

COUNTY AUDIT

# KAY COUNTY

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012



*Independently serving the citizens of  
Oklahoma by promoting the  
accountability and fiscal integrity of  
governmental funds.*



Oklahoma State  
Auditor & Inspector  
Gary A. Jones, CPA, CFE

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
AND INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

This publication, issued by the Oklahoma State Auditor and Inspector's Office as authorized by 19 O.S. § 171, has not been printed, but is available on the agency's website ([www.sai.ok.gov](http://www.sai.ok.gov)) and in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries Publications Clearinghouse Digital Collection, pursuant to 74 O.S. § 3105.B.



# Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405.521.3495 • Fax: 405.521.3426

October 8, 2014

TO THE CITIZENS OF  
KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

Transmitted herewith is the audit of Kay County, Oklahoma for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. The audit was conducted in accordance with 19 O.S. § 171.

A report of this type can be critical in nature. Failure to report commendable features in the accounting and operating procedures of the entity should not be interpreted to mean that they do not exist.

The goal of the State Auditor and Inspector is to promote accountability and fiscal integrity in state and local government. Maintaining our independence as we provide this service to the taxpayers of Oklahoma is of utmost importance.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the assistance and cooperation extended to our office during our engagement.

Sincerely,

GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE  
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTORY SECTION (Unaudited)

Statistical Information.....	iii
County Officials.....	iv
Ad Valorem Tax Distribution .....	v
Assessed Value of Property Trend Analysis.....	vi
County Payroll Expenditures Analysis .....	vii
County General Fund Analysis .....	viii
County Highway Fund Analysis .....	ix

FINANCIAL SECTION

Report of State Auditor and Inspector .....	1
Financial Statement:	
Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances—Regulatory Basis (with Combining Information)—Major Funds.....	3
Notes to the Financial Statement.....	4

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Comparative Schedule of Receipts, Expenditures, and Changes in Cash Balances—Budget and Actual—Budgetary Basis—General Fund.....	9
Comparative Schedule of Receipts, Expenditures, and Changes in Cash Balances—Budget and Actual—Budgetary Basis—County Health Department Fund .....	11
Combining Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances—Regulatory Basis—Remaining Aggregate Funds .....	12
Notes to Other Supplementary Information .....	13
Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards .....	15
Note to the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards.....	16

INTERNAL CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE SECTION

Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters  
Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With  
*Government Auditing Standards*..... 17

Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance With Requirements That Could Have a Direct  
and Material Effect on Each Major Program and Internal Control Over Compliance in  
Accordance With OMB Circular A-133 ..... 19

Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs..... 21

Schedule of Prior Year Findings and Questioned Costs ..... 47

ITEMS OF INTEREST

**Finding 2012-8 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Purchasing and Noncompliance with State Statute (Repeat Finding):** OSAI noted two instances of obligating county funds prior to encumbering the purchases, three instances where the expenditure did not have supporting documentation, and one instance of an invoice paid that was not approved by the Board of County Commissioners. **(Pg. 28)**

**Finding 2012-10 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance with State Statute Regarding Bidding Procedures:** The Sheriff purchased a video surveillance system in the amount of \$70,692.36 and did not solicit bids for this purchase as required by state statute. Also, testwork reflected that \$102,065 in concrete, \$968 in screening, \$1,940 in crusher run, and \$1,353 in rebar used in the Courthouse Parking Lot Construction Project were purchased from vendors who did not submit bids. **(Pg. 29)**

**Finding 2012-11 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance with State Statutes Regarding Acceptance of Bids (Repeat Finding):** Bids received by the Board of County Commissioners for commonly-used goods and services were tabled for one week, and then all submitted bids were accepted as opposed to “lowest and best” as required per statute. Additionally, piece-meal bids of commonly-used goods and services were used to award entire projects without a project bidding process. Such a practice allowed vendors to provide goods and services for which it had not bid and/or to subcontract with non-bidders or other bidders that were not the lowest bidders. **(Pg. 31)**


**Finding 2012-3 – Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (Repeat Finding):** The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards submitted for the audit was overstated in the amount of \$94,522. This amount included BIA Expenditures which were understated by \$233,371 and FEMA expenditures which were overstated by \$324,251. **(Pg. 35)**

**Finding 2012-17 – Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Major Programs – BIA (Repeat Finding):** Federal BIA grant expenditures in the amount of \$1,179,162 were not adequately documented. OSAI could not determine that the work was completed as invoiced by the vendor. This amount has been reported as questioned costs. Also, \$24,322 of American Recovery Reinvestment Act expenditures were not supported by a vendor contract containing the required Buy-America clause. **(Pg. 39)**

**INTRODUCTORY SECTION  
UNAUDITED INFORMATION ON PAGES iii - ix  
PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY**

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
STATISTICAL INFORMATION  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---



Located in north central Oklahoma bordering Kansas, Kay County was formed from the “Cherokee Strip” or “Cherokee Outlet”. Originally designated as county “K,” its name means simply that.

Newkirk, the county seat, is home of the Kay County Courthouse, originally built in 1894 and replaced with the current stone courthouse in 1926. The economy of the county is based on petroleum wealth as well as productive agricultural land. Blackwell, the second largest city, is located in the midst of the rich Chikaskia River farmland.

Kaw Dam and Reservoir, part of the \$1.2 billion plan for the Arkansas River in Oklahoma and Arkansas, is located in Kay County. Other attractions include the 101 Ranch site, Pioneer Woman Statue and Museum, the Chilocco Indian School, Ponca City Cultural Center and Indian Museum, and the Marland Mansion, all in Ponca City. Annual events include the Iris Festival in April and the 101 Ranch Rodeo in August.

Kay County was once home to Territorial Governor William M. Jenkins and infamous outlaw Belle Starr. Three history books have been written about the county. They are: *Diamond Jubilee*, *The Last Run*, and *Keepsakes and Yesteryears*. Historical societies are located in Newkirk and Tonkawa. For more information, call the county clerk at (580) 362-2537.

County Seat – Newkirk

Area – 945.12 Square Miles

County Population – 46,110  
(2009 est.)

Farms – 1,050

Land in Farms – 492,178 Acres

Primary Source: Oklahoma Almanac 2011-2012

**Board of County Commissioners**

District 1 – Dee Schieber  
District 2 – Steve Austin  
District 3 – Tyson Rowe

**County Assessor**

Carol Purdy

**County Clerk**

Tammy Reese

**County Sheriff**

Everette VanHoesen

**County Treasurer**

Christy Kennedy

**Court Clerk**

Mary Ramey


**District Attorney**

Brian Hermanson



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
AD VALOREM TAX DISTRIBUTION  
SHARE OF THE AVERAGE MILLAGE  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

Property taxes are calculated by applying a millage rate to the assessed valuation of property. Millage rates are established by the Oklahoma Constitution. One mill equals one-thousandth of a dollar. For example, if the assessed value of a property is \$1,000.00 and the millage rate is 1.00, the tax on that property is \$1.00. This chart shows the different entities of the County and their share of the various millages as authorized by the Constitution.




County-Wide Millages		School District Millages								
		Cities/Towns				Career				
		Sinking	Gen.	Bldg.	Skg.	Tech	Common	Total		
County General	10.25									
County Health	1.79									
		Braman	I-18	-	36.04	5.15	7.89	15.23	4.10	68.41
		Peckman	D-27	-	35.95	5.14	7.67	15.23	4.10	68.09
		Newkirk	I-29	-	36.36	5.19	21.45	15.23	4.10	82.33
		Blackwell	I-45	-	36.10	5.16	32.74	15.23	4.10	93.33
		Kildare	D-50	-	36.48	5.21	5.95	15.23	4.10	66.97
		Ponca City	I-71	4.71	35.76	5.11	22.47	15.23	4.10	82.67
		Kaw City/Shidler	J-11K	-	36.32	5.19	5.52	15.23	4.10	66.36
		Tonkawa	I-87	-	36.11	5.16	16.04	15.23	4.10	76.64
		Noble-Joint	I-2	-	35.50	5.07	6.12	15.23	4.10	66.02
		Noble-Joint	I-4	-	36.22	5.17	3.69	15.23	4.10	64.41
		Osage-Joint	J-11	-	37.67	5.38	5.52	15.23	4.10	67.90
		Grant-Joint	J-95	-	35.67	5.10	-	15.23	4.10	60.10

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
 ASSESSED VALUE OF PROPERTY  
 TREND ANALYSIS  
 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

Valuation Date	Personal	Public Service	Real Estate	Homestead Exemption	Net Value	Estimated Fair Market Value
1/1/2011	\$129,737,180	\$53,754,167	\$171,207,830	\$11,037,271	\$343,661,906	\$3,124,199,145
1/1/2010	\$123,604,864	\$29,623,448	\$172,211,487	\$11,155,584	\$314,284,215	\$2,857,131,955
1/1/2009	\$126,207,014	\$27,094,656	\$173,864,541	\$11,207,868	\$315,958,343	\$2,872,348,573
1/1/2008	\$128,032,128	\$27,145,528	\$171,150,020	\$11,285,170	\$315,042,506	\$2,864,022,782
1/1/2007	\$131,955,222	\$27,959,083	\$168,559,016	\$11,510,785	\$316,962,536	\$2,881,477,600


**Estimated  
 Fair Market  
 Value**




**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
COUNTY PAYROLL EXPENDITURES ANALYSIS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

County officers' salaries are based upon the assessed valuation and population of the counties. State statutes provide guidelines for establishing elected officers' salaries. The Board of County Commissioners sets the salaries for all elected county officials within the limits set by the statutes. The designated deputy or assistant's salary cannot exceed the principal officer's salary. Salaries for other deputies or assistants cannot exceed the principal officer's salary. The information presented below is for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012.

**Payroll Expenditures by Department**



**Payroll Expenditures by Department**




**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
COUNTY GENERAL FUND ANALYSIS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

## County General Fund

The Oklahoma Constitution and the Oklahoma Statutes authorize counties to create a County General Fund, which is the county's primary source of operating revenue. The County General Fund is typically used for county employees' salaries plus many expenses for county maintenance and operation. It also provides revenue for various budget accounts and accounts that support special services and programs. The Board of County Commissioners must review and approve all expenditures made from the County General Fund. The primary revenue source for the County General Fund is usually the county's ad valorem tax collected on real, personal (if applicable), and public service property. Smaller amounts of revenue can come from other sources such as fees, sales tax, use tax, state transfer payments, in-lieu taxes, and reimbursements. The chart below summarizes receipts and disbursements of the County's General Fund for the last five fiscal years.




**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
COUNTY HIGHWAY FUND ANALYSIS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

## County Highway Fund

The County receives major funding for roads and highways from a state imposed fuel tax. Taxes are collected by the Oklahoma Tax Commission. Taxes are imposed on all gasoline, diesel, and special fuel sales statewide. The County's share is determined on formulas based on the County population, road miles, and land area and is remitted to the County monthly. These funds are earmarked for roads and highways only and are accounted for in the county highway fund. The chart below summarizes receipts and disbursements of the County's Highway Fund for the last five fiscal years.



