



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Bay View
Erie County
304 East Bay View Drive
Sandusky, Ohio 44870-6175

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Bay View, Erie County, Ohio (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, 2011 and 2010, 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. The Village processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Village because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 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, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:

- a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the Payment Register Report, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We selected all reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
- a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. We inspected the Fund Status Report to determine whether the Findings for Adjustment identified in the prior agreed-upon procedures report in the amounts of \$112.95 and \$122.90, due from the Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Fund, payable to the State Highway Fund, were properly posted to the report. The Fiscal Officer recorded an adjustment on February 28, 2012 in the Village's financial records reimbursing the State Highway fund \$112.95 and \$122.90.
8. We tested investments held at December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger 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 Revenue Ledger Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2011 and 2010:
 - a. One personal property tax receipt in 2010
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts

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

3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the Erie County Auditor Confirmation (County Confirmation) from 2011 and five from 2010.

- a. We compared the amount from the DTL and County Confirmation to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger Report. 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, 2011 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2010 recorded in the UAN receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged, where applicable, complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures report, we noted the following promissory note outstanding as of December 31, 2009. This amount agreed to the Villages January 1, 2009 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Police Cruiser Promissory Note	\$22,340

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger Report and Appropriation Ledger Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of promissory note debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule(s) to General Fund and Fire Levy Fund payments reported in the Appropriation Ledger Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Village made the payments. We found no exceptions.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133 allows various methods for subdivisions to incur debt. The Village has two promissory notes with a local bank for the purchase of a police cruiser and ambulance. This type of debt does not meet the criteria for any type of debt allowed in Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133. We recommend the Village contact their legal counsel before incurring future debt.
5. The Fiscal Officer did not record the proceeds from the 2010 promissory note in the Revenue Ledger Report. In order to properly reflect the benefit received from the promissory note, proceeds of \$36,110 should have been recorded in the Fire Levy Fund.

6. For new debt issued during 2010, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds to purchase a used ambulance. We scanned the Payment Register Report and noted the Fiscal Officer did not record the ambulance purchase expenditure. In order to properly reflect the benefit received from the proceeds of the promissory note purchase an expenditure in the amount of \$36,110 should have been recorded in the Fire Levy Fund.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Payroll Register – Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register – Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the General Information Report, minute record, or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period during 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$1,987	\$1,987
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	January 10, 2012	502	502
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	January 12, 2012	2,443	2,443

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten for the year ended December 31, 2010 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 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 amounts 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Fire Levy funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Fire Levy 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Fire Levy. The amounts on the appropriation ordinances 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 Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Fire Levy funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Fire Levy 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 Revenue Ledger Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers 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 and Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 to determine if the Village proceeded by force account (i.e. used its own employees) to maintain or repair roads (cost of project exceeding \$30,000) or to construct or reconstruct Village roads (cost of project \$30,000/per mile) 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:

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 26, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF BAY VIEW

ERIE 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 15, 2012**