



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Clifton
Greene County
P.O. Box 27
Clifton, Ohio 45316

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Clifton, Greene County (the Village) have agreed, solely to assist the Council and Mayor in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transactions; and management, the Mayor, and / or the Council are responsible for complying with the compliance requirements. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2008 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal Report. 2009 and 2010 bank balances exceeded the book balances by \$36 and 12 respectively. The Village should verify that the book balance reconciles to the bank.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 bank account balance with the Village's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Cash (Continued)

6. We selected the only deposit in transit from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced the deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exception.
 - b. We agreed the deposit's amount to the Cash Journal. The deposit in transit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2010 and one from 2009:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s) as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Ledger to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010 and 2009:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Receipt Ledger included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and five from 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2010 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2009 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger and Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Cash Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Report and Appropriation Ledger and determined whether the following information in the minute record was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
 - c. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged.
 - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
 - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

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

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2010. We noted the following:

<u>Withholding</u>	<u>Date Due</u>	<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Amount Withheld</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 3	\$ 3
Local Taxes	January 30, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 5	\$ 5
Social Security/Medicare	January 30, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$636	\$636

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. For the Appropriation Ledger report, we refooted checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for *security of persons and property*, and checks recorded as *public works* in the Street Maintenance & Repair fund for 2010. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed total disbursements (non-payroll and payroll) from the Appropriation Ledger and Payroll Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 to the total disbursements recorded in the check register. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

3. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Cash Journal for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 and determined whether:
 - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - b. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the check number, date, payee name and amount recorded in the Cash Journal and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - c. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the restricted purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
 - d. The fiscal officer certified disbursements requiring certification or issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D). We found two instances where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should precede the invoice date. To improve controls over disbursements and to help reduce the possibility that Village funds will exceed budgetary spending limitations, the Village's Clerk-Treasurer should certify that the funds are or will be available prior to the obligation by the Village. Because we did not test all disbursements, there may be other instances where this occurred.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Ledger for the General, Street, and State Highway funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Street Lighting, and Land and Building funds, the Council appropriated separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services," as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General, Road, and Festival. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Street, and State Highway funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 for the General, Street, and State Highway fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipt Ledger for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2010 and 2009. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Village received new restricted receipts. We noted no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Village to establish a new fund.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Revenue Ledger and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 -- .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which Section 5705.16 would require approval by the Tax Commissioner and Court of Common Pleas.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger to determine whether the Village elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. We noted the Village did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Cash Journal and Appropriation Ledger report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 for material or labor procurements which exceeded \$25,000, and therefore required competitive bidding under Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14.

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger and Cash Journal Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 to determine if the Village had road construction projects exceeding \$30,000 for which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 117.16(A) and 723.52 requires the Village engineer, or officer having a different title but the duties and functions of an engineer, to complete a force account project assessment form (i.e., cost estimate). We identified no projects requiring the completion of the force account assessment form.

Officials' Response:

(Cash #3) The differences in the bank reconciliations for the end of both years is due to the fact that there were deposits (interest and State of Ohio Municipal Levy payments) and withdrawals (Bank service charge) in December for which the Village did not know amounts until the bank statements were received in January. The Village posted the amounts to the ledgers in January and reconciled this with the monthly financial reports each month. A copy of these reconciliations are in the folder with the monthly financial reports.

(Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements #3.d) The purchase order problem was a typographical error. P.O. #10-60 should have been dated 2/9/10 (well in advance of checks #9740 and 9760). P.O. #10-61 is dated 2/10/10 and P.O. #10-60 is entered in the Appropriations ledger correctly on 2/9/10.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Village's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, and others within the Village, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 26, 2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF CLIFTON

GREENE COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

CERTIFIED
JUNE 2, 2011