

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

REPORTS DUE	FY 2005				FY 2006				FY 2007				FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010			
	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT
	24	161	19	204	24	156	18	198	24	148	18	190	24	153	17	194	24	152	16	192	24	153	16	193
<u>Areas of Noncompliance with Audit Guidelines</u>																								
1. Audit reports not filed @	-	9	1	10	-	3	1	4	-	1	2	3	-	7	1	8	-	8	1	9	-	4	1	5
2. Audit reports not filed on time @	3	32	3	38	1	33	5	39	4	26	3	33	4	42	1	47	1	25	2	28	-	39	2	41
3. Auditor issued a qualified opinion / disclaimer / adverse opinion or improperly issued an unqualified opinion	-	3	-	3	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	4	-	4
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	-	4	1	5	1	11	1	13	2	3	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	1
b. Auditor's opinion did not cover all opinion units or financial statements	-	14	5	19	1	7	1	9	1	9	-	10	-	1	4	5	1	2	-	3	1	6	-	7
c. Auditor did not report on all required information.	1	10	2	13	-	6	2	8	-	1	-	1	-	2	3	5	1	3	-	4	2	4	-	6
5. Financial statements not presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles @																								
a. Required statements not presented or presentation inappropriate	3	52	5	60	2	48	3	53	4	18	5	27	1	23	4	28	3	15	1	19	-	11	4	15
b. Inadequate disclosure in the financial statements (e.g., basis of accounting, cash deposits with financial institutions and investments)	1	11	-	12	1	22	-	23	1	14	-	15	-	6	-	6	1	5	-	6	1	6	-	7
6. Auditor did not submit letter stating reasons for expressing other than an unqualified opinion	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	0	-	3	-	3
TOTAL	8	137	17	162	6	134	13	153	12	73	10	95	5	83	13	101	8	61	4	73	5	77	7	89

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.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS

SUMMARY REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT REPORTS

REPORTS DUE	FY 2005				FY 2006				FY 2007				FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010			
	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT	CO	CT	TD	TOT
	24	161	19	204	24	156	18	198	24	148	18	190	24	153	17	194	24	152	16	192	24	153	16	193
<u>Areas of Noncompliance with State Law*</u>																								
1. Uninsured/uncollateralized cash deposits	6	14	1	21	4	11	-	15	7	18	1	26	5	17	-	22	3	8	-	11	2	7	-	9
2. Miscellaneous	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE	6	15	1	22	4	12	0	16	7	18	1	26	5	17	0	22	3	8	0	11	2	7	0	9
<u>Potential Financial Problems *</u>																								
1. General fund deficits	-	3	-	3	-	5	-	5	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6
2. Unfavorable general fund trends and ratios	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	0
3. Pension costs	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
TOTAL POTENTIAL FINANCIAL PROBLEMS	1	4	0	5	1	7	0	8	1	5	0	6	1	8	0	9	0	9	0	9	0	6	0	6

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 October 24, 2011, acceptable responses to all of our requests for corrective action plans had been submitted, except for two local governments. Specifically, the Town of Morningside (uninsured, uncollateralized cash deposits) and the Town of Port Deposit (unreserved general fund deficit) did not submit responses.