## **FINANCIAL SECTION**



# Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405-521.3495 • Fax: 405-521.3426

## Independent Auditor's Report

TO THE OFFICERS OF  
KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

We have audited the combined total—all county funds on the accompanying regulatory basis Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances of Kay County, Oklahoma, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2012, listed in the table of contents as the financial statement. This financial statement is the responsibility of Kay County's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the combined total—all county funds on this financial statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

As described in Note 1, this financial statement was prepared using accounting practices prescribed or permitted by Oklahoma state law, which practices differ from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The differences between this regulatory basis of accounting and accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America are also described in Note 1.

In our opinion, because of the effects of the matter discussed in the preceding paragraph, the financial statement referred to above does not present fairly, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, the financial position of Kay County as of June 30, 2012, or changes in its financial position for the year then ended.

In our opinion, the financial statement referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the combined total of receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash balances for all county funds of Kay County, for the year ended June 30, 2012, on the basis of accounting described in Note 1.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated October 7, 2014, on our consideration of Kay County's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the combined total of all county funds on the financial statement. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*, and is not a required part of the financial statement. The remaining Other Supplementary Information, as listed in the table of contents, is presented for purposes of additional analysis, and is not a required part of the financial statement. Such supplementary information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the combined total—all county funds on the regulatory basis Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Changes in Cash Balances and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the combined total—all county funds. The information listed in the table of contents under Introductory Section has not been audited by us, and accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Gary A. Jones". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE  
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

October 7, 2014



**REGULATORY BASIS FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA**  
**STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND**  
**CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES—REGULATORY BASIS**  
**(WITH COMBINING INFORMATION)—MAJOR FUNDS**  
**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

	Beginning Cash Balances July 1, 2011	Receipts Apportioned	Transfers In	Transfers Out	Disbursements	Ending Cash Balances June 30, 2012
Combining Information:						
Major Funds:						
County General Fund	\$ 1,363,164	\$ 5,030,732	\$ 251	\$ -	\$ 4,436,429	\$ 1,957,718
County Sinking	3	10	-	13	-	-
County Judgements	-	1	-	-	-	1
Highway Cash	1,133,287	5,095,460	521,313	-	5,546,259	1,203,801
BIA - Road Projects	454,115	1,965,039	-	2,206	2,301,814	115,134
Highway CBRIF	823,127	420,308	-	519,107	329,167	395,161
Highway Ridgevale Road Repair	40,321	-	-	-	40,321	-
Blackwell Wind Farm	-	1,304,141	-	-	1,291,112	13,029
County Health Department	837,356	657,274	-	-	566,099	928,531
County Sales Tax	1,908,330	2,360,000	-	-	2,526,511	1,741,819
JFA Gross Revenue Account	298,854	3,856,100	-	-	3,839,293	315,661
Sheriff JAG Grant	-	22,517	-	-	22,467	50
Remaining Aggregate Funds	937,341	719,693	13	251	486,577	1,170,219
<b>Combined Total - All County Funds</b>	<b>\$ 7,795,898</b>	<b>\$ 21,431,275</b>	<b>\$ 521,577</b>	<b>\$ 521,577</b>	<b>\$ 21,386,049</b>	<b>\$ 7,841,124</b>

The notes to the financial statement are an integral part of this statement.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies**

**A. Reporting Entity**

Kay County is a subdivision of the State of Oklahoma created by the Oklahoma Constitution and regulated by Oklahoma Statutes.

The accompanying financial statement presents the receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash balances of the total of all funds under the control of the primary government. The general fund is the county's general operating fund, accounting for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund, where its use is restricted for a specified purpose. Other funds established by statute and under the control of the primary government are also presented.

The County Treasurer collects and remits material amounts of intergovernmental revenues and ad valorem tax revenue for other budgetary entities, including school districts, and cities and towns. The cash receipts and disbursements attributable to those other entities do not appear in funds on the County's financial statement; those funds play no part in the County's operations. Any trust or agency funds maintained by the County are not included in this presentation.

**B. Fund Accounting**

The County uses funds to report on receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash balances. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain government functions or activities.

Following are descriptions of the county funds included as combining information within the financial statement:

County General Fund – accounts for the general operations of the government. Disbursements are for the general operations of the County.

County Sinking – accounts for the payment of interest and principal on the matured portion of long-term debt and civil judgments.

County Judgments – accounts for the collections of debt service receipts derived generally from a special ad valorem tax levy.

Highway Cash – accounts for state, local, and miscellaneous receipts and disbursements for the purpose of constructing and maintaining county roads and bridges.

BIA – Road Projects – accounts for funding received by Indian nations from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and disbursed to the County as a vendor for special road projects.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

Highway CBRIF – accounts for state receipts and disbursements for the purpose of constructing and maintaining county roads and bridges.

Highway Ridgevale Road Repair – accounts for donations from residents living on Ridgevale Road to be expended for upkeep of Ridgevale Road.

Blackwell Wind Farm – accounts for funds paid to the County by Blackwell Wind, LLC, for the purpose of providing the County funds to perform modifications, improvements, and maintenance for Primary Roads traveled by Blackwell Wind, LLC vehicles during the course of building the Blackwell Wind Farm.

County Health Department – accounts for monies collected on behalf of the county health department from ad valorem taxes and state and local revenues.

County Sales Tax – accounts for the collection from the Kay County Justice Facilities Authority and the disbursements are for the operations of the County Jail.

JFA Gross Revenue Account – accounts for the collection of sales tax revenue and the disbursement of funds as restricted by the sales tax resolution.

Sheriff JAG Grant – accounts for the receipt and disbursement of funds from state and local governments for the purpose of equipment for the Sheriff's office.

**C. Basis of Accounting**

The financial statement is prepared on a basis of accounting wherein amounts are recognized when received or disbursed. This basis of accounting differs from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, which require revenues to be recognized when they become available and measurable or when they are earned, and expenditures or expenses to be recognized when the related liabilities are incurred. This regulatory basis financial presentation is not a comprehensive measure of economic condition or changes therein.

Title 19 O.S. § 171 specifies the format and presentation for Oklahoma counties to present their financial statement in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (U.S. GAAP) or on a regulatory basis. The County has elected to present their financial statement on a regulatory basis in conformity with Title 19 O.S. § 171. County governments (primary only) are required to present their financial statements on a fund basis format with, at a minimum, the general fund and all other county funds, which represent ten percent or greater of total county revenue. All other funds included in the audit shall be presented in the aggregate in a combining statement.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**D. Budget**

Under current Oklahoma Statutes, a general fund and a county health department fund are the only funds required to adopt a formal budget. On or before the first Monday in July of each year, each officer or department head submits an estimate of needs to the governing body. The budget is approved for the respective fund by office, or department and object. The County Board of Commissioners may approve changes of appropriations within the fund by office or department and object. To increase or decrease the budget by fund requires approval by the County Excise Board.

**E. Cash and Investments**

For the purposes of financial reporting, "Ending Cash Balances, June 30" includes cash and cash equivalents and investments as allowed by statutes. The County pools the cash of its various funds in maintaining its bank accounts. However, cash applicable to a particular fund is readily identifiable on the County's books. The balance in the pooled cash accounts is available to meet current operating requirements.

State statutes require financial institutions with which the County maintains funds to deposit collateral securities to secure the County's deposits. The amount of collateral securities to be pledged is established by the County Treasurer; this amount must be at least the amount of the deposit to be secured, less the amount insured (by, for example, the FDIC).

The County Treasurer has been authorized by the County's governing board to make investments. Allowable investments are outlined in statutes 62 O.S. § 348.1 and § 348.3.

All investments must be backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government, the Oklahoma State Government, fully collateralized, or fully insured. All investments as classified by state statute are nonnegotiable certificates of deposit. Nonnegotiable certificates of deposit are not subject to interest rate risk or credit risk.

**2. Ad Valorem Tax**

The County's property tax is levied each October 1 on the assessed value listed as of January 1 of the same year for all real and personal property located in the County, except certain exempt property. Assessed values are established by the County Assessor within the prescribed guidelines established by the Oklahoma Tax Commission and the State Equalization Board. Title 68 O.S. § 2820.A. states, ". . . Each assessor shall thereafter maintain an active and systematic program of visual inspection on a continuous basis and shall establish an inspection schedule which will result in the individual visual inspection of all taxable property within the county at least once each four (4) years."

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

Taxes are due on November 1 following the levy date, although they may be paid in two equal installments. If the first half is paid prior to January 1, the second half is not delinquent until April 1. Unpaid real property taxes become a lien upon said property on October 1 of each year.

**3. Other Information**

**A. Pension Plan**

Plan Description. The County contributes to the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement Plan (the Plan), a cost-sharing, multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan administered by the Oklahoma Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS). Benefit provisions are established and amended by the Oklahoma Legislature. The Plan provides retirement, disability, and death benefits to Plan members and beneficiaries. Title 74, Sections 901 through 943, as amended, establishes the provisions of the Plan. OPERS issues a publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and supplementary information. That report may be obtained by writing OPERS, P.O. Box 53007, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 or by calling 1-800-733-9008.

Funding Policy. The contribution rates for each member category are established by the Oklahoma Legislature and are based on an actuarial calculation which is performed to determine the adequacy of contribution rates.

**B. Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB)**

In addition to the pension benefits described in the Pension Plan note, OPERS provides post-retirement health care benefits of up to \$105 each for retirees who are members of an eligible group plan. These benefits are funded on a pay-as-you-go basis as part of the overall retirement benefit. OPEB expenditure and participant information is available for the state as a whole; however, information specific to the County is not available nor can it be reasonably estimated.

**C. Contingent Liabilities**

Amounts received or receivable from grantor agencies are subject to audit and adjustment by grantor agencies, primarily the federal government. Any disallowed claims, including amounts already collected, may constitute a liability of the applicable fund. The amount, if any, of expenditures which may be disallowed by the grantor cannot be determined at this time; although, the County expects such amounts, if any, to be immaterial.

As of the end of the fiscal year, there were no claims or judgments that would have a material adverse effect on the financial condition of the County; however, the outcome of any lawsuit would not be determinable.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**D. Sales Tax**

The voters of Kay County approved a two-thirds (.6665) of one (1) cent sales tax. This sales tax was established to provide revenue for acquisition, construction, and equipping a new Kay County Detention Facility. A portion of the sales tax, one-third (.33325) of one (1) cent, shall have a limited duration of twenty (20) years from the date of commencement, or until principal and interest upon indebtedness incurred on behalf of Kay County by the Kay County Justice Facilities Authority is paid in full.

