



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF BEVERLY
WASHINGTON COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE _____ **PAGE**

Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures..... 1

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Beverly
Washington County
919 Mitchell Avenue
Beverly, Ohio 45715

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Beverly, Washington 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, 2013 and 2012, 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, 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 documentation 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 Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Fund Ledger 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 balances with the Village's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly 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.
6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 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 2013 and one from 2012:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We noted receipts were posted at net instead of at gross.
 - 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 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 selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Check Report by Vendor 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

1. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2013 and five from 2012.
 - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the daily excel sheet. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We totaled the daily excel sheet for the month from step a. and compared the monthly total to the Deposit Listing-Summary Report. We then compared the Deposit Listing Summary Report total to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Receipt Register Report for that month. The amounts agreed.
2. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.

Income Tax Receipts (Continued)

3. We selected five income tax refunds from 2013 and five from 2012.
 - a. We compared the refund paid from the Payment Register Detail Report to the refund amount requested in the tax return. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We noted each of the refunds were approved by Council.
 - c. We noted the refunds were paid from General Fund.

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 2012 recorded in the Daily Deposit Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Daily Deposit Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Customer History Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Customer 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 fund, and was recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Past Due Balance Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$2,644 and \$2,579 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, none were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
3. We read the Adjustment Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$2,016 and \$1,929 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2013 and five non-cash adjustments from 2012, and noted that the President of the Board of Public Affairs approved each adjustment.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following bonds, notes and 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
2005 OPWC Wellfield	\$72,461
2007 OPWC WWTP	\$428,116
2008 Swimming Pool Note	\$37,748
2010 Fire Truck Note	\$102,985

Debt (Continued)

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. We noted on-behalf payments made by the Ohio Water Development Authority for the Beverly Waterline Replacement Project in the amount of \$584,603 in 2013 that were not recorded on the Village's books. All other debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to 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.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Waterline Replacement Capital Project fund per the Receipt Register Report. We noted on-behalf payments made by the Ohio Water Development Authority for the Beverly Waterline Replacement Project in the amount of \$584,603 that were not recorded on the Village's books.
5. For new debt issued during 2013, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds for waterline replacement. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village used the proceeds for waterline replacement during 2013. No new debt was issued in 2012.

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 QuickBooks Payroll Transaction Detail and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the QuickBooks Payroll Transaction Detail 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, 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 and 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. Departments and funds 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, 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:

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal Income Taxes and Medicare	01/31/14	01/14/14	\$ 3,104	\$ 3,104
State Income Taxes	01/15/14	01/13/14	\$ 603	\$ 603
Village of Beverly Income Tax	01/31/14	01/13/14	\$ 927	\$ 927
OPERS Retirement	01/31/14	01/13/14	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,840
OP&F Retirement	01/31/14	01/13/14	\$ 805	\$ 805

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 tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We could not compare the reconciled cash totals as of December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 to the Mayor's Court Agency Fund balance reported in the Fund Status Reports because the Village does not maintain an Agency Fund for Mayor's Court.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of December 31, 2013 and 2012 listing of unpaid distributions as of each December 31. At December 31, 2013, we noted \$547 in long outstanding checks. The Village is currently investigating these items in order to resolve them.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2013 bank account balance with the Mayor's Court financial institution. We found no exceptions.
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.

Mayors Court Transactions (Continued)

6. 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 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 and Water Operating 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, Street and Water Operating 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 Status Report for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Street and Water Operating. 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, Street and Water Operating 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, Street and Water Operating 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, 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 Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$5,000 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.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

8. We inquired of 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.

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

March 31, 2014

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF BEVERLY

WASHINGTON 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
APRIL 15, 2014**