



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Navarre  
Stark County  
27 West Canal Street  
Navarre, Ohio 44662

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Navarre (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, 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Monthly Fund Statements Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Monthly Fund Statement Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Monthly Fund Statement Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Year to Date Fund Statement – by Account # Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced three debits to the subsequent January bank statement. We found two debits (outstanding checks) still outstanding through the June 2013 reconciliation.
  - 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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.
7. We inspected the "Revenue History report by Account #" to determine whether the Finding For Adjustment identified in the prior audit report due from the General fund, payable to the Cemetery Endowment fund, was properly posted to the report. We found 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 2012 and one from 2011:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue Entry Journal. 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 History Report by account # to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Revenue History Report by Account # included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the Stark County Pay In Sheets from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue Entry Journal. 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.

#### **Income Tax Receipts**

1. We compared the allocation of income tax receipts for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 to the Village's funds according to the allocation requirements of Ordinance No. 4-2007. The allocation agreed with the percentages the Ordinance requires.

2. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the Cash Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We compared the Cash Receipts Journal total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Revenue Entry Journal for that date. The amounts agreed.
3. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
4. We selected five income tax refunds from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the refund paid from Check Register Direct Posting Expense Entry Journal to the refund amount requested in the tax return. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We noted each of the refunds was approved by Income Tax Administrator.
  - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the Income Tax Fund, as is required.

#### **Joint Economic Development District (JEDD)**

We haphazardly selected one JEDD cash receipt from the year ended December 31, 2012 and one from the year ended 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Entry Journal. The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

#### **Water and Sewer Fund**

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the Utility System Daily Cash Receipts Journal and determined whether the:
  - a. Receipt amount per the Utility System Daily Cash Receipts Journal agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Detailed Summary Each Customer's Account. The amounts agreed.
  - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
    - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Pay In for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
    - ii. Complied with rates in force during the audit period multiplied by the consumption amount recorded for the billing period, plus any applicable late penalties, plus unpaid prior billings. 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 Utility Billing Delinquent Report
  - a. We noted this report listed \$7,791 and \$6,372 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
  - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$0 and \$0 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.

3. We read the Utility System File Maintenance Transactions Report.
  - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$64 and \$0 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
  - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2012 and five non-cash adjustments from 2011, and noted that the Fiscal Officer and Utility Secretary approved each adjustment.

#### Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2010. This amount agreed to the Village's January 1, 2011 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
OPWC Loan Repayment Project CT257	\$4,783.67

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Expense Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances.
3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to debt service fund payments reported in the Expense Ledger. 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 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Distribution Journal and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Distribution Journal 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 payroll ordinance or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel file and timesheet 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.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 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 2012. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2013	December 27, 2012	\$3,416	\$3,416
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 24, 2012	\$761	\$761
Village of Navarre income taxes	January 31, 2013	December 24, 2012	\$489	\$489
OPERS retirement Employer	January 30, 2013	December 27, 2012	\$6,888	\$6,888
Employee		December 24, 2012	\$2,440	\$2,440
OP&F retirement Employer	March 31, 2013	March 4, 2013	\$9,374	\$9,374
Employee	January 31, 2013	December 24, 2012	\$822	\$822

4. We haphazardly 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 Expense Ledger:
- Accumulated leave records
  - The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - 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 Navarre-Check Register for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 and determined whether:
- The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
  - 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 Expense Ledger Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - 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.
  - 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 Monthly Revenue Statement by Account # for the General, Income tax and Water funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Income Tax 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.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Monthly Expense Statement by Account # for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Income Tax and Water funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Monthly Expense Statement by Account #.
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, Income Tax and Water funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Income Tax and Water fund, as recorded in the Monthly Expense Statement by Account #. 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 December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and 2011 Appropriation Adjustment/Transfer Journal 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 Adjustment/Transfer Journal 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**

We inquired of management and scanned the “Navarre – Check Register” for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 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.

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, flowing style.

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

September 11, 2013

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**VILLAGE OF NAVARRE**

**STARK 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  
OCTOBER 3, 2013**