

& Inspector

This publication is printed and issued by the State Auditor and Inspector as authorized by Article 10, § 9C (i) of the Oklahoma Constitution and as defined by 19 O.S. § 1704.3. Pursuant to 74 O.S. § 3105.B, ten (10) copies have been prepared and distributed at a cost of \$23.78. Copies have been deposited with the Publications Clearinghouse of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

STATE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

STEVE BURRAGE, CPA State Auditor

MICHELLE R. DAY, ESQ. Chief Deputy



2300 N. Lincoln Boulevard State Capitol, Room 100 Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4801 Phone (405) 521-3495 Fax (405) 521-3426 www.sai.ok.gov

March 16, 2010

TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VICI-CAMARGO EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE DISTRICT

Transmitted herewith is the agreed-upon procedures report for the Vici-Camargo Emergency Medical Service District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. The Office of the State Auditor and Inspector is committed to serving the public interest by providing independent oversight and by issuing reports that serve as a management tool to the State. Our goal is to ensure a government that is accountable to the people of the State of Oklahoma.

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

Sincerely,

STEVE BURRAGE, CPA

STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

STATE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

STEVE BURRAGE, CPA State Auditor

MICHELLE R. DAY, ESQ. Chief Deputy



2300 N. Lincoln Boulevard State Capitol, Room 100 Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4801 Phone (405) 521-3495 Fax (405) 521-3426 www.sai.ok.gov

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VICI-CAMARGO EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE DISTRICT

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by management of the Vici-Camargo Emergency Medical Service District (the District), solely to assist you in evaluating the receipt and disbursement process, the safeguarding of capital assets, and in determining whether selected receipts and disbursements are supported by underlying records for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States of America. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

1. We observed whether receipting, depositing, and reconciling functions were performed by separate employees.

Finding: Based on the observation of revenue collections, receipting, depositing, and reconciling functions are performed by the same employee.

- 2. We randomly selected 20 runs from the dispatch log book in order to:
 - A. Trace to the run sheet.
 - B. Agree fee charged to fee schedule.
 - C. Trace run to billing records.
 - D. Trace receipt number from billing records to receipt.
 - E. Trace receipt to deposit slip.
 - F. Agree cash/check composition of deposits to the receipts issued.
 - G. Observe whether receipts are pre-numbered and issued in numerical order.
 - H. Agree date of receipts to date of deposit slip.
 - I. For any voided receipts, observe the original receipt.
 - J. Observe second billing and or list sent to collection agency if no payment was received.
 - K. Observe whether the amount was written off with District Board authorization in the Board minutes.

Finding: With respect to procedure B, 2 of the 20 runs observed were charged a non-emergency fee of \$225, but should have been charged an emergency fee of \$300.

With respect to the other procedures applied, there were no findings.

3. We agreed receipts issued by the District to deposits made with the Dewey County Treasurer for the fiscal year.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

4. We agreed Dewey County Treasurer's apportioned revenue to District records.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

5. We observed whether receiving goods and services, preparing claims, and issuing payments were performed by separate employees.

Finding: The claims are prepared by the same employee that receives some of the goods/services, and prepares/issues payments.

6. We reconciled disbursements, as reported on the District's Estimate of Needs, to debits/checks clearing the bank for the fiscal year.

Finding: A variance of \$3,894.02 was identified when comparing the disbursements reported on the Estimate of Needs to disbursements reported on the District's records from July 2008 through June 2009.

- 7. We randomly selected 20 checks in order to:
 - A. Agree to invoices.
 - B. Agree payee on cancelled check to vendor on invoice.
 - C. Observe the receiving invoice for signature of District employee verifying goods and/or services were received.
 - D. Observe claim approval to District Board minutes.
 - E. Select any items requiring bids in order to:
 - i. Observe proof of publication for the bid.
 - ii. Observe the lowest and best bid was accepted.
 - iii. Observe District Board approval of the bid as recorded in the minutes.

Finding: The following exceptions were noted as a result of applying the procedures:

With respect to procedure A, 1 of the 20 expenditures observed did not have an invoice for goods or services to determine the amount paid was correct.

With respect to procedure C, 3 of the 20 expenditures observed had no evidence that the goods/services were received.

With respect to the other procedures applied, there were no findings.

8. We observed whether expenditures exceeded appropriations in any budget category.

Finding: The audit expense category exceeded budgeted appropriations by \$636.56.

9. We observed the publication notice of the District's Estimate of Needs for the fiscal year.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

10. We observed whether Board members coverage for official bond was included in the District's insurance policy.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

- 11. With respect to the District's policy regarding safeguarding of capital assets, we performed the following:
 - A. Observe the existence of an equipment inventory list.
 - B. Observe documentation of the conduct of a physical inventory.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

12. We observed insurance policies for the existence of coverage of capital assets.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

13. We obtained District Board minutes to identify items not pertinent to District operations.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an examination or a review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or limited assurance on the on the receipt and disbursement process, the safeguarding of capital assets, and the determination of whether selected receipts and disbursements are supported by underlying records for the District. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or limited assurance. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Board of Trustees, Excise Board, and Legislative Officials and should not be used for any other purpose. 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.

STEVE BURRAGE, CPA

STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

March 1, 2010



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

WWW.SAI.OK.GOV