



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Convoy
Van Wert County
123 South Main Street
P.O. Box 310
Convoy, Ohio 45832

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of Village of Convoy (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

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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2009 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, 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 institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash (Continued)

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 check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. 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 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 two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax 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 County Auditor's Appropriation History from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Ohio Public Works Commission to the Village during 2011 and 2010. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Income Tax Receipts

1. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the cash register tape. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We compared the cash register tape total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Receipt Register Report for that date. The amounts agreed.
2. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
3. We selected five income tax refunds from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the refund paid from Payment Register Detail Report to the refund amount requested in the tax return. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We noted each of the refunds were approved by the Income Tax Administrator.
 - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the General Fund, as is required.

Water and Sewer Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2010 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:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Daily Cash Receipts Journal for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. Complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Aged Customer Delinquent Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$8,707 and \$6,345 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$5,415 and \$3,518 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 \$2,013 and \$3,988 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.
 - b. We noted that the President of the Board of Public Affairs does not approve any adjustment. We recommend the President of the Board of Public Affairs approve each non-cash receipt adjustment made by the Fiscal Officer indicating it was appropriate.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3 except for the Ohio Public Works Commission Loan (CM32E). The summary indicates a balance of \$59,023 when it should be \$56,914. This was an input error made by the Fiscal Officer. We recommend amounts entered into the debt summary on the UAN system be reviewed for accuracy.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Ohio Water Development Authority Loan	\$98,821
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan (CT38K)	277,737
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan (CM11I)	9,433
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan (CM32E)	56,914

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail 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 except for loan proceeds from the Ohio Public Works Commission and the Ohio State Fire Marshal's Office in 2011. Also payments made in 2011 on the loan with the Ohio State Fire Marshal's Office were not included on the summary. We recommend that the debt summary on the UAN system include all pertinent information including new debt issued and any principal payments made during the year.
3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt 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.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Fire and EMS and the Storm Sewer Project funds per the Receipt Register Report. The loan proceeds received in the Fire and EMS fund were incorrectly classified as miscellaneous revenue. Loan proceeds in the Storm Sewer Project fund were incorrectly classified as intergovernmental revenue. We recommend all debt proceeds be properly classified as debt proceeds in the UAN system.
5. For new debt issued during 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds from the Ohio Public Works Commission for the storm drainage improvement project, and purchase a fire truck with proceeds from the Ohio State Fire Marshal's Office. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village had a storm drainage improvement project in September of 2011 and purchased a fire truck in October of 2011.

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 Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files and minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

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 & Medicare	January 31, 2012	December 29, 2011	\$4,366.30	\$4,366.30
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	December 29, 2011	\$ 690.20	\$ 690.20
Village of Convoy income taxes	January 15, 2012	December 29, 2011	\$ 409.47	\$ 409.47
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	December 29, 2011	\$7,485.85	\$7,485.85

3. We selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report:
 - a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The Village's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 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 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 estimated receipts 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 Water 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 Water 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.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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 Water funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 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 Water 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 Water 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, 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 exceeding \$5,000 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, 2011 and 2010 for material or labor procurements which exceeded \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011), and therefore required competitive bidding under Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14.

We identified a new well construction project exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011), subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14. For this project, we noted that the Council advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

We identified a storm drainage improvement project exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011), subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14. For this project, we noted that the Council advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail 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:

Water and Sewer adjustments will be presented to the Board of Public Affairs President for his approval and documented in the minutes. I will also double check the input figures and try to enter the correct figures for the debt balances on the debt summary report along with all debt held by the Village. I will also make a note to enter all new debt under the classification of debt proceeds on the financial statement.

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 17, 2012

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF CONVOY

VAN WERT 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 24, 2012