



**VILLAGE OF PLEASANTVILLE
FAIRFIELD COUNTY**

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2009-2008



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF PLEASANTVILLE
FAIRFIELD COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Pleasantville
Fairfield County
207 West Columbus Street
Pleasantville, Ohio 43148

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Pleasantville, Fairfield 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, 2009 and 2008, 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, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2007 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, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balances with the Village's financial institution. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent year's 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.

Cash (Continued)

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 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 2009 and one from 2008:
 - 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 2009 and 2008:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts.
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts.

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) and five receipts from the County Auditor Detailed Expenditures Report (DER) from 2009 and five from each, the DTL and DER, from 2008.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and DER 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.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2009 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged 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.

Water and Sewer Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 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 Cash Receipts Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Amount charged was posted as a receivable in the Cash Receipts Report for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - d. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected 10 beginning A/R and/or delinquent accounts as of January 1, 2009, to determine the completeness and accuracy of the Customer Accounts brought forward from the Walnut Creek Sewer District records. We found no exceptions.

3. We read the Cash Receipts Report.

We noted this report listed \$4,010.08 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2009.

4. We read the Cash Receipts Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$915 non-cash receipts adjustments for the year ended December 31, 2009.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2009 and noted that Council approved one out of the five adjustments selected, ranging from \$15 to \$59. We recommend that any adjustments made by the Fiscal Officer are approved by Council.
5. We confirmed the Water receipts paid from the Walnut Creek Sewer District to the Village during 2008 with the District.
 - 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.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scan the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in Step 2. We noted no new debt issuances during 2008 or 2009.
2. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agree principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule(s) to Debt Service and Water Debt Service 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 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and determine whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and/or minute record 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, and
 - 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 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 file or minute record. 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, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Payroll (Continued)

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount
Federal Income Taxes	January 31, 2010	February 4, 2010	\$535
State Income Taxes	January 15, 2010	February 4, 2010	420
Local Income Taxes	January 15, 2010	February 4, 2010	439
OPERS Retirement (Withholding plus Employee Share)	January 30, 2010	February 4, 2010	1,354

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair, and Water Funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008.

The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund for 2009. The Resources Available for Appropriation Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$124,325. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$124,272.

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 2009 and 2008 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 Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2009 and 2008. 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair, and Water Funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted that Water Fund appropriations for 2009 exceeded certified resources by \$1,078, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The 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, 2009 and 2008 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, 2009 and 2008. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Village received new restricted receipts.

The Village established the FEMA Snow Emergency and Disaster funds during 2008 to segregate Federal Emergency Management Agency receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09.

7. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers and advances exceeding \$3,000 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 -- .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers and advances 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 scan the Appropriation Status Reports to determine whether the Village elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. We noted that the Village did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scan the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for material or labor procurements which exceeded \$25,000, and therefore required competitive bidding under Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14.

We identified the Walnut/Columbus Street and Lincoln Avenue Water Replacement projects both exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 731.14. For these projects, we noted that Council advertised the projects in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures (Continued)

2. We inquired of management and scan the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 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 a 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 the finance committee, management and Village Council, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mary Taylor".

Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

August 31, 2010

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF PLEASANTVILLE

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 23, 2010**