



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of North Kingsville
Ashtabula County
3541 E. Center Street
North Kingsville, Ohio 44068

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of Village of North Kingsville (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, 2014 and 2013, 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, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2013 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, 2014 and 2013 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statements. We noted two exceptions where electronic checks for \$5,260 were marked as cleared in December but did not clear the bank until January 2015.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We found no exceptions.
6. We selected five reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January and February bank statement. We found one exception for \$100 for zoning fees that were deposited in December.
 - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Receipts Register. Each credit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 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* for 2014 and one from 2013:
 - 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 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 2014 and 2013. 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 2014 and five from 2013. We also selected five receipts from the County Payment Register from 2014 and five from 2013.
 - 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 compared the allocation of income tax receipts for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 to the Village's funds according to the allocation requirements of Ordinance No. O-13-085. The allocation agreed with the percentages the Ordinance requires.
2. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2014 and five from 2013.
 - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the cash register tape. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We compared the cash register tape total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Receipt Register Report for that date. The amounts agreed.
3. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
4. We selected five income tax refunds from 2014 and five from 2013.
 - a. We compared the refund paid from 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 Deputy Clerk and Clerk Treasurer.
 - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the General Fund.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

1. We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2014 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2013 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 funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2012. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2013 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2012:
Tamkrist Trail Improvement Bond	\$16,974
Vehicle Acquisition Bond Bonds	\$86,129
Fire Truck Bond	\$464,470

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

Debt (Continued)

3. We obtained a summary of bonded and lease debt activity for 2014 and 2013 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 and lease 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 2014 and one payroll check for five employees from 2013 from the Wage Withholding Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage Withholding 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 codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel file. 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, 2014 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 2014. 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, 2015	December 19, 2014	\$3,297.85	\$3,297.85
State income taxes	January 15, 2015	December 19, 2014	\$1,058.84	\$1,058.84
Village of North Kingsville income taxes	January 31, 2015	December 19, 2014	\$515.55	\$515.55
City of Ashtabula Income taxes	January 31, 2015	December 19, 2014	\$6.01	\$6.01
City of Conneaut Income taxes	January 31, 2015	December 19, 2014	\$35.99	\$35.99
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2015	January 16, 2015	\$7,063.00	\$7,063.00
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2015	January 16, 2015	\$4,062.04	\$4,062.44

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2014 and ten from the year ended 2013 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 and Cash Balances

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We compared the reconciled cash totals as of December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 to the Mayor's Court Agency Fund balance reported in the Fund Status Reports. The balances agreed.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of December 31, 2014 and 2013 listing of unpaid distributions as of each December 31. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected one deposit in transit from the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent January and February bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed the deposit amount to the court's cash book. Each deposit in transit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
6. 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.

7. From the cash book, we haphazardly selected one month from the year ended December 31, 2014 and one month from the year ended 2013 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, SCMR and Golf Course funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2014 and 2013 to determine whether, for the General, SCMR and Golf Course 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 2014 and 2013 for the following funds: General, SCMR, and Golf Course. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report except for the General Fund in 2013 where the Appropriation Resolutions exceeded the Appropriation Status Report by \$425.
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, SCMR and Golf Course funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certificate 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, 2014 and 2013 for the General, SCMR and Golf Course fund, 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, 2014 and 2013. 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 2014 and 2013 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$13,000 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 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.
9. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into the fund must be used for the purpose for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicate 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 Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dave Yost
Auditor of State
Columbus, Ohio

April 17, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF NORTH KINGSVILLE

ASHTABULA 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 7, 2015