



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Savannah
Ashland County
PO Box 164
Savannah, Ohio 44874

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Savannah, Ashland 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, 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 and Investments

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 Cash Balance Statement – By Account # report to the December 31, 2007 balances in the prior year audited statements 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 Cash Balance Statement – By Account # report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 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, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We noted five of the six outstanding checks from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation were greater than one year old, with some dating as far back as May 31, 2006. **We recommend the Village develop a written policy regarding writing off of old or stale checks following the guidance provided for in Auditor of State Management Advisory Services Bulletin 91-11. This bulletin indicates that pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code Section 9.39 unclaimed money shall be deposited to the credit of a trust fund and shall be retained there until claimed by its lawful owner. If not claimed within a period of five years, the money shall revert to the General Fund. The Village should also consider placing an ad in a local newspaper listing the names of individuals with outstanding checks in an effort to clear up these items.**

Cash and Investments (continued)

The amount and date of the remaining outstanding check from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation was traced to the check register, to determine the check was dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions. However, we noted the check was still outstanding as of the date of February 28, 2010.

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 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 2009 and one from 2008:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Pay-in Summary Journal. 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 Pay-in Summary Journal 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 Pay-in Summary Journal included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year. We noted in 2009 only one personal property tax receipt was received, which was confirmed by Ashland County.

3. 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 Pay-in Summary Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). 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 Ashland County to the Village during 2009 and 2008 with the County. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Sewer and Sewer Debt Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Sewer Fund and Sewer Debt Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2009 and 10 collection cash receipts from the year ended 2008 recorded in the Daily Cash Receipts Journal and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Daily Cash Receipts Journal agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Customer Balance Report – By Account # report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period complied with rates in force during the audit period. We found no exceptions.
 - c. Amount charged was posted as a receivable in the Billing Journal for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - d. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We read the Customer Balance Report – By Account # report.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$14,277 and \$11,160 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2009 and 2008, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported for December 31, 2009 in the preceding step, \$6,423 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent. The Aged Customer Delinquent Report – By Account # report which details this information could not be located for December 31, 2008 and could not be reproduced. **We recommend the Village retain copies of its year-end Aged Customer Delinquent Reports so management may monitor the status of delinquent accounts.**
3. The Village does not have a report detailing the total non-cash receipt adjustments made for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. **We recommend the Village retain or prepare a schedule of non-cash receipt adjustments made to its customers' accounts so these adjustments may be reviewed and monitored by management.**

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Statement – By Account # report and Expense Statement – By Account # report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2. We noted no new debt issuances.
2. We prepared a summary of bonded debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Sewer Fund payments and Sewer Debt fund payments reported in the Check Posting Journal. We also compared the date the debt service 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 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Village's manual payroll ledger and determined whether the following information in the Village's files and minute records 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 tax withholding authorization and withholding.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (continued)

We found no exceptions to steps a - e above, except we found retirement system enrollment forms were not maintained for two employees and Federal and State tax withholding authorization forms were not maintained for all Village employees. However, the payroll register did disclose retirement and tax withholdings for these employees. **We recommend the Village maintain all documentation to support wages paid and deductions withheld.**

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found an \$11.93 reimbursement to one employee for internet and postage was included in the employee's paycheck. **We recommend employee reimbursements be paid by a separate check and not included in the employee's paycheck. We found no other exceptions.**
 - c. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented on the employees' timecards. 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:

<u>Withholding</u>	<u>Date Due</u>	<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Amount Withheld</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>
Federal income taxes (withholding plus employer share)	January 31, 2010	January 18, 2010	\$716	\$716
State income taxes	February 1, 2010	January 18, 2010	87	87
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	January 30, 2010	January 18, 2010	1,965	885

We noted the Village did not remit to OPERS the retirement withholdings for three employees, totaling \$450, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 145.47 and 145.48 until April 13, 2010, which was after the January 31, 2010 due date.

Additionally, we noted State Income Tax withholdings for the period of July through September 2009 in the amount of \$50 were included in the \$87 paid on January 18, 2010 as noted above, which was after the November 2, 2009 due date. **We recommend the Village remit all OPERS, State Income Tax and other withholdings by the required dates.**

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Check Posting Journal for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2009 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 Check Posting Journal 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 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 Statement – By Account # for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The Village did not record the amounts on the *Certificate* in the accounting system. **The fiscal officer should record the amounts on the Certificate in the accounting system and should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Statement – By Account # 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 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General; Street Construction, Maintenance and Repair; and Sewer 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 Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Expense Statement – By Account # report for 2009 and 2008 for the following funds: General Fund; Street Construction, Maintenance and Repair Fund; and Sewer Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Expense Statement – By Account # report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General Fund; Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Fund; and Sewer Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted that General Fund appropriations for