**E. Transfers**

During the fiscal year, the County made the following transfers between cash funds.

- Residual transfer of \$251 from the Emergency Management Agency fund to the County General Fund. In the prior year, Emergency Management Agency was placed in the County General Fund and funds were transferred with the exception of this \$251.
- \$519,107 was transfer from Highway CBRI to Highway Cash to reimburse Highway Cash for road and bridge projects.
- Residual transfer per Board of County Commissioners resolution \$2,206, was transferred from the various BIA –Road Project funds to the Highway Cash fund to close BIA –Road Project funds.
- Residual transfer of \$13 from County Sinking into County Cash Improvement.

**F. Special Item**

**Investigative Audit**

The State Auditor and Inspector’s Office is currently conducting a special investigative audit of the alleged improper bidding practices of the County.

**OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA**  
**COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND**  
**CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES—BUDGET AND ACTUAL—BUDGETARY BASIS—**  
**GENERAL FUND**  
**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

	General Fund		
	Budget	Actual	Variance
Beginning Cash Balances	\$ 1,363,141	\$ 1,363,164	\$ 23
Less: Prior Year Outstanding Warrants	(131,137)	(131,160)	(23)
Less: Prior Year Encumbrances	(51,075)	(51,075)	-
Plus: Lapsed Balance	-	5,792	5,792
Beginning Cash Balances, Budgetary Basis	<u>1,180,929</u>	<u>1,186,721</u>	<u>5,792</u>
Residual Transfer	-	251	251
Receipts:			
Ad Valorem Taxes	3,202,304	3,235,148	32,844
Charges for Services	171,241	493,111	321,870
Intergovernmental Revenues	318,301	833,666	515,365
Miscellaneous Revenues	824,219	468,807	(355,412)
Total Receipts, Budgetary Basis	<u>4,516,065</u>	<u>5,030,732</u>	<u>514,667</u>
Expenditures:			
District Attorney	46,750	46,337	413
County Sheriff	839,746	839,664	82
County Treasurer	144,830	143,616	1,214
County Commissioner	185,005	184,500	505
County Commissioners O.S.U. Extension	114,650	107,205	7,445
County Clerk	178,577	178,475	102
Court Clerk	279,300	274,608	4,692
County Assessor	161,547	158,944	2,603
Revaluation of Real Property	219,705	205,022	14,683
District Court	56,385	51,686	4,699
General Government	801,247	527,336	273,911
Excise - Equalization Board	5,200	4,276	924
County Election Board	125,350	121,249	4,101
Insurance Benefits	1,965,228	1,120,434	844,794
County Purchasing Agent	36,741	36,741	-
Data Processing	49,093	48,208	885
Charity	2,500	1,850	650
Unappropriated Court	270,389	270,389	-
Resale Payroll	72,783	72,783	-
County Audit Budget Account	49,792	49,792	-
Free Fair Budget Account	26,500	26,499	1
Emergency Management	60,676	37,605	23,071
Provision for Interest on Warrants	5,000	1,895	3,105
Total Expenditures, Budgetary Basis	<u>5,696,994</u>	<u>4,509,114</u>	<u>1,187,880</u>

Continued on next page

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
 COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND  
 CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES—BUDGET AND ACTUAL—BUDGETARY BASIS—  
 GENERAL FUND - CONTINUED  
 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

	General Fund		
	Budget	Actual	Variance
Continued from previous page			
Excess of Receipts and Beginning Cash Balances Over Expenditures, Budgetary Basis	\$ -	1,708,590	\$ 1,708,590
Reconciliation to Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances			
Add: Current Year Outstanding Warrants		126,348	
Add: Current Year Encumbrances		122,757	
Add: Current Year Estopped Warrants		23	
Ending Cash Balance		\$ 1,957,718	

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND  
CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES—BUDGET AND ACTUAL—BUDGETARY BASIS—  
COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT FUND  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

	County Health Department Fund		
	Budget	Actual	Variance
Beginning Cash Balances	\$ 837,356	\$ 837,356	\$ -
Less: Prior Year Outstanding Warrants	(25,153)	(25,153)	-
Less: Prior Year Encumbrances	(57,344)	(57,344)	-
Plus: Lapsed Balance	-	13,065	13,065
Beginning Cash Balances, Budgetary Basis	754,859	767,924	13,065
Receipts:			
Ad Valorem Taxes	559,232	564,967	5,735
Miscellaneous Revenues	48,325	92,307	43,982
Total Receipts, Budgetary Basis	607,557	657,274	49,717
Expenditures:			
Health and Welfare	1,362,416	613,610	748,806
Total Expenditures, Budgetary Basis	1,362,416	613,610	748,806
Excess of Receipts and Beginning Cash Balances Over Expenditures, Budgetary Basis	\$ -	811,588	\$ 811,588
Reconciliation to Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances			
Add: Current Year Encumbrances		84,743	
Add: Current Year Outstanding Warrants		32,200	
Ending Cash Balance		\$ 928,531	

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA**  
**COMBINING STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND**  
**CHANGES IN CASH BALANCES—REGULATORY BASIS—**  
**REMAINING AGGREGATE FUNDS**  
**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

	Beginning Cash Balances July 1, 2011	Receipts Apportioned	Transfers In	Transfers Out	Disbursements	Ending Cash Balances June 30, 2012
Remaining Aggregate Funds:						
Resale Property	\$ 402,836	\$ 173,936	\$ -	-	\$ 122,737	\$ 454,035
Sheriff Commissary	3,734	-	-	-	3,322	412
County Clerk Lien Fee	40,825	60,954	-	-	8,509	93,270
County Clerk Preservation Fee	84,923	67,980	-	-	22,912	129,991
County Treasurer Mortgage Certification Fee	40,437	6,510	-	-	5,401	41,546
Sheriff Training	11,110	3,000	-	-	13,755	355
Local Emergency Planning Committee Grant	6,265	2,000	-	-	1,366	6,899
Emergency Management Agency	252	-	-	251	-	1
Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant	3,015	-	-	-	-	3,015
County Cash Improvement	4,117	7	13	-	-	4,137
Community Service Sentencing Program	1,231	-	-	-	-	1,231
Visual Inspection Reimbursement Investment	95,159	12,283	-	-	11,040	96,402
Sheriff Jail Cash Fund	42,694	-	-	-	41,914	780
Sheriff Service Fee	197,656	242,798	-	-	255,621	184,833
Open Dumping Reward	3,087	302	-	-	-	3,389
Use Tax	-	149,923	-	-	-	149,923
<b>Combined Total - Remaining Aggregate Funds</b>	<b>\$ 937,341</b>	<b>\$ 719,693</b>	<b>\$ 13</b>	<b>\$ 251</b>	<b>\$ 486,577</b>	<b>\$ 1,170,219</b>

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**1. Budgetary Schedules**

The Comparative Schedules of Receipts, Expenditures, and Changes in Cash Balances—Budget and Actual—Budgetary Basis for the General Fund and the County Health Department Fund present comparisons of the legally adopted budget with actual data. The "actual" data, as presented in the comparison of budget and actual, will differ from the data as presented in the Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances with Combining Information because of adopting certain aspects of the budgetary basis of accounting and the adjusting of encumbrances and outstanding warrants to their related budget year.

Encumbrance accounting, under which purchase orders, contracts, and other commitments for the expenditure of monies are recorded in order to reserve that portion of the applicable appropriation, is employed as an extension of formal budgetary integration in these funds. At the end of the year unencumbered appropriations lapse.

**2. Remaining County Funds**

Remaining aggregate funds as presented on the financial statement are as follows:

Resale Property – accounts for the collection of interest and penalties on delinquent taxes and the disposition of same as restricted by statute.

Sheriff Commissary – accounts for profits on commissary sales in the County jail and disbursements for the fund are restricted by statute.

County Clerk Lien Fee – accounts for lien collections and disbursements as restricted by statute.

County Clerk Preservation Fee – accounts for fees charged by the County Clerk for recording instruments and disbursements are for the maintenance and preservation of public records.

County Treasurer Mortgage Certification Fee – accounts for the collection of fees by the Treasurer for mortgage tax certificates and the disbursement of the funds as restricted by statute.

Sheriff Training – accounts for collections from the sale of property forfeited in drug cases and disbursements are for the officer training, equipment, and crime prevention.

Local Emergency Planning Committee Grant – accounts for grant monies received for the Local Emergency Planning Committee at Ponca City and disbursements are for emergency planning.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTES TO OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

Emergency Management Agency – accounts for the receipt and disbursement of funds from state and local governments for civil defense purposes.

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant – accounts for the receipt and disbursement of funds from the U.S. Department of Justice to promote and strengthen greater accountability in the Juvenile Justice System.

County Cash Improvement – accounts for use tax collections and disbursements are used to maintain the courthouse (pest control, heat and air, etc.).

Community Service Sentencing Program – accounts for the collection of funding through the State Department of Corrections for administrative expenses and supervision of offenders.

Visual Inspection Reimbursement Investment – Investment of visual inspection reimbursement funds.

Sheriff Jail Cash Fund – accounts for the monies received from the State of Oklahoma for the boarding and feeding of DOC prisoners.

Sheriff Service Fee – accounts for the collection and disbursement of sheriff process service fees as restricted by statute.

Open Dumping Reward – accounts for the monies collected from fines imposed for littering and disbursed to citizens involved in the reporting of littering offenses.

Use Tax – accounts for revenues from sales tax charged to out-of-county vendors on in-county sales. Disbursements are for any legal expense of the County.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

Federal Grantor/Pass-Through Grantor/Program Title	Federal CFDA Number	Pass-Through Grantor's Number	Federal Expenditures
<b>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>			
<b>Department of the Army-Office of Chief Engineers</b>			
Passed Through State of Oklahoma Treasury			
Flood Control Projects	12.106		\$ 15,592
Total U.S. Department of Defense			<u>15,592</u>
<b>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR</b>			
Direct Grant:			
Payments in Lieu of Taxes	15.226		95,795
Total U.S. Department of Interior			<u>95,795</u>
<b>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</b>			
Passed Through the City of Ponca City:			
Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program	16.738		4,425
Total U.S. Department of Justice			<u>4,425</u>
<b>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>			
<b>Federal Highway Administration</b>			
Passed Through the Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	AGB00100019	8,173
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	AGB00110008	235,066
ARRA - Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	AGB00110003	169,649
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	AGB00110006	783,512
ARRA - Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	RAC00310007	70,599
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	A12AC00747	72,472
Total CFDA # 20.205			<u>1,339,471</u>
<b>Nation Highway Traffic Safety Administration</b>			
Passed Through the Oklahoma Highway Safety Office:			
State and Community Highway Safety	20.600	AL-11-03-02-03	4,416
Alcohol Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grants I	20.601	K8-12-03-21-04	11,908
<b>Pipeline and Hazrdous Materials Safety Administration</b>			
Passed Through the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management:			
Interagency Hazardous Materials Public Sector Training and Planning Grants	20.703		1,310
Total U.S. Department of Transportation			<u>1,357,105</u>
<b>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY</b>			
Passed Through the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management:			
Disaster Grants - Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters)	97.036	PA 4064	195,375
Hazard Mitigation Grant	97.039		9,500
Emergency Management Performance Grants	97.042	EMPG 12	2,170
Passed Through State Department of Public Safety:			
Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP)	97.078		94,950
Total U.S. Department of Federal Emergency Management			<u>301,995</u>
<b>Total Expenditures of Federal Awards</b>			<u>\$ 1,774,912</u>

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
NOTE TO THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

Basis of Presentation

The schedule of expenditures of federal awards includes the federal grant activity of Kay County, and is presented on the *cash basis of accounting*. The information in this schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*.



