



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Creston
Wayne County
P.O. Box 194
Creston, Ohio 44217

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Creston (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, 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 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 Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balance agreed. 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 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 selected all reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each credit to the May and July 2012 bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Receipts Register. We determined that each credit was recorded as a 2012 receipt for a different amount resulting in an adjustment to the reconciliation.
7. 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.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental 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 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 four real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011, including two from Wayne County and two from Medina County. 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 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - 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

1. 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 MITS Batch Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We compared the tax return 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 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the refund paid from Appropriations Ledger Report to the refund amount requested in the tax return. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We noted each of the refunds was approved by the Tax Assistant.
 - 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, 2012 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2011 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 Demand Statement Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Demand Statement 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. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Update Journal Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$53,670 and \$52,380 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$1,103 and \$1,755 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
3. We read the Monthly Cash Receipts Journal - Adjustments Only Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$(328.92) and \$(1,252.35) 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. Per the Water/Sewer Clerk, the President of the Board of Public Affairs verbally approves significant non-cash adjustments. No written documentation of this approval was maintained. We recommend the President of the Board of Public Affairs or the Water/Sewer Superintendent give the Water/Sewer Clerk written approval to make non-cash adjustments that are unusual in nature or above a certain dollar amount, as established by the Board of Public Affairs.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following capital leases and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
OPWC Loans	\$289,925
OWDA Loan	\$31,943
OWDA Loans	\$181,172
Hughes Property Loan	\$49,199
2010 Chevy Truck Loan	\$19,593
Community Center Loan	\$220,673
Skid Loader Capital Lease	\$11,024
Backhoe Loan	\$41,722

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of loan and capital lease debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to payments from multiple funds, including the General fund, Street Construction, Maintenance & Repair fund, State Highway fund, Cemetery Fund, Parks & Recreation Fund, Creston Community Center fund, Bond Retirement fund, Water Operating fund, Sewer Operating fund, and Sewer Replacement & Improvement fund, 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, except the OPWC payment of \$12,933 due on July 1, 2012 that was not paid until August 9, 2012 and the OWDA payments of \$9,032 and \$1,593 due on July 1, 2012 that were not paid until July 27, 2012.
4. For a new capital lease entered into during 2011, we inspected the motion approved by Council, noting the Village approved a lease to purchase a mower. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village paid lease payments for a mower in 2011 and 2012.

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 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 employees' personnel files, minute record, 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 files 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
 - 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:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$3,381.59	\$3,381.59
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 29, 2012	671.74	671.74
Village of Creston income taxes	January 30, 2013	December 29, 2012	311.98	311.98
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 29, 2012	6,306.07	6,306.07
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	1,390.84	1,390.84

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 one instance where disbursements requiring certification were properly certified (per review of the PO Charges Report) but a signed copy of the purchase order was not maintained and one instance where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a *Then and Now Certificate* was issued. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should be on or before the invoice date, unless a *Then and Now Certificate* is used. Because we did not test all disbursements requiring certification, our report provides no assurance whether or not additional similar errors occurred.

Mayors Court Transactions and Cash Balances

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We compared the reconciled cash totals as of December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 to the Mayor's Court balance reported in the Mayor's Court Check Book. The balances agreed.
3. We observed the year-end bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
4. We selected all deposits in transit from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed these deposits' amounts to the court's cash book. Each deposit in transit was recorded as a receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
5. 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.

6. From the cash book, we haphazardly selected one month from the year ended December 31, 2012 and one month from the year ended 2011 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 *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Summary Report for the General, Water Operating and Sewer Bond funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the Water Operating and Sewer Bond Funds. The Revenue Summary Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Water Operating and Sewer Bond fund of \$268,800 and \$102,000, respectively, for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$258,800 and \$48,114, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Summary 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Water Operating, and Sewer Bonds 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 Summary Report for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: the General, Water Operating, and Sewer Bond funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Summary Report for all three funds in 2012. In 2011 the General and Water Operating funds agreed, however the Sewer Bond fund approved appropriations were \$80,000 while the Appropriation Summary Report reflected \$253,500.
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 Sewer Bond 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, Water Operating, and Sewer Bond funds, as recorded in the total appropriation measures approved by the Village Council. 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, 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 Revenue Summary Reports and Appropriation Summary Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$20,000 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 Summary 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

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 10, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF CRESTON

WAYNE 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
JUNE 11, 2013**