





# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

#### INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Neville Clermont County P.O. Box 126 Neville, Ohio 45156

To the Village Council:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Neville, Clermont County, Ohio (the Village), have agreed, solely to assist the Council and Mayor in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cashbasis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008, 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

- 1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
- 2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2007 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
- 3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
- 4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 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, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
- 5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

## Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

- We selected a property tax receipt from one Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes (the Statement) for 2009 and one from 2008:
  - 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 receipts were allocated to the proper fund as required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. The receipts were recorded in the proper year.
- 2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2009 and 2008:
  - a. Two personal property tax receipts
  - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

- We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009 and five from 2008.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL 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.
- 4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Neville Bicentennial Committee to the Village during 2009 with the Corporation. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

## **Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2009 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2008 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- 1. Receipt amounts agree to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- 2. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- 3. Receipts were posted to the proper funds, and were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

# **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

- 1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and determined whether the following information in the minutes record and the salary pay rate from Resolution #04-2005 (in perm file) 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 and fund 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.

- 2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
  - a. We compared the salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation legislatively approved. 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 meeting minutes and Resolution #04-2005. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
- 3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	12/31/09	\$ 589.91	\$ 589.91
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	12/31/09	577.68	577.68
OPERS retirement				
(withholding plus				
employee share)	January 30, 2010	12/31/09	1,560.00	1,560.00

## **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

- 1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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 duplicate, 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 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, Special Revenue, and Capital Project funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted the following exceptions:

### 2009

Fund	Cert of Est Resources	Revenue Status Report	Variance
General Fund	29,250	27,145	2,105
Special Revenue:			
Parks & Recreation	3,610	0	3,610
Capital Projects	0	85	(85)

#### 2008

Fund	Cert of Est Resources	Revenue Status Report	Variance
Special Revenue:			
Parks & Recreation	12,000	15,000	(2,000)

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 for the monitoring of spending.

2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General, Special Revenue, and Capital Project 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). No exceptions noted.

3. We compared total appropriations as required by Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2009 and 2008 for the General, Special Revenue, and Capital Project funds. We noted the following exceptions:

#### 2009

Fund	Appropriations	Appropriation Status Report	Variance
General Fund	29,745	31,645	(1,900)
Special Revenue:			
Street Construction	4,000	4,500	( 500)
Parks & Recreation	0	3,610	(3,610)
Capital Projects	0	2,000	(2,000)

#### 2008

Fund	Appropriations	Appropriation Status Report	Variance
Special Revenue:			
Street Construction	2,000	5,567	(3,567)
Parks & Recreation	5,000	13,675	(8,675)

The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts recorded on the approved appropriation measures to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Council may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and for the monitoring of spending.

- 4. Ohio Rev. Code, Section 5705.39, prohibits appropriations from exceeding certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General and Special Revenue funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. No exceptions noted.
- 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, 2009 and 2008 for the General and Special Revenue fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted the following exceptions:

# 2008

Fund	Appropriations	Expenditures	Variance
Special Revenue:			
Street Construction	2,000	4,740	(2,740)
Parks & Recreation	5,000	9,238	(4,238)

The Fiscal Officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Fiscal Officer 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, 2009 and 2008. 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 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 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 such reserve accounts.

## **Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

- 1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for material or labor procurements which exceeded \$25,000, and therefore required competitive bidding under Ohio Rev. Code, Section 731.14. We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.
- We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 to determine if the Village had road construction projects exceeding \$30,000 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 and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

Mary Taylor

May 14, 2010



# Mary Taylor, CPA Auditor of State

#### **VILLAGE OF NEVILLE**

#### **CLERMONT 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.

**CLERK OF THE BUREAU** 

Susan Babbitt

**CERTIFIED JULY 1, 2010**