



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Farmersville
Montgomery County
117 E. Walnut Street
Farmersville, Ohio 45325

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Farmersville (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, 2015 and 2014, 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We 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. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2014 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, 2015 and 2014 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2015 investment account balance with the Village's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website for the checking and STAR Ohio accounts. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 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

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2015 and one from 2014:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue 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 Revenue Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Revenue 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 2015 and five from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Expense Reports from 2015 and five from 2014.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue 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 2015 and five from 2014.
 - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the income tax receipt ticket. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We compared the income tax receipt ticket total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Revenue 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 2015 and five from 2014.
 - 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 the Income Tax Clerk.
 - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the General Fund, as is required.

Water, Sewer, and Refuse Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water, Sewer, and Refuse Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and 10 Water, Sewer, and Refuse Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the Receipt Detail Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Receipt Detail Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Customer Billing Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Customer Billing 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 Master Activity Summary Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$50,358 and \$45,223 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$2,373 and \$1,739 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
3. We read the Master Activity Summary Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$4,858 and \$6,230 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2015 and five non-cash adjustments from 2014, and noted that the Water Clerk approved each adjustment.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following bonds and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
OPWC Loan Number CD016	\$73,684
OWDA Loan Number 4688	\$87,333
US Bank Bonds	\$64,113

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2015 or 2014 or debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and loan debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Water Operating, Sewer Operating, and Street Construction, Maintenance and Repair funds payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We found no exceptions. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Village made the payments. We found three exceptions. The US Bank Bond payments due on June 1, 2014, June 1, 2015, and December 1, 2015 were not paid until June 9, 2014, June 8, 2015, and December 7, 2015, respectively. The Village should implement procedures to verify all debt payments are made on or before the stated due dates on the amortization schedule.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for five employees from 2014 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage 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 files. 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, 2015 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 2015. 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, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$2,408	\$2,408
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$463	\$463
Village of Farmersville income tax	January 30, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$873	\$873
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$3,995	\$3,995
School District income tax	January 31, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$212	\$212

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and ten from the year ended 2014 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.

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 Construction and Maintenance, and Water Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for all funds tested in 2015 and the General fund in 2014. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Street Construction and Maintenance, and Water Operating funds of \$288,890, \$140,446, and \$201,733, respectively, for 2015. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$330,998, \$140,146, and \$198,583, respectively. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$308,810 for 2014. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$296,549. The 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 Council may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and to monitor spending.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2015 and 2014 to determine whether, for the General, Street Construction and Maintenance, 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 2015 and 2014 for the following funds: General, Street Construction and Maintenance, and Water Operating. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report, except for the General fund in 2015 and 2014. The Appropriation Status Report recorded appropriations of \$355,076 and \$328,940 in 2015 and 2014, respectively. However, the total appropriations adopted by Council reflected \$354,284 and \$336,249, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts adopted by Council to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Council may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and to monitor spending.
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 Construction and Maintenance, and Water Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. We noted that General Fund appropriations for 2015 and 2014 exceeded certified resources by \$9,420 and \$16,448, respectively, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Council should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Village to incur fund balance deficits.
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, 2015 and 2014 for the General, Street Construction and Maintenance, and Water Operating fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted that General Fund expenditures for 2015 exceeded total appropriations by \$36 contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). The Fiscal Officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Treasurer may request the Council to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary, and if resources are available.

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, 2015 and 2014. 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 2015 and 2014 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$30,000 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, 2015 and 2014 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 the Hemple Road Improvement fund had a negative cash balance of \$(76,431) at December 31, 2015.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 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.

Other Compliance

1. Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires villages to file their financial information in the HINKLE system formerly known as the Annual Financial Data Reporting System (AFDRS) within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed AFDRS to verify the Village filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. Financial information for the year ended December 31, 2015 was filed on August 4, 2016 which was not within the allotted timeframe.
2. We inquired of the fiscal officer and/or scanned the Fiscal Integrity Act Portal (<http://www.ohioauditor.gov/fiscalintegrity/default.html>) to determine whether the fiscal officer obtained the training required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 507.12 and 733.81. Fiscal Officer did not obtain the required training.

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 style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

September 29, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF FARMERSVILLE

MONTGOMERY 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
OCTOBER 13, 2016