



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Bailey Lakes
Ashland County
1244 Second Street
P.O. Box 989
Ashland, Ohio 44805

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Bailey Lakes, Ashland County, Ohio (the Village) have agreed, solely to assist the Village Council and Mayor in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, 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 Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Fund 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 Reports. 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 balance to the amount appearing in the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all two reconciling debits (outstanding checks) from the December 31, 2013 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.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Receipts

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 Revenue History 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 Revenue History Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2013 and 2012. We noted the Revenue History 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 selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor History Report from 2013 and five from 2012.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue History Report. 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.

Water and Sewer Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2013 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 recorded in the Cash Received Balance Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Cash Received Balance Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Account History Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Account History 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. The Village's utility system does not maintain an aging accounts receivable report that reports the total amount of receivables unpaid. Without an aging accounts receivable report, the Village lacks reliable information on overdue amounts and information upon which to judge whether the Village should write off or follow up on uncollectible accounts. We recommend the Village maintain an aging schedule of unpaid accounts receivable and periodically present the report to Council for review.

Water and Sewer Fund (Continued)

3. We read the Cash Received Balance Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$0 and \$162 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
 - b. We selected both non-cash adjustments from 2012, and noted the Village Council approved each adjustment.

Debt

1. The prior audit agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2011.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue History Report and Budget History 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 loan debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments to Sewer fund payments reported in the Budget History Report. We also compared the date the debt 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 Sewer fund per the Revenue History Report. The amounts agreed.
5. For new debt issued during 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the loan proceeds to purchase a backup generator and electrical panel for the waste water plant. We scanned the Budget History Report and noted the Village purchased a backup generator and electrical panel for the waste water plant in January of 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 Budget History Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded on the supporting voucher documentation to legislatively approved rate or salary. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Budget History Report. We found no exceptions.
 - c. 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 minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

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, 2014	January 15, 2014	\$288.20	\$288.20
State income taxes	January 31, 2014	January 27, 2014	\$83.89	\$83.89
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	December 11, 2013	\$140.00	\$140.00

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Budget History Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Budget History 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 four instances 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.

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 History Report for the General, Water and Sewer funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Water and Sewer 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 Budget History Report for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Water and Sewer funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Budget History Report.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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 and Sewer 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 and Sewer funds, as recorded in the Budget History 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 Revenue History 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.
7. We scanned the 2013 and 2012 Revenue History Reports and Budget History Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 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 Budget History 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 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

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Budget History 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, Village Council 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 "Y" and "O".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State
Columbus, Ohio

April 24, 2014



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF BAILEY LAKES

ASHLAND 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 8, 2014**