



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Carroll
Fairfield County
68 Center Street
Carroll, Ohio

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of Carroll Village (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 2013, [including mayor's court receipts, disbursements and balances,] 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, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Fund Status Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2013 and 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2013 bank account balance with the Village's financial institution. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February bank statements. 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.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental, and Municipal Income Taxes

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2013 and one from 2012:
 - 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 funds 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 2013 and 2012. We noted the Receipt 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 2013 and five from 2012. We also select five receipts from the County Auditor's Account History Detail Report from 2013 and five from 2012:
 - 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.

Income Tax Receipts

We obtained the December 31, 2013 and 2012 Total Distribution reports submitted by the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA), the agency responsible for collecting income taxes on behalf of the Village. We agreed the total gross income taxes per year to the Village's Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.

Water Operating and Sewer Operating Funds

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Operating collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2013 and 10 Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds collection cash receipts from the year ended 2012 recorded in the Bill Journal Receipt Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Bill Journal Receipt Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the bill report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Bill Journal Receipt Report 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. Receipts were posted to the proper funds, and were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.

Water Operating and Sewer Operating Funds (Continued)

2. We read the Penalty Transaction Log
 - a. We noted this report listed \$8,053 and \$6,653 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$1,428 and \$2013 were recorded as more than 60 days delinquent.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2011. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

| Issue | Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2011: |
|-----------------|--|
| OPWC Loan CQ14L | \$379,654 |
| OWDA loan #4980 | 319,599 |
| OWDA Loan #2633 | 239,652 |

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Water, Sewer, and General 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.
4. We compared the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the General fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts did not agree. The Village did not record \$25,074 in debt proceeds on their FY 2013 Financial Statements.
5. For new debt issued during 2013 and 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds to purchase a police cruiser. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village did not record \$25,074 of expenditures; however the proceeds were used to purchase a police cruiser on December 11, 2013.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 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 & minute record. We determined 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, 2013 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 2013. 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, 2014 | December 31, 2013 | \$3,776 | 3,776 |
| State Income Taxes | January 31, 2014 | December 20, 2013 | 189 | 189 |
| RITA | January 31, 2014 | December 20, 2013 | 312 | 312 |
| OPERS retirement | January 31, 2014 | December 31, 2013 | 2,021 | 2,021 |

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

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a and b above.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 2012 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.

Mayors Court Transactions

1. We haphazardly selected five cases from the court cash book and agreed the payee and amount posted to the:
- a. Duplicate receipt book.
 - b. Docket, including comparing the total fine paid to the judgment issued by the judge (i.e. mayor).
 - c. Case file.

The amounts recorded in the cash book, receipts book, docket and case file agreed.

Mayors Court Transactions (Continued)

2. From the cash book, we haphazardly selected one month from the year ended December 31, 2013 and one month from the year ended 2012 and determined whether:
 - a. The monthly sum of fines and costs collected for those months agreed to the amounts reported as remitted to the Village, State or other applicable government in the following month. We found no exceptions.
 - b. The totals remitted for these two months per the cash book agreed to the returned canceled checks. 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 book.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances* required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Street Construction and Repair, and Water Operating for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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 \$203,100 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$201,700. 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 2013 and 2012, to determine whether, for the General, Street Construction and Repair, and Water Operating funds 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 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Water Operating, and Street Construction and Maintenance and Repair. 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, Water Operating, and Street Construction and Maintenance and Repair funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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, 2013 and 2012 for the General, Water Operating, and Street Construction and Maintenance and Repair 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 Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and 2012 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers & advances exceeding \$1000 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 with 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.
9. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

July 30, 2014



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF CARROLL

FAIRFIELD 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
SEPTEMBER 02, 2014**