



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Leesville Village
Carroll County
P.O. Box 204
Leesville, Ohio 44639

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of Leesville Village (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 Status Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2014 balances in the Fund Status 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 bank account balances with the Village's financial institution. We found no exceptions.
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 and February bank statements. We found the following exceptions. Two checks were voided and reissued in 2016.
 - 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.

Cash and Investments – (Continued)

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, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

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 Receipt Register 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 Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2015 and 2014. 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 2015 and five from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2015 and five from 2014.
 - 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 fund(s). We noted two receipts from State DTL not posted to the proper fund in 2015.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from AEP and Utica East Ohio Midstream LLC to the Village during 2015 to supporting documentation. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Sewer Operation Fund

The Village provides sewer utility to its customers. The Village does not have an accounts receivable system. Without accounts receivable information, the Village lacks reliable information on overdue amounts, systems-derived documentation on noncash adjustments and approval of noncash adjustments, and information upon which to judge whether the District should write off or follow up on uncollectible amounts. We recommend the Village acquire an accounts receivable and billing system.

The Fiscal Officer is billing and collecting tap in fees and sewer monthly fees and recording these in an excel spreadsheet. The system did not carry forward prior balances due, if any. The utility billing system should integrate prior month balances due into the system.

Sewer Operation Fund – (Continued)

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Sewer Operation Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and 10 Sewer Operation Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the Excel Spreadsheet Billing and Collection Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Receipt Register Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Excel Spreadsheet Billing and Collection Report. No exceptions were noted.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Excel Spreadsheet Billing and Collection Report for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - ii. Complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2013.
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. In 2014 we noted the village received an OWDA loan forgiveness issue in the amount of \$2,099,743 that was posted as Other Debt Proceeds rather than as intergovernmental as required. In addition, the Village also received debt forgiveness of an OWDA loan of \$220,353, which should also have posted as Intergovernmental. In 2015, the Village received another OWDA loan forgiveness issue of \$215,093 which they posted as Other Financing Sources rather than Intergovernmental Revenue.

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 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 files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursement – (Continued)

2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files 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, 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	1/20/16	\$1,662.68	\$1,681.06
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	12/31/15	22.28	22.28
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	2/1/16	446.64	433.32

The Village remitted federal and Medicare taxes annually. Per IRS Publication 15, the Village should choose to remit taxes either monthly or semi-weekly; if they do not, they may be subject to a 15% penalty.

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 two 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 Status Report for the General, Street Improvement and Enterprise Improvement 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 the General and Street Improvement Fund in 2015. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$27,570 and Street Fund of \$19,612 for 2015. However, the final Amended Official *Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$27,220 in the General Fund and \$19,052 in the Street Improvement Fund. 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 Improvement and Enterprise Improvement 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 Improvement and Enterprise Improvement Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions for General Fund in 2014 did not agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions for General Street Improvement and Enterprise Funds in 2015 did not agree 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 Improvement and Enterprise Improvement funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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, 2015 and 2014 for the General, Street Improvement and Enterprise Improvement 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, 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 \$500 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.
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 no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

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. No exceptions noted.
2. We inquired of the fiscal officer and scanned the Fiscal Integrity Act Portal to determine whether the fiscal officer obtained the training required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 507.12 and 733.81. Fiscal Officer obtained at least 6 of the required 12 hours of training. Fiscal Officer provided certificates for completing 2014 and 2015 Local Government Officials Conference.

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
October 17, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF LEESVILLE

CARROLL 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
NOVEMBER 10, 2016