts agreed.
2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period, if applicable. We noted the District did not retain supporting documentation for 14 of the 35 receipts tested to verify amounts were correctly charged.
3. 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, 2010 through 2014 from the County Payroll Ledger and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the County Payroll Ledger to supporting documentation of County payroll transmittal records. We found no exceptions. We determined whether salaries and benefits were paid only from the *Special Fund*, as required by the SWCD Administrative Handbook Chapter 5. We noted no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the check was classified as *salaries*. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

2. For the five employees tested in step 1 from 2015, we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel 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, 2010 and December 31, 2015, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the County Payroll Register:
 - 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 District Check Register 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 2010 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 District Check Register and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We noted one instance in 2015 where a direct debit of \$618.30 did not clear the bank. As such, the District determined that the payment should not be included in the expenditures or the outstanding check register.
 - 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 invoice submitted to the County Auditor agreed to the payee name and amount recorded in the District Check Register and the County General Ledger. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. The invoice was signed by the District Administrator and approved by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.

2015 Special Fund Budgetary Compliance

1. We read 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. We noted the Estimated Receipts of \$353,000 did not agree to the amount posted on the schedule on pg. 5 of \$0. We noted the Appropriations of \$357,436 did not agree to the amount posted on the schedule on pg. 4 of \$0.
2. We compared the total estimated receipts reported on Page 5 of the Report to the *Amended Official 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 Budget to Actual Report for the Special Fund. The District did not receive a Budget to Actual Report to monitor receipts from the County Auditor. The District recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) receipts of \$0 in the Annual Report. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$353,000. The District Administrator should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budget to Actual 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 scanned 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 Budget to Actual Report for the Special Fund, and to the appropriations reported on Page 4 of the Report. Noted the approved appropriations of \$357,436 did not agree to the County Budget to Actual Report of \$358,171 or the amount recorded on pg. 4 of the Annual Report of \$0. The District Administrator should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budget to Actual Report to approved appropriations. If the amounts do not agree, the Board of Supervisors may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.28(B)(2)(C) prohibit appropriations from exceeding estimated resources. We compared total appropriations to total estimated resources for the Special Fund for the year ended December 31, 2015. We noted appropriations did not exceed estimated resources for the Special Fund.
5. 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 determined that interfund transfers-in equaled transfers-out and were approved by the Board of Supervisors. We found no exceptions.
8. We scanned 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 scanned the District Check Register and the Stark County General Ledger 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.

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

November 30, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

STARK COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

STARK 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
JANUARY 12, 2017**