**INTERNAL CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE SECTION**



# Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405-521.3495 • Fax: 405-521.3426

## **Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With *Government Auditing Standards***

TO THE OFFICERS OF  
KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

We have audited the combined totals—all funds of the accompanying Combined Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances of Kay County, Oklahoma, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2012, which comprises Kay County's basic financial statement, prepared using accounting practices prescribed or permitted by Oklahoma state law, and have issued our report thereon dated October 7, 2014. Our report on the basic financial statement was adverse because the statement is not a presentation in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. However, our report also included our opinion that the financial statement does present fairly, in all material respects, the receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash balances – regulatory basis of the County for the year ended June 30, 2012, on the basis of accounting prescribed by Oklahoma state law, described in Note 1. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

### Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered Kay County's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statement, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of Kay County's internal control over financial reporting.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses, and therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses have been identified. However, as described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses and other deficiencies that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. We consider the deficiencies in internal control described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs to be material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting. 2012-1, 2012-2, 2012-4, and 2012-5.

A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. We consider the deficiencies in internal control described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs to be significant deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting. 2012-8, 2012-10, 2012-11, 2012-12, 2012-13, and 2012-14.

#### Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether Kay County's financial statement is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2012-8, and 2012-10.

We noted certain matters regarding statutory compliance that we reported to the management of Kay County, which are included in Section 4 of the schedule of findings and questioned costs contained in this report.

Kay County's responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. We did not audit Kay County's responses and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, others within the entity, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties. This report is also a public document pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act (51 O.S. § 24A.1 et seq.), and shall be open to any person for inspection and copying.



GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE  
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

October 7, 2014



# Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405-521.3495 • Fax: 405-521.3426

## **Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance With Requirements That Could Have a Direct and Material Effect on Each Major Program and Internal Control Over Compliance in Accordance With OMB Circular A-133**

TO THE OFFICERS OF  
KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

### Compliance

We have audited the compliance of Kay County, Oklahoma, with the types of compliance requirements described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that could have a direct and material effect on Kay County's major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2012. Kay County's major federal program is identified in the summary of auditor's results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to its major federal program is the responsibility of Kay County's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on Kay County's compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about Kay County's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of Kay County's compliance with those requirements.

As described in item 2012-17, in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs, Kay County did not comply with requirements regarding Davis-Bacon Act that is applicable to its Highway Planning and Construction grant. Compliance with such requirement is necessary, in our opinion, for Kay County to comply with the requirements applicable to that program.

In our opinion, except for the noncompliance described in the preceding paragraph, the County, complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2012. The results of our auditing procedures also disclosed an instance of noncompliance with those requirements, which is required to be reported in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and which is described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as item 2012-3.

### Internal Control Over Compliance

Management of Kay County is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to federal programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered Kay County's internal control over compliance with the requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program to determine the auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of Kay County's internal control over compliance.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses have been identified. However, as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. We consider the deficiencies in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2012-3, 2012-16, and 2012-17 to be material weaknesses.

Kay County's responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. We did not audit Kay County's responses and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, others within the entity, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties. This report is also a public document pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act (51 O.S., section 24A.1 et seq.), and shall be open to any person for inspection and copying.



GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE  
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

October 7, 2014

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**SECTION 1—Summary of Auditor’s Results**

Financial Statements

Type of auditor's report issued:.....Adverse as to GAAP; unqualified as to statutory presentation

Internal control over financial reporting:

- Material weakness(es) identified?..... Yes
- Significant deficiency(ies) identified? ..... Yes

Noncompliance material to financial statements noted?..... Yes

Federal Awards

Internal control over major programs:

- Material weakness(es) identified?..... Yes
- Significant deficiency(ies) identified? ..... None reported

Type of auditor's report issued on  
compliance for major programs: ..... Qualified

Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported  
in accordance with section 510(a) of Circular A-133?..... Yes

Identification of Major Programs

<u>CFDA Number(s)</u> 20.205	<u>Name of Federal Program or Cluster</u> Highway Planning and Construction
---------------------------------	--

Dollar threshold used to distinguish between  
Type A and Type B programs: ..... \$300,000

Auditee qualified as low-risk auditee?..... No

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**SECTION 2—Findings related to the Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With *Government Auditing Standards***

**Finding 2012-1 – Disaster Recovery Plans, Operation Manuals, Backups and Computer Systems Security (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Upon inquiry and observation, we noted the following:

- The Disaster Recovery Plans for the County Clerk and the County Treasurer were outdated and had not been tested.
- The Disaster Recovery Plan for the County Assessor’s office has not been tested.
- The Board of County Commissioners does not have written Disaster Recovery Plan.
- There is inadequate security over the computers and systems in the County Treasurer, County Clerk, County Sheriff and County Assessor’s offices:
  - Back-ups are not tested regularly in the County Assessor and County Sheriff’s offices.
  - Back-ups for the County Sheriff are maintained on-site.
  - The County Treasurer does not use the user logs as a monitoring device.
  - The County Sheriff does not have procedure/operating manuals for their offices.
  - In the County Clerk and County Assessor’s offices, the computer system does not log users off for inactivity and users do not always log off when they leave their computers unattended.
- The County Treasurer, County Clerk, and County Assessor do not have a plan that forecasts and budgets for the future computer needs of the County.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to develop and implement a Disaster Recovery Plan. Additionally, policies and procedures to ensure security of information systems and operations of county offices have not been developed and implemented.

**Effect of Condition:** The failure to have a formal and effective Disaster Recovery Plan and operating manuals could result in the County being unable to function in the event of a disaster or unforeseen officer absence. By not ensuring the security and accuracy of data maintained in the information systems, the risks for exposing computers to unauthorized access, misuse of county assets, and loss of data increases.

**Recommendation:** The Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector’s Office (OSAI) recommends the County develop and test a current Disaster Recovery Plan, which is stored off-site to ensure the safekeeping and integrity of the County’s data.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**County Assessor:** We will have a meeting once a year and go over the Disaster Recovery Plan. The back-ups are checked every night and we are notified every morning by email by if the back-up was successful or not. We buy computers as needed.

**County Clerk:** The County Clerk's Disaster Recovery Plan was updated by adding new employees. All employees have a copy of the plan and were asked to take the plan home with them. Copies of the plan were also given to the following: County Commissioners, County Sheriff, County Treasurer, Newkirk Police Department, Newkirk Fire Department, and Kay County Emergency Management Director. The office is aware of procedures to follow in case of a disaster.

The clerk always keeps plenty of money in Preservation and County Clerk Lien Fee Accounts for future computer needs and other unexpected emergencies. The clerk keeps a list of when computers were purchased in order to keep track of when an upgrade may be necessary.

**County Sheriff:** The County Sheriff's Department Disaster Recovery Plan will be tested in the future by discussing and updating at deputy and staff meetings. Copies of the computer back-ups are taken home by the Sheriff, Undersheriff, and Captain. Additionally, a copy is maintained at dispatch and the County Clerk's office will be given a copy and the County Sheriff's Department will start testing computer back-ups on a regular basis.

**County Treasurer:** I will implement checking the user logs monthly. On my plan to fill future computer needs, I have always staggered my computer purchases so that all computers do not need to be at the same time and are only replaced when needed.

**Auditor Response:** At the time of our discussion with the Sheriff, storage of computer system back-ups, (other than the financial computer system) were not maintained off-site.

**Criteria:** According to the standards of the Information Systems Audit and Control Association (CobiT, Delivery and Support 4) information services function, management should ensure that a written Disaster Recovery Plan is documented and contains the following:

- Current names, addresses, contact numbers of key county personnel and their roles and responsibilities of information services function.
- Listing of contracted service providers.
- Information on location of key resources, including back-up site for recovery operating system, application, data files, operating manuals and program/system/user documentation.
- Alternative work locations once IT resources are available.

Also, according to the standards of the Information Systems Audit and Control Association (CobiT, Delivery and Support) DS11.6 Security Requirements for Data Management, management should define and implement policies and procedures to identify and apply security requirements applicable to the receipt, processing, storage and output of data to meet business objectives, the organization's security policy and regulatory requirements.



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2012-2 – Inadequate County-Wide Controls (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** County-wide controls regarding Risk Management and Monitoring have not been designed.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to address risks of the County.

**Effect of Condition:** This condition could result in unrecorded transactions, undetected errors, or misappropriation of funds.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends that the County design procedures to identify and address risks. OSAI also recommends that the County design monitoring procedures to assess the quality of performance over time. These procedures should be written policies and procedures and could be included in the County's policies and procedures handbook.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Assessor:** Our daily backups are tested daily and stored off-site. We are going to go over our Disaster Recovery Plan annually. We will try to implement the recommendations presented by the Auditor's office.

**County Clerk:** The County Clerk's office works diligently on segregation of duties and cross training for this office with limited employees. Every effort is made to ensure the County Clerk's information system back-ups are accurate and maintained off-site. The County Clerk and employees attends county training classes, County Clerk Schools and other workshops relating to this office.

The County Clerk's Disaster Recovery Plan was updated by adding new employees and has been given to all County Clerk employees and those elected officials and emergency response departments in which it would be useful.

In August of 2012, the County Clerk wrote a Standard Operating Procedures of Internal Controls Handbook for Kay County. The handbook was given to the following departments: Commissioner Districts 1, 2 and 3, County Sheriff, County Treasurer, and Emergency Management Director. The handbook consists of State and Federal guidelines to follow regarding federal monies received and expended. The handbook describes Background, Purpose, and Applicability, Matrix of Compliance Requirements, Compliance Requirements, Agency Program Requirements, and Internal Controls.

The County works together with the County budget maker to ensure the estimate of needs is accurate and complete; however, review procedures will be put in place.

Audit findings are taken very seriously and measures will be made to correct noted findings.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**County Sheriff:** The County Sheriff's Department uses the vendor software program (for expenditures), which is backed up daily and the back-ups are kept off-site. We now have a written Disaster Recovery Plan and intend on testing it. We will be maintaining records of our federal awards in a manner they can be checked for accuracy. The County Sheriff's Department tries to correct all findings presented to us by OSAI.

