
ALGER & ASSOCIATES, LLC



VILLAGE OF HAYESVILLE

ASHLAND COUNTY

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

A large, light green outline of the letters 'A&A' in a decorative, serif font. The letters are positioned behind the text 'AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES'.

FOR THE YEARS ENDED

DECEMBER 31, 2010 & 2009



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Members of Council
Village of Hayesville
P.O. Box 246
Hayesville, Ohio 44838

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of the Village of Hayesville, Ashland County, prepared by Alger & Associates, LLC, for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010. Based upon this review, we have accepted these reports in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. The Village of Hayesville is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 26, 2011

VILLAGE OF HAYESVILLE
ASHLAND COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



ALGER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

Certified Public Accountants

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Hayesville
Ashland County
P.O. Box 246
Hayesville, Ohio 44838

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Hayesville (the Village) and the Auditor of State 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 and Investments

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 Fund Status Report 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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 and the December 31, 2009 bank account balances 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 and the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all of the outstanding checks from the December 31, 2010 and all outstanding checks from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:

- a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January and February bank statements. 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.
6. We selected all the deposits in transit from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
- a. We traced each deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed these deposits' amounts to the Receipts Register. Each deposit in transit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 to determine that they:
- a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. We noted no exceptions.

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 Register Report. 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 Register Report 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 receiptsWe noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected all of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and all from 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Water and Sewer Fund

1. We haphazardly selected ten Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten Water and Sewer collection cash receipts from the year ended 2009 recorded in the Receipt Register Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Receipt Register Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Daily Cash Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period complied with rates in force during the audit period multiplied by the consumption amount recorded for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Amount charged was posted as a receivable in the Receipt Register for the billing period.
 - d. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Customer Delinquent Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$15,857.36 and \$16,345.33 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$11,950.39 and \$11,171.09 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
3. We read the Daily Cash Receipts Journal.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$570.59 and \$258.17 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2010 and five non-cash adjustments from 2009, and noted that the Clerk approved each adjustment.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or outstanding as of December 31, 2010 or 2009. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2.
2. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2010 and 2009 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to enterprise fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Village made the payments. We found no exceptions.

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 Employee Detail Adjustment Report and determined whether the following information in the employees personnel file 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 employees' personnel files. 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:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2011	December 28, 2010	\$993.57	\$993.57
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 27, 2010	\$223.93	\$223.93
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2011	December 28, 2010	\$1,302.45	\$1,302.45

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report 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 Payment Register Detail Report 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 no exceptions.

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 Status Report for the General, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$68,818.39 for 2009. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$68,213.60. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Council may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and to monitor spending.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Water Operating and Sewer Operating 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, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds. 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, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted that General Fund appropriations for 2009 exceeded certified resources by \$3,208.78, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. Council should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Village to incur fund balance deficits.
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, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds, 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 Register Report 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.
7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$0 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 Status Reports 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 Payment Register Detail 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 Payment Register Detail 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.

The Village did not respond to any exceptions noted in the report.

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 and those charged with governance and the Auditor of State and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF HAYESVILLE

ASHLAND 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
MAY 10, 2011