



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF FLUSHING
BELMONT COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
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 Flushing
Belmont County
P.O. Box 66
212 High Street
Flushing, Ohio 43977

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Flushing, Belmont 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, 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 prior year audited statements. 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 institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all five outstanding checks from the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each outstanding check to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

- 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 §§135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code § 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 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 §§ 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 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 2013 and five from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Cross Reference Report by Vendor Number 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.

Water and Sewer Funds

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 Cash Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Payment Stub agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Daily Cash Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Daily Cash 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.

Water and Sewer Funds (Continued)

2. We read the Aged Trial Balance Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$11,274 and \$16,793 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$752 and \$3,131 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.

3. We read the Adjustment Billing Journal.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$1,386 and \$2,830 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2013 and noted that the Village Administrator approved each adjustment. No 2012 adjustments to customer accounts were approved by the Village Administrator due to the Village Fiscal Officer not being aware of this requirement until 2013.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loans and note 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:
Ohio Water Development Authority Loans	\$405,508
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan	518
Promissory Note	14,297

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 loan and note debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to the General, Water Debt and Sewer Debt Funds' 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 Water Design and Project and Sewer Force Main Design and Project Funds per the Receipt Register Report. Amounts agreed with the exception of \$72,775 of Ohio Water Development Authority (OWDA) and \$10,776 of Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) loan proceeds were not recorded by the Village in 2013. \$889 of OWDA loan proceeds were not recorded by the Village in 2012. The on-behalf-of activity including capital outlay expenditures for these loans was also not recorded by the Village. No adjustment is needed due to no effect on the fund balances.

5. For new debt issued during 2013 and 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds for new water lines and to construct a new lift station. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village began and completed various water line projects and constructed a new lift station.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 from the Employee Wage Detail Report 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 Wage Detail Report for 2013 and Employee Detail Adjustment Report for 2012 to supporting documentation (timecard, minutes, legislatively-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 and minute record. 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. 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, 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 & Medicare	1/31/14	12/27/13	\$2,314.32	\$2,314.32
State income taxes	1/15/14	12/27/13	\$285.18	\$285.18
OPERS retirement	1/30/14	12/27/13	\$4,560.84	\$4,560.84

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.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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 § 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* required by Ohio Rev. Code § 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Fire Apparatus Equipment, and Water Operating Funds 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 in 2013. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$45,044 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$45,145. The Village 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 Village 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, State Highway, and Sewer Operating Funds, the Village 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 § 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Street Construction Maintenance and Repair, and Water Design and Project Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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, Park and Recreation, and Policy Levy 2 Funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code § 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, Police Levy 1, and Water Debt Funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code § 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 § 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 which Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.14 - .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which § 5705.16 would require approval by the Tax Commissioner and Court of Common Pleas.
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 § 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 §§ 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

June 27, 2014



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF FLUSHING

BELMONT 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
JULY 29, 2014**