**County Treasurer:** Every effort is made to ensure the County Treasurer's information system back-ups are accurate and maintained off-site. Our segregation of duties ensures low risk of fraud. I will update the phone numbers of the Disaster Recovery Plan and distribute new copies to employees. I feel we attend the proper training and workshops. I will work to further the communication between officers with monthly officer's meetings. I do the financial statement for the County and it is accurate and complete. I am very dedicated to answering all complaints and concerns the citizens have with the County Treasurer's office or the County. I have open communication with all employees to help them understand what is expected of them. I always correct the auditors' findings.

**County Commissioner District 1:** County Commissioner chose not to respond.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2:** I always attend workshops and conferences that are put on by ACCO and CODA. We have the forms now for the SEFA report and we will work to implement these changes as soon as we can. We always strive to follow the law and want to do things the correct way, but it would be helpful to know these things more than every three years.

**Criteria:** Internal control is an integral component of an organization's management that provides reasonable assurance that the objectives of effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial reporting and compliance with laws and regulations are being made. Internal control comprises the plans, methods, and procedures used to meet missions, goals, and objectives. Internal control also serves as the first line of defense in safeguarding assets and preventing and detecting errors and fraud. County management is responsible for designing a county-wide internal control system comprised of Risk Assessment and Monitoring for the achievement of these goals.

Risk Assessment is a component of internal control which should provide for an assessment of the risks the County faces from both internal and external sources. Once risks have been identified, they should be analyzed for their possible effect. Management then has to formulate an approach for risk management and decide upon the internal control activities required to mitigate those risks and achieve the internal control objectives.

Monitoring is a component of internal control which should assess the quality of performance over time and ensure that the findings of audits and other reviews are promptly resolved. Ongoing monitoring occurs during normal operations and includes regular management and supervisory activities, comparisons, reconciliations, and other actions people take in performing their duties. It includes ensuring that management know their responsibilities for internal control and the need to make control monitoring part of their regular operating process.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2012-4 – Inadequate Segregation of Duties Over Purchasing (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Upon inquiry and observation of the County’s purchasing process, it was noted that the Purchasing Agent enters all vendors into the purchase order system, prepares purchase orders, encumbers purchase orders, reviews the purchase order for accuracy, prepares and prints warrants, delivers warrants to the Treasurer to be registered and receives register warrants, maintains ledgers, and distributes warrants.

**Cause of Condition:** Policies and procedures have not been designed with regard to segregation of duties and/or compensating controls of the purchasing process.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, undetected errors, and misappropriation of funds.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends that management be aware of these conditions and determine if duties can be properly segregated. In the event that segregation of duties is not possible due to limited personnel, OSAI recommends implementing compensating controls to mitigate the risks involved with a concentration of duties. Compensating controls would include separating key processes and/or critical functions of the office, and having management review and approval of accounting functions.

Further, the duties of encumbering and posting to the ledgers should be segregated from the printing and distribution of payments.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Clerk:** Two employees are involved with the purchasing responsibilities and purchase orders are reviewed for accuracy. For continued segregation of duties one clerk will enter vendors into system and the other will generate purchase orders, one will prepare warrants and one will reconcile to purchase orders and distribute warrants.

**Criteria:** Accountability and stewardship are overall goals of management in the accounting of funds. Internal controls should be designed to analyze and check accuracy, completeness, and authorization of disbursements and/or transactions. To help ensure a proper accounting of funds, the duties of processing, authorizing, and distribution should be segregated.

**Finding 2012-5 – Inadequate Segregation of Duties Over Payroll (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Upon inquiry and observation of the County’s payroll process, it was noted that the Payroll Clerk enrolls new hires, makes payroll changes, runs verification reports, prints payroll checks, takes

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

payroll checks to the Treasurer to be registered and receives registered checks, performs report reconciliations, and removes terminated employees from system.

**Cause of Condition:** Policies and procedures have not been designed with regards to segregation of duties and/or compensating controls of the payroll process.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, undetected errors, and misappropriation of funds.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends that management be aware of these conditions and determine if duties can be properly segregated. In the event that segregation of duties is not possible due to limited personnel, OSAI recommends implementing compensating controls to mitigate the risks involved with a concentration of duties. Compensating controls would include separating key processes and/or critical functions of the office, and having management review and approval of accounting functions.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Clerk:** Two employees are involved with payroll responsibilities. The payroll/accounts payable clerk switches duties every three months, however, daily the two employees work together on these two functions of the office. To further improve these functions one employee will review the time records and the other will prepare the payroll and one will issue and the other will distribute payroll warrants to individuals.

**Criteria:** Accountability and stewardship are overall goals of management in the accounting of funds. Internal controls should be designed to analyze and check accuracy, completeness, and authorization of payroll calculations and/or transactions. To help ensure a proper accounting of funds, the duties of processing, authorizing, and payroll distribution should be segregated.

**Finding 2012-8 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Purchasing and Noncompliance with State Statute (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** While testing thirty-three purchase orders, we noted the following:

- Two instances where the invoice dates and/or service dates were prior to the encumbrance dates for purchase orders (PO #2684 – Highway District #2 and PO #3862 – Highway District #2).
- Three instances where there was no receiving report attached to attest to the receiving of goods or services (PO #618 – Highway District #1 – BIA L A Cann North, PO #18 – Highway District #1 – BIA “O” Street Project, and PO #3204 – Highway District #1 – BIA Traders Bend).
- One instance where the claim/purchase order was not approved by the Board of County Commissioners (PO # 804 – Highway District #1 – BIA “O” Street Project).

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Cause of Condition:** The County is not following established purchasing procedures.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions resulted in noncompliance with state statute, inaccurate records, and incomplete information, and could result in a misappropriation of assets.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends Kay County practice proper purchasing procedures. All purchases should be properly requisitioned, encumbered, approved, and received with proper supporting documentation attached.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Commissioner District 1:** We recently were required to attach receiving reports to all BIA projects. All purchase orders should have been run through the meetings.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2:** I have already instructed my employees of this problem and it will be corrected. We mention this to them periodically in meetings but will continue to stress the importance of have the purchase orders in place before ordering anything.

**County Clerk:** County purchasing procedures are in place; office will thoroughly monitor purchase orders to be in compliance. Normally, errors on purchase orders are “red stamped” with an explanation.

**Criteria:** Title 19 O.S. § 1505 prescribes the procedures established for the requisition, purchase, lease-purchase, rental, and receipt of supplies, materials, and equipment for maintenance, operation, and capital expenditures of county government.

Further, good internal controls would include all supporting documentation related to disbursements be attached to the purchase order prior to approval for payment.

**Finding 2012-10 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance with State Statute Regarding Bidding Procedures**

**Condition:** The test of five items with a cost of \$10,000.00 or more reflected that there was no bid to support the Sheriff’s purchase of video surveillance system equipment in the amount of \$70,692.36. Additionally, there was no indication on documentation retained that this was a sole source purchase (P.O. #995 - General Sheriff).

Additional testwork revealed that \$102,065 in concrete, \$968 in screening, \$1,940 in crusher run, and \$1,353 in rebar used in the Courthouse Parking Lot Construction Project were not bid from vendors awarded this six-month bid.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed and implemented to ensure compliance with statutes with regard to the bidding process.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions resulted in noncompliance with state statute and could result in undetected errors and in some instances misappropriation of assets.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends that policies and procedures be implemented to ensure that all statutorily required bidding procedures are followed.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Commissioner District 1:** There is no limit on six-month bids, projects are cheaper to do.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2:** I believe the purchase of the video surveillance systems was actually upgrading equipment we currently had in place. That is why we believed this was a single source purchase and the Sheriff's office took care of this.

**County Sheriff:** It was discussed and approved in a commissioner meeting as a single source item because it would work with the surveillance equipment we had previously installed. However, we did not indicate on the purchase order that it was a single source item.

**County Clerk:** The County Clerk's office has policies and procedures implemented regarding statutorily required bidding procedures.

**Auditor Response:** Upon review of the minutes of Board of County Commissioners meetings there was no mention that the surveillance system was considered to be a sole source purchase. The minutes of May 9, 2011, indicate the acceptance of the Homeland Security Grant for Kay County Sheriff Department. Undersheriff Kelley said this grant will be used to update communications and install computers in patrol cars that will tie into Homeland Security. In the September 6, 2011 minutes, the Commissioners approved the transfer of \$70,692.36 from the General Government Health Insurance Benefits account to General Government Capital Outlay account to cover the costs of the surveillance system purchase. Then the purchase order was approved in the October 11, 2011 meeting minutes.

Vendors awarded the six-month bids for concrete, screenings, crusher run, and rebar were not used in the construction of the courthouse parking lot.

**Criteria:** Title 19 O.S. § 1505.B prescribes the established bidding procedures for selecting a vendor for the purchase, lease-purchase, or rental of supplies, materials, equipment and information technology and telecommunication goods and services used by a county for the bidding of goods and/or services.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2012-11 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance with State Statutes Regarding Acceptance of Bids (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) solicits bids for commonly-used goods and services, but its process of accepting bids does not appear to comply with 19 O.S. § 1505(B) regarding the purchase of commonly-used items and 19 O.S. § 1501(A)(3)(j) regarding the purchase of “processed native materials for road and bridge improvements.”

After bids for commonly-used goods and services are solicited and opened, the Kay County BOCC tables the matter for one week and then accepts all bids submitted, as noted below, without regard as to whether or not it is a processed native material.

- Asphalt
- Concrete
- Pouring/Finishing Concrete
- Road Rock
- Bridge Materials
- Lumber
- Culvert Pipe
- Grader Blades
- Janitorial Supplies
- Office Supplies
- Heavy-equipment Rental
- Road-striping
- Routine Electrical Work

With the exception of road rock, none of the solicitations are for “processed native materials for road [or] bridge improvements,” including solicitations for bridge materials which are comprised mostly of non-native materials.

Additionally, no documentation was maintained to indicate any vendor was contacted at the time of work to determine both its ability and availability to provide goods or services.

The District #1 and District #3 commissioners appear to regularly requisition money for road projects that exceed \$10,000, using piece-meal bids obtained for commonly-used goods and services as the basis for awarding an entire project despite the selected vendor not bidding the full project and not qualifying as the lowest bidder. In addition to not always using the lowest bidders, they often allowed a vendor to provide goods and services for which it had not bid and/or to subcontract with non-bidders or other bidders that were not the lowest bidders.

