



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Jefferson Belmont Regional Solid Waste Authority
Jefferson County
P.O. Box 4699
Steubenville, Ohio 43952

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Jefferson Belmont Regional Solid Waste Authority (the "Authority") 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 Statement of Cash Flows – Direct to the December 31, 2012 documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Statement of Cash Flows – Direct to the December 31, 2013 balances in the Statement of Cash Flows – Direct. 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 balance reported in the Statement of Cash Flows - Direct. We found no exceptions.
4. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts 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 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 found no exceptions.

Tipping Fees and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We confirmed the amounts paid from Apex Environmental, LLC to the Authority during 2014 and 2013. They confirmed payment of the following amounts to the Authority:

Company	2014 Payments	2013 Payments
Apex Environmental, LLC	\$1,092,715	\$1,946,586

- a. We compared the amount confirmed with the amount the Authority recorded in its receipt records. The only difference was Apex Environmental, LLC confirmed \$115,204 more than the Authority recorded during 2013 and \$10,376 less than the Authority recorded in 2014. This was due to the timing of the payment and recording of November fees. November 2013 fees were paid by Apex in December 2013 and recorded by the Authority in January 2014 and November 2014 fees were paid by Apex in December 2014 and recorded by the Authority in January 2015. Therefore we did not consider this an exception.
 - 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.
2. We obtained the March 2013 and June 2014 total tonnage reports from the landfill in step 1.
 - a. We recalculated the dollar amount sent to the Authority based on the rates in force during the period and agreed to the amounts posted to the Authority's ledgers. We found no exceptions.

Other Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2014 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2013 recorded in the receipt records files and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Journal. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following lease outstanding as of December 31, 2012. The amounts agreed to the Authority's January 1, 2013 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2012:
Truck Lease	\$400,719

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Journal and Expenditure Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

Debt – (Continued)

3. We obtained a summary of lease debt activity for 2014 and 2013 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to general fund payments reported in the Expenditure journal. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Authority made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2014 and one payroll check for five employees from 2013 from the Quick Check/Transaction Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount recorded in the Quick Check/Transaction Register to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and 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 any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the minute record and personnel files were 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 and fund 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

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

3. 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 & Medicare	January 31, 2015	December 26, 2014	\$2,459	\$2,459
State income taxes	January 15, 2015	January 4, 2015	\$1,123	\$1,123
Local income tax	January 31, 2015	January 6, 2015	\$582	\$582
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2015	January 15, 2015	\$9,943	\$9,943

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Quick Check/Transaction Register:
 - a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The Authority'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 ten disbursements from the Check/Voucher Register – Detail for the year ended December 31, 2014 and ten from the year ended 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 Check/Voucher Register – Detail 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. The fiscal officer certified disbursements requiring certification or issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.
 - e. The disbursement was allowable under Ohio Rev. Code Section 3734.57(G), and the Authority's policies and procedures. 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 Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Detail Budget/Actual Transactions report for the General, Tire Amnesty and Capital Reserve Funds for the year ended December 31, 2014 and the General fund for the year ended December 31, 2013. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2014 and 2013 to determine whether, for the General, Tire Amnesty and Capital Reserve funds for 2014 and the General fund for 2013, the Directors appropriated separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services," as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2), 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Detail Budget/Actual Transactions report for 2014 for the General, Tire Amnesty and Capital Reserve funds and for 2013 for the General fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Detail Budget/Actual Transactions report.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.28(B)(2)(c) prohibits appropriations from exceeding the estimated revenue available for expenditure (receipts plus beginning unencumbered cash). We compared total appropriations to total estimated revenue for the General, Tire Amnesty and Capital Reserve funds for the year ended December 31, 2014 and the General fund for the year ended December 31, 2013. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded estimated revenue.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.28(B)(2) and 5705.41(B) prohibit expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the year ended December 31, 2014 for the General, Tire Amnesty and Capital Reserve funds and for the year ended December 31, 2013 for the General fund, as recorded in the Detail Budget/Actual Transactions report. We noted that expenditures did not exceed appropriations.
6. We scanned the 2014 and 2013 Revenue Journals and Detail Budget/Actual Transactions 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.
7. We scanned the Balance Sheet for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 for negative cash fund balance. 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.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Authority'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 Authority, 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

July 2, 2015

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

JEFFERSON BELMONT SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY

JEFFERSON 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 13, 2015**