

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS
SUMMARY REVIEW
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT REPORTS

REPORTS DUE	FY 2004				FY 2005				FY 2006				FY 2007				FY 2008				FY 2009			
	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TOT</u>
	24	156	18	198	24	161	19	204	24	156	18	198	24	148	18	190	24	153	17	194	24	152	16	192
<u>Areas of Noncompliance with Audit Guidelines</u>																								
1. Audit reports not filed @	-	12	1	13	-	9	1	10	-	3	1	4	-	1	2	3	-	7	1	8	-	8	1	9
2. Audit reports not filed on time @	6	31	2	39	3	32	3	38	1	33	5	39	4	26	3	33	4	42	1	47	1	25	2	28
3. Auditor issued a qualified opinion / disclaimer / adverse opinion or improperly issued an unqualified opinion	1	1	-	2	-	3	-	3	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2
4. Auditor's report not presented in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards @																								
a. Auditor's report did not contain one or more of the basic elements required by auditing standards	-	6	1	7	-	4	1	5	1	11	1	13	2	3	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
b. Auditor's opinion did not cover all opinion units or financial statements	1	32	4	37	-	14	5	19	1	7	1	9	1	9	-	10	-	1	4	5	1	2	-	3
c. Auditor did not report on all required information.	1	6	-	7	1	10	2	13	-	6	2	8	-	1	-	1	-	2	3	5	1	3	-	4
5. Financial statements not presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles @																								
a. Required statements not presented or presentation inappropriate	8	92	4	104	3	52	5	60	2	48	3	53	4	18	5	27	1	23	4	28	3	15	1	19
b. Inadequate disclosure in the financial statements (e.g., basis of accounting, cash deposits with financial institutions and investments)	2	20	2	24	1	11	-	12	1	22	-	23	1	14	-	15	-	6	-	6	1	5	-	6
6. Auditor did not submit letter stating reasons for expressing other than an unqualified opinion	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	0
TOTAL *	19	201	14	234	8	137	17	162	6	134	13	153	12	73	10	95	5	83	13	101	8	61	4	73

CO - Counties

CT - Cities and Towns

TD - Taxing Districts

TOT - Total Units

@ - Local governments may appear more than once as certain local governments had more than one deficiency in these areas.

* - Large amounts in Fiscal Year 2004 due to new accounting standards effective for fiscal year 2004.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS
SUMMARY REVIEW
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT REPORTS

REPORTS DUE	FY 2004				FY 2005				FY 2006				FY 2007				FY 2008				FY 2009			
	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT
Areas of Noncompliance with State Law*	24	156	18	198	24	161	19	204	24	156	18	198	24	148	18	190	24	153	17	194	24	152	16	192
1. Uninsured/uncollateralized cash deposits	8	10	-	18	6	14	1	21	4	11	-	15	7	18	1	26	5	17	-	22	3	8	-	11
2. Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE	8	10	0	18	6	15	1	22	4	12	0	16	7	18	1	26	5	17	0	22	3	8	0	11
Potential Financial Problems *																								
1. General fund deficits	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	5	-	5	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6
2. Unfavorable general fund trends and ratios	-	3	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	3
3. Pension costs	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	0
TOTAL POTENTIAL FINANCIAL PROBLEMS	1	6	0	7	1	4	0	5	1	7	0	8	1	5	0	6	1	8	0	9	0	9	0	9

CO - Counties
CT - Cities and Towns
TD - Taxing Districts
TOT - Total Units

* Some local governments had more than one area of noncompliance with State law or potential financial problem (that is, certain local governments may be included in both categories).

Note - As of November 10, 2010, acceptable responses to all of our requests for corrective action plans had been submitted, except for two local governments. Specifically, the City of District Heights (unfavorable trends or ratios) and the Town of Morningside (uninsured, uncollateralized cash deposits) did not submit responses.