**Cause of Condition:** The County did not comply with 19 O.S. § 1505(B), which requires that counties award bids to the lowest and best bidders. Further, the County did not comply with 19 O.S. § 1501(A)(3)(j), which allows counties to accept all bids only for processed native materials for road and bridge improvements.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions resulted in noncompliance with state statutes regarding the awarding of bids. As a result, the County often did not obtain the best prices for road projects or for materials purchased from the commonly-used goods bid lists. In effect, this practice resulted in a vendor being awarded a project for which no bid had been submitted.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends the County discontinue its practice of accepting all bids for services or for commonly-used goods that are not processed native materials for road or bridge improvements and award the contract to the lowest and best bidder. County officials should clearly document the reason for not awarding a bid to the lowest bidder.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** I was not aware of the bid issue being incorrect. I will follow correct procedures in the future, soliciting bids from vendors with the goal of obtaining quality goods/services for the best price.

**County Commissioner District 1:** County Commissioner chose not to respond.

**Current County Commissioner District 2:** I was not in office at these times; however, we as a commissioner board will look over all bids and only except the lowest and best bids.

**Criteria:** Best business practices would include soliciting bids from vendors with the goal of obtaining quality goods and/or services for the best price.

When counties purchase “needed or commonly [-] used supplies, materials, [or] equipment,” 19 O.S. § 1505(B) requires the counties to solicit bids, compare them to the state contract price for the items, and select “the lowest and best bid based upon, if applicable, the availability of material and transportation cost to the job site within 30 days,” specifying the reason “any time the lowest bid was not considered to be the lowest and best bid.”

When counties purchase “processed native materials for road and bridge improvements,” 19 O.S. § 1501(A)(3)(j) requires the counties to solicit bids but allows them to “\*\*\* accept all bids received, with the lowest and best bid from those accepted to be selected \*\*\* based upon availability, bid price, plus transportation costs \*\*\* at the time of opening of any construction project.” OSAI would note the distinction between the terms “accept” and “award.” A decision to accept a bid is based upon it meeting certain bid specifications and, thus, is determined to be a qualified bid. The statutory guidance to award a bid is to identify the lone bidder who best meets the “lowest and best bid” criteria to the exclusion of all other bidders.

Further, 19 O.S. § 1505(B)(5) outlines the procedures to follow when the low bidder cannot fulfill a county bid contract. The statute states, “If a vendor who is the low bidder cannot or will not sell goods or services as required by a county bid contract, the county purchasing agent may purchase from the next low bidder or take quotations as provided in paragraph 6 of this subsection, *provided, however, such purchase does not exceed Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00).*”



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2012-12 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Time Records (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** While reviewing payroll time records, we noted the following:

- Time records for Districts #1 are not signed by both the employee and the official.
- The Sheriff does not maintain time records for full-time employees and does not sign all pay claims.

**Cause of Condition:** Policies and procedures were not designed regarding a review of timesheets to ensure both employee and official or department head have reviewed and signed all timesheets and pay claims.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions could result in inaccurate records or incomplete information of employees' time resulting in a potential loss of county funds.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends all County officials have properly approved time records to support monthly payroll. Each employee's time record should reflect the hours worked for each day; the compensatory time earned, taken or paid; and be approved by the County officer or department head.

Additionally, OSAI recommends that all pay claims be reviewed and approved by the official prior to the issuance of payroll.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Commissioner District 1:** We now have a monthly time record signed by the employees and supervisor. We did not have this in place in 2012.

**County Sheriff:** The Sheriff's office does maintain time records; as our employees are salaried, if their hours change by having overtime/comp-time (accrued or used), vacation, sick leave, or holiday leave, they fill out and turn in a signed information sheet. The hours are checked and then signed by the Patrol Captain and Undersheriff or Sheriff. The payroll claims are then signed by the Sheriff or Undersheriff before they are sent to the Commissioners.

**Auditor Response:** Upon review of time records, it was noted that the Sheriff only has records for time exceptions and records for full-time employees do not indicate time actually worked.

**Criteria:** Accountability and stewardship are overall goals of management in the accounting of funds. To help ensure a proper accounting of funds, time records should be used to document hours worked and leave used each day. Time records should be signed by both the employee and the Supervisor/County Official certifying the validity of the hours worked and/or leave used. Additionally, all pay claims should be reviewed and approved by the official prior to the issuance of payroll.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2012-13 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Signature Stamps – County Treasurer (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Upon inquiry and observation of the procedures involved in the registering and paying of warrants, we noted the follow control deficiencies within the County Treasurer’s office.

- The County Treasurer’s signature stamp is kept in an unlocked drawer in a desk in the office.
- The County Treasurer’s signature stamp is used by someone other than the County Treasurer to stamp warrants as being registered.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed and implemented to ensure the safe keeping of the County Treasurer’s signature stamp.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions could result in unauthorized transactions, misappropriation of funds, or clerical errors that are not detected in a timely manner.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends the County Treasurer implement procedures to monitor the safe keeping and usage of the signature stamp. Officials who utilize signature stamps should ensure that signature stamps are adequately safeguarded from unauthorized use.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Treasurer:** I have rectified this issue and signature stamps are now kept in vault and will only be used by County Treasurer.

**Criteria:** An important aspect of internal controls is the safeguarding of assets. Internal controls over safeguarding of assets constitute a process, affected by an entity’s governing body, management, and other personnel, designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized transactions and safeguarding assets from misappropriation.

**Finding 2012-14 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Bank Reconciliations (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Based on testwork performed, there was no indication of review of the bank reconciliations by someone other than the preparer.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to ensure all reconciliations are reviewed and approved by someone other than the preparer.

**Effect of Condition:** This condition could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, undetected errors, or misappropriation of funds.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends all accounts be reconciled on a monthly basis and that the Treasurer ensures that all bank reconciliations reflect an indication of review that they are approved by someone other than the preparer.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Treasurer:** Treasurer does review all bank statements and even processes the monthly Miscellaneous Receipts for most bank statements as well as compare amounts to general ledger. In the future, I will also initial each statement after review.

**Auditor Response:** Although the Treasurer reviews bank reconciliations, there was no indication of this review.

**Criteria:** To help ensure a proper accounting of funds, bank reconciliations should be performed on a monthly basis and approved by someone other than the preparer and include an indication of review.

**SECTION 3—Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance With Requirements That Could Have a Direct and Material Effect on Each Major Program and Internal Control Over Compliance in Accordance With OMB Circular A-133**

**Finding 2012-3 – Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** All

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** All

**CFDA NO:** All

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** All

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2012

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** All

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Condition:** The offices and/or departments within the County, that expended federal funds, have not designed and implemented formal procedures for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

During our review and reconciliation of the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards as initial prepared by Kay County the following was noted:

- CFDA #10.923 – Emergency Watershed Protection Program expenditures for \$15,592 were not reported.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

- CFDA #16.738 – Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant expenditures were overstated by \$18,041.75.
- CFDA #20.205 – Highway Planning and Construction (BIA) expenditures were understated by \$233,371.
- CFDA #97.036 – Disaster Grants – Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters) FEMA-4064 expenditures were overstated by \$324,251.
- CFDA #20.600 – State and Community Highway Safety expenditures were understated by \$4,416.
- CFDA #20.601 – Alcohol Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grants I expenditures were overstated by \$3,760.
- CFDA #97.042 – Emergency Management Preparedness Grants expenditures were overstated \$16,127.
- CFDA #97.039 – Hazard Mitigation Grant expenditures were understated \$9,500.
- CFDA #97.078 – Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP) expenditures were understated by \$4,778.75.

These errors resulted in the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards being overstated by \$94,521.78.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to accurately report federal expenditures on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions resulted in a misstatement of the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends Kay County implement a policy for handling all federal grants awarded to the County. These policies could incorporate by reference applicable federal regulations to be followed, as well as the appropriate policy for the application, receipt, and expenditure of federal funds. OSAI also recommends that amounts reported on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards be reconciled to accounting records.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** We appreciate and value your suggestions regarding our 2012 audit findings. I have spoken with the Kay County officers regarding such findings that will need to be corrected and will rely on their corrective action plans.

**County Commissioner District 1:** We have forms in place now to better monitor projects.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2:** We will strive to do better on this. We now have the forms in our possession to record all Federal Awards as they are received which should alleviate this problem in the future.

**County Sheriff:** The overstated expenditures were a portion of the Buffer Zone Protection Program listed in CFDA #97.078 listed above. In the future we will try to make sure the grant funds are kept separately.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**County Clerk:** This was the first year the County prepared the SEFA. The County Clerk compiled the SEFA Report from records given by each department and each officer signs off on the report. Now that the county has a better understanding of the records required the county can provide a more accurate reporting.

In August of 2012, the County Clerk wrote a Standard Operating Procedures of Internal Controls Handbook for Kay County. The handbook was given to the following departments: Commissioner Districts 1, 2 and 3, County Sheriff, County Treasurer, and Emergency Management Director. The handbook consists of State and Federal guidelines to follow regarding federal monies received and expended. The handbook describes Background, Purpose, and Applicability, Matrix of Compliance Requirements, Compliance Requirements, Agency Program Requirements and Internal Controls.

**County Treasurer:** No federal expenditures for the Treasurer's office, but I do provide information to other offices when applicable

**Criteria:** OMB A-133, Subpart C, §\_\_.300 reads as follows:

Subpart C—Auditees

§\_\_.300 Auditee responsibilities.

The auditee shall:

(b) Maintain internal control over Federal programs that provides reasonable assurance that the auditee is managing Federal awards in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of contracts or grant agreements that could have a material effect on each of its Federal programs.

(d) Prepare appropriate financial statements, including the schedule of expenditures of Federal awards in accordance with §\_\_.310.

Further, accountability and stewardship are overall goals of management in the accounting of funds. To help ensure a proper accounting of funds, an accurate record of federal expenditures should be maintained.

**Finding 2012-16 – Inadequate County Wide Controls over Major Programs – BIA (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation

**CFDA NO:** 20.205

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction

**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** AGB00100019, AGB00110008, AGB00110003, AGB00110006, RAC00310007, and A12AC00747

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2012

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Activities Allowed or Unallowed; Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; Period of Availability; Procurement, Suspension and Debarment, and Reporting.

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Condition:** County-wide controls regarding Control Environment, Risk Management, Information, and Communication and Monitoring have not been designed.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to ensure the County is in compliance with grant requirements.

**Effect of Condition:** This condition could result in noncompliance to grant requirements.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends that the County implement a system of internal controls to ensure compliance with grant requirements.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** I was not aware of the Davis Bacon Act or Regulations. In the future we will follow all Federal Regulation regarding disbursements.

**County Clerk:** In August of 2012, the County Clerk wrote a Standard Operating Procedures of Internal Controls Handbook for Kay County. The handbook was given to the following departments: Commissioner Districts 1, 2, and 3, County Sheriff, County Treasurer, and Emergency Management Director.

The handbook consists of State and Federal guidelines to follow regarding federal monies received and expended. The handbook describes Background, Purpose, and Applicability, Matrix of Compliance Requirements, Compliance Requirements, Agency Program Requirements and Internal Controls.

The County Clerk compiles the SEFA Report from records given by each department and each officer signs off on the final report.

Hopefully, by having this Internal Controls handbook in place it will correct some of the issues.

**Criteria:** Internal control is an integral component of an organization's management that provides reasonable assurance that the objectives of effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial reporting and compliance with laws and regulations are being made. Internal control comprises the plans, methods, and procedures used to meet missions, goals, and objectives. Internal control also serves as the first line of defense in safeguarding assets and preventing and detecting errors and fraud. County management is responsible for designing a county-wide internal control system comprised of Control Environment, Risk Assessment Information and Communication and Monitoring for the achievement of these goals.

Control Environment is the foundation of an effective internal control system and begins with the "tone at the top" - the words and actions of management. Under an effective control environment, employees view internal control as essential and integral to doing their day-to-day job duties.

Risk Assessment is a component of internal control which should provide for an assessment of the risks the County faces from both internal and external sources. Once risks have been identified, they should be

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

analyzed for their possible effect. Management then has to formulate an approach for risk management and decide upon the internal control activities required to mitigate those risks and achieve the internal control objectives of efficient and effective operations, reliable financial reporting, and compliance with laws and regulations.

Information and Communication is a component of internal control which should allow for effective communication of relevant, accurate, and timely information that is required to meet the County's objectives, including reliable financial reporting, efficient and effective operations, and compliance with laws and regulations.

Monitoring is a component of internal control which should assess the quality of performance over time and ensure that the findings of audits and other reviews are promptly resolved. Ongoing monitoring occurs during normal operations and includes regular management and supervisory activities, comparisons, reconciliations, and other actions people take in performing their duties. It includes ensuring that management know their responsibilities for internal control and the need to make control monitoring part of their regular operating process.

**Finding 2012-17 – Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Major Programs – BIA (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation

**CFDA NO:** 20.205

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** ARRA - Highway Planning and Construction

**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** AGB00100019, AGB00110008, AGB00110003, AGB00110006, AC00310007, and A12AC00747

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2012

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; and Reporting.

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$1,179,162

**Condition:** During the process of documenting the County's internal controls regarding federal disbursements, we noted the County has not established internal controls to ensure compliance with the following compliance requirements: Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; and Reporting.

During the review of twenty-eight or 100% of BIA expenditures, we noted the following:

- Certified payroll reports were not submitted for the BIA-Hubbard Road Bridge Project, BIA-“O” Street Project, BIA-North Pecan Road Project, BIA Prospect/Airport Bridge #110, and BIA-Oakland Bridge #145.
- Invoices supporting fiscal year 2012 purchase order #1160 – BIA Hubbard Road Bridge were not itemized.
- Receiving reports were not present to support \$1,179,162 in federal expenditures.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

- Fiscal year 2012 purchase order #804-BIA “O” Street in the amount \$24,322.00 was not approved by the BOCC.
- Invoices to support fiscal year 2012 purchase orders #994 – BIA Hubbard Road Bridge and #3662 – BIA Oakland Bridge #145 did not have dates.
- Encumbrances for fiscal year 2012 purchase orders #804–BIA “O” Street in the amount \$24,322.00 and #1160-BIA Hubbard Road Bridge in the amount of \$592,436.35 were made after the invoice dates.
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expenditures in the amount of \$24,322.00 (fiscal year 2011 purchase order #18 and fiscal year 2012 purchase order #804 “O” Street) were not supported by a vendor contract containing the required Buy-America clause.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to ensure compliance with OMB Circular A-133. The County is not following established purchasing procedures.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions resulted in noncompliance to grant requirements. The County runs the risk of misappropriation of funds and the possibility of not having adequate funds available to pay for expenses incurred.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends the County gain an understanding of requirements for these programs and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with requirements. OSAI also recommends Kay County practice proper purchasing procedures. All purchases should be properly requisitioned, encumbered, approved, and received with proper supporting documentation attached.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** I was not aware of the Davis Bacon Act or Regulations. In the future we will follow all Federal Regulation regarding disbursements.

**County Clerk:** The County Clerk is not directly responsible for each of the controls for the items listed above. This was done outside of the clerk’s responsibilities and duties. The clerk’s office does the purchasing and bidding upon request of other officers and has no control over accounts they spend money in; the clerk is not the requisitioning officer of these accounts and is not the receiving officer for the BIA accounts.

**County Commissioner District 1:** The vendor had the Certified wage reports we didn’t thank we needed them and didn’t ask for them.

We now has in place receiving reports that are itemized.

We no longer accept invoices without dates

We were under the understanding the Buy America Clause only applied to stimulus monies and the BIA did not require copy’s the above Clause.

**Current County Commissioner District 2:** I was not in office at these times; however, we as a commissioner board will look at the projects to see if they fall under A-133, and if so we will go to CFDA.gov and make sure we are in compliance with all requirements and regulations. We will also make sure we are following the purchasing procedure regulations.



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Auditor Response:** The contract between the County and the BIA for the “O” Street project clearly stated that the funds were “funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009”(stimulus); regardless, the Davis-Bacon Act is a Federal requirement for all federally funded construction projects regardless of whether the funds were stimulus or not.

**Criteria:** *OMB A-133, Subpart C, §\_\_\_.300* reads as follows:

Subpart C—Auditees

§\_\_\_.300 Auditee responsibilities.

The auditee shall:

(b) Maintain internal controls over Federal programs that provides reasonable assurance that the auditee is managing Federal awards in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of contracts or grant agreements that could have material effect on each of its Federal programs.

OMB A-133 Compliance Supplement for Compliance Requirement Allowable Costs-requires adequate documentation which would include detailed invoices and receiving information.

OMB A-133 Compliance Supplement for Compliance Requirement Davis –Bacon Act requires all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors to work on construction contracts in excess of \$2,000 financed by Federal assistance fund must be paid wages not less than those established for the locality of the project (prevailing wage rate) by the Department of Labor (40 USC 3141-3144, 3146, and 3147 (formerly 40 USC 276a to 276a-7)). Further, documentation of compliance with this requirement should be retained by the county.

American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA) § 1605 Subpart 25.6—American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—Buy American Act—Construction Materials requires the use of American made products. Documentation of compliance with this requirement should be retained by the county.

Title 62 O.S. § 310.1 states in part:

Unless otherwise provided by ordinance, officers, boards, commissioners and designated employees of...shall submit all purchase orders and contracts prior to the time the commitment is made, to the officer charged with keeping the appropriation and expenditure records or clerk, who shall, if there be an unencumbered balance in the appropriation made for that purpose, so certify...that the amount of this encumbrance has been entered against the designated appropriation account...

Title 19 O.S. § 1505.E. states in part:

A receiving officer for the requesting department shall be responsible for receiving all items delivered to that department... the receiving officer shall obtain the delivery ticket, bill of lading, or other delivery document and compare it with the purchase order...the receiving officer shall complete a receiving report in quadruplicate which shall state the

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

quantity and quality of goods delivered...the receiving officer shall file the receiving report and submit the original and a copy...to the county purchasing agent and a copy of the receiving report with delivery documentation to the county clerk...The invoice shall state the name and address of the vendor and must be sufficiently itemized to clearly describe each item purchased, the unit price when applicable, the number or volume of each item purchased, the total price, the total purchase price, and the date of the purchase. Upon receipt of an invoice the county clerk shall compare the following documents: a.) requisition, b.) purchase order, c.) invoice with noncollusion affidavit as required by law, d.) receiving report and e.) delivery documentation ...If the documents conform as to the quantity and quality of the items, the county clerk shall prepare a warrant for payment...

**SECTION 4—This section contains certain matters not required to be reported in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*. However, we believe these matters are significant enough to bring to management’s attention. We recommend that management consider these matters and take appropriate corrective action.**

**Finding 2012-19 – Segregation of Duties – Court Clerk (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** Upon inquiry and observation of the Court Clerk’s office it was noted that one person is responsible for performing the daily close out, preparing the deposit, and taking the deposit to the County Treasurer. Another person is responsible for preparing claims and vouchers, signing vouchers, mailing out vouchers, retaining claims, and supporting documentation, preparing monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reporting.

**Cause of Condition:** The Court Clerk’s office has not implemented procedures to ensure adequate controls are in place to safeguard assets and to separate key functions and processes among various employees in the office or to have levels of review over the processes performed.

**Effect of Condition:** A single person having responsibility for more than one area of recording, authorization, custody of assets, and execution of transactions could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, clerical errors, or misappropriation of funds not being detected in a timely manner.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends the following key accounting functions of the Court Clerk’s office be adequately segregated:

- Preparing and reviewing deposits and taking them to the bank.
- Maintaining accounting records and reconciling bank statements.

In addition, OSAI recommends establishing a system of controls to adequately protect the collections of the Court Clerk’s office, which includes but are not limited to the following:

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

- Establish separate cash drawers for all employees receiving cash.
- A daily log of mailed in receipts should be compiled.

**Management Response:**

**County Court Clerk:** I did not take office until September 4, 2012. From this point forward, a person other than the preparer will review and approve reports from the bookkeeper.

**Criteria:** Effective internal controls require that key functions within a process be adequately segregated to allow for prevention and detection of errors and possible misappropriation of funds.

**Finding 2012-20 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over the Court Fund (Repeat Finding)**

**Condition:** During our audit of the Court Clerk’s records, the following was noted:

- The Court Fund annual report was not completed accurately as to reflect the Court Clerk’s balance.
- The Court Clerk did not reconcile the Court Fund collections, disbursements, and ending balance to the County Treasurer.

**Cause of Condition:** Policies and procedures have not been designed and implemented to ensure the Court Fund is reconciled to the County Treasurer at year end and the Court Fund annual report is completed accurately and reviewed and approved by someone other than the preparer.

**Effect of Condition:** These conditions could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, undetected errors, or misappropriation of funds.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends reconciliations of the Court Fund be performed and approved by someone other than the preparer and that evidence of review should be documented and year end reports be prepared accurately and reviewed and approved by someone other than the preparer.

**Management Response:**

**County Court Clerk:** I did not take office until September 4, 2012. From this point forward, a person other than the preparer will review and approve reports from the bookkeeper.

**Criteria:** Effective internal controls are necessary to ensure stewardship and accountability of public funds. Important aspects of effective accounting procedures includes reconciliations for all accounts be performed and reviewed and approved by someone other than the preparer and annual reports be completed accurately and reviewed and approved by someone other than the preparer.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding: 2012-21 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Consumable Inventories**

**Condition:** When documenting controls over consumable inventory and comparing consumable item records to items in stock, we noted the following:

**District 1:**

- Fuel is not adequately safeguarded.
- The amount of fuel in the tanks is not reconciled to consumable records.
- Consumable records are not up to date and accurate.
- Of the 10 items tested, 6 items did not agree to consumable records.

**District 2:**

- Fuel tanks are not monitored and amounts in tanks are not reconciled to consumable records. The actual amount of diesel in the tank was 149 gallons more than the records indicated and the actual amount of unleaded in the tank was 727 gallons less than consumable records indicated.
- Consumable records are not up to date and accurate.
- Many items have negative balances noted on the records.
- Of the 10 items tested, 7 items did not agree to consumable records and tires were not noted on consumable records.
- Items in stock are not routinely compared to inventory records.
- Transfer information on consumable records is not reconciled to transfer documents.

**District 3:**

- Consumable records maintained in the computer are not up to date and accurate due to input errors.
- Grader blades are not maintained on consumable inventory records.

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been designed to perform periodic inventory of consumable items on hand to inventory records.

**Effect of Condition:** Failure to maintain accurate records of consumable inventories could result in inaccurate records, unauthorized use of consumable inventories, or misappropriation of consumable inventories.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends management implement internal controls to ensure compliance with 19 O.S. § 1504A. These controls would include:

- Performing and documenting a periodic physical count of inventory.
- Separating the key function of receiving, maintaining, and verifying consumable inventories.
- Maintaining a fuel log with all pertinent information and with a current balance.
- Reconciling fuel log periodically to fuel on hand and explain any variance or adjustments.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** A complete inventory of the yard will be done on a quarterly basis and our computer systems vendor will be contacted in order to correct any input errors. Grader blades are maintained on the consumable inventory but were accidentally left off the inventory sheet given to the auditor.

**County Commissioner District 1 Commissioner:** We now have a camera monitoring the fuel tanks. It is a struggle to keep records of fuel, pipe, grader blades, and rock. We are requiring our employees to do a sign in sheet of the items used at the end of every day.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2 Commissioner:** We are sticking the tanks on a regular basis to remedy the situation. We feel confident our records are accurate with fuel on hand. There was some confusion when we moved to the new facility on how much fuel we started with. We are working to fix that. I have spoken with my assistant and she will be speaking to our computer systems vendor to find a solution to the consumable records and transfer document issues. We also will begin to compare our actual inventories to what the computer says we should have.

**Criteria:** Effective internal controls include designing and implementing procedures to ensure that all supplies, materials, and equipment received, disbursed, stored and consumed by their department comply with 19 O.S. § 1504A.

**Finding: 2012-22 – Inadequate Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Fixed Assets**

**Condition:** When comparing fixed asset items in inventory to inventory records, we noted the following:

**District 1:**

- Of the 20 items tested, 3 pieces of equipment did not have an inventory asset number.
- There was no documentation as to when the last physical inventory was taken.

**District 2:**

- Of the 20 items tested, 3 pieces of equipment did not have an inventory asset number, and 2 pieces of rolling stock were not marked with “Property of Kay County.”
- There was no documentation as to when the last physical inventory was taken.
- Of the 3 disposed of items tested none were supported by Board approved disposal records or resolutions.

**District 3:**

- Of the 20 items tested, 2 pieces of equipment did not have an inventory asset number, 1 piece of equipment had the wrong number attached, and 1 piece of inventory was not noted on the inventory list.
- There was no documentation as to when the last physical inventory was taken.
- Of the 3 disposed items tested, 1 had no Board approved disposal record or resolution and 1 item was traded in on March 16, 2013, but the Board approved resolution was not prepared until April 22, 2013.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Cause of Condition:** Procedures have not been implemented regarding the accurate reporting of fixed assets, periodic inventory of fixed assets, and Board approval prior to the disposing of fixed assets.

**Effect of Condition:** Failure to maintain accurate records of fixed asset inventories, failure to perform a periodic physical inventory of fixed assets, and failure to obtain Board approval prior to the disposing of fixed assets could result in inaccurate records, unauthorized use of fixed assets, or misappropriation of fixed assets.

**Recommendation:** OSAI recommends the County adopt policies and procedures to implement a system of internal controls over the fixed assets inventory records. These controls would include that all offices:

- Perform an annual inventory count.
- Retain documentation to verify the physical inventory counts were performed.
- Inventory count should be performed by someone other than the receiving officer or inventory officer.

Further, OSAI recommends the County comply with 19 O.S. § 178.1 by maintaining inventory records and properly marking assets with county identification numbers, and performing and documenting a periodic inventory of fixed assets. The verification should be performed by an individual independent of the fixed asset recordkeeping process.

**Management Response:**

**BOCC Chairman:** The two pieces of equipment were given a number; one had been lost but replaced. The incorrect number was corrected and one piece of equipment that was not noted on the inventory list was due to the price not being entered into the computer system. If the price is not listed, it will not print it out on the printout sheet. This has been corrected.

The date was not written on the physical inventory sheet that was given to the auditor, but was done one week prior to the auditor's performing inventory. Future inventory will be taken and dated on a quarterly basis.

In the future, disposed items must and will be approved with attached resolution prior to disposal. In the past, we had never received copies of resolutions regarding disposed equipment from the County Clerk, but we will start requesting them for future reference.

**County Commissioner District 1:** We now are creating our own inventory numbers instead of the County Clerk. We keep an inventory log in the office beside the one maintained in the computer system but it was never requested to be seen.

**Prior County Commissioner District 2:** We are in the process of ordering inventory stickers for the pieces of equipment that had no numbers. We will be affixing decals stating "Property of Kay County District #2" on those pieces of equipment that had none. Inventory stickers were placed on disposed items, but not until after this fiscal year ended. In reviewing the inventory we found those items had been

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

disposed of so we submitted them on one resolution but not until after the fiscal year had ended. We are working to correct those kind of mistakes.

**Auditor Response:** We obtained the inventory lists from the District Barn and performed our inventory inspection based upon those lists. Additionally, prior to the disposal of inventory items, the office in possession of the item should submit a resolution to the Board of County Commissioners requesting the disposal of the item. All resolutions should be presented to and reviewed by the Board of County Commissioners in an open meeting.

**Criteria:** An important aspect of internal controls is the safeguarding of assets. Internal controls constitute a process affected by an entity's governing body, management and other personnel, designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of fixed assets, and safeguarding items from loss, damage, or misappropriation.

Title 19 O.S. § 178.1 states in part: The board of county commissioners in each county of this state shall take, or cause to be taken, an inventory of all working tools, apparatus, machinery and equipment belonging to the county or lease or otherwise let to it or to any department thereof, other than that which is affixed to and made a part of lands and buildings, the cost of which as to each complete working unit thereof is more than Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00), and thereafter maintain or cause to be maintained a continuous inventory record... annually thereafter, or oftener...

Title 69 O.S. § 645 states in part, "equipment shall be conspicuously and legibly marked PROPERTY OF (name of county) COUNTY..."

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA**  
**SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS**  
**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2009-9 – FEMA – Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Homeland Security

**CFDA NO:** 97.036

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Disaster Grants - Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters)

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2009

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** All

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133. Also, the County has not designed an accounting system or yearend process to accumulate and report its —in-kind labor and equipment charges reported on the schedule of expenditures of federal awards.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; however, two years have passed since the audit report was submitted to the federal clearinghouse. The federal agency or pass-through entity are not currently following up with the auditee on the finding, and a management decision was not issued by the federal agency or the pass-through entity.

**Finding 2009-10 – FEMA Files – Documentation of Federal Expenditures**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Homeland Security

**CFDA NO:** 97.036

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Disaster Grants - Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters)

**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** 1775, and 1803

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2009

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** All

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$137,602.92

**Finding Summary:** Districts 1 and 2 were unable to provide adequate documentation to support the federal monies disbursed on disasters.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; however, two years have passed since the audit report was submitted to the federal clearinghouse. The federal agency or pass-through entity are not currently following up with the auditee on the finding, and a management decision was not issued by the federal agency or the pass-through entity.



**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2010-3 – Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** All  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** All  
**CFDA NO:** All  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** All  
**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2010  
**CONTROL CATEGORY:** All  
**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-3.

**Finding 2010-9 – Material Contracts (BIA) (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation  
**CFDA NO:** 20.205  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction  
**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00090027, and AGB00100019  
**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2010  
**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Procurement, Suspension and Debarment.  
**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Finding Summary:** The County did not properly bid expenditures for the federal program Highway Planning and Construction.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-9.

**Finding 2010-16 – County Wide Controls over Major Programs – BIA**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation  
**CFDA NO:** 20.205  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction  
**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00090027, and AGB00100019  
**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2010

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Activities Allowed or Unallowed; Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; Period of Availability; and Procurement, Suspension and Debarment.

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-16.

**Finding 2010-17 – Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Major Programs – BIA**

**PASS THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation

**CFDA NO:** 20.205

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction

**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00090027, and AGB00100019

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2010

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; and Reporting.

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$1,264,799

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-17.

**Finding 2011-3 – Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** All

**FEDERAL AGENCY:** All

**CFDA NO:** All

**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** All

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2011

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Reporting

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$-0-

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-3.

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**Finding 2011-9 – Material Contracts (BIA) (Repeat Finding)**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation  
**CFDA NO:** 20.205  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction  
**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00090027, and AGB00100019  
**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2011  
**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Procurement, Suspension and Debarment.  
**QUESTIONED COSTS:** -0-

**Finding Summary:** The County did not properly bid expenditures for the federal program Highway Planning and Construction.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-9.

**Finding 2011-16 – County Wide Controls over Major Programs – BIA**

**PASS-THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation  
**CFDA NO:** 20.205  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction  
**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, RAC0310007, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00100019, and AGB00100020  
**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2011  
**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Activities Allowed or Unallowed; Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; Period of Availability; and Procurement, Suspension and Debarment.  
**QUESTIONED COSTS:** -0-

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** Not Corrected.

**Finding 2011-17 – Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over Major Programs – BIA**

**PASS THROUGH GRANTOR:** Bureau of Indian Affairs  
**FEDERAL AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Transportation  
**CFDA NO:** 20.205  
**FEDERAL PROGRAM NAME:** Highway Planning and Construction

**KAY COUNTY, OKLAHOMA  
SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

---

**FEDERAL AWARD NUMBER:** RAC00310003, RAC0310007, AGB00090026, RAC00310001, AGB00100019, and AGB00100020

**FEDERAL AWARD YEAR:** 2011

**CONTROL CATEGORY:** Allowable Costs/Cost Principles; Davis-Bacon Act; and Reporting.

**QUESTIONED COSTS:** \$1,777,019

**Finding Summary:** The County has not designed and implemented formal internal controls for the reporting of its federal programs as required by OMB Circular A-133.

**Status:** No corrective action taken; see Finding 2012-17.



**OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR**  
2300 N. LINCOLN BOULEVARD, ROOM 100  
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105-4896

[WWW.SAI.OK.GOV](http://WWW.SAI.OK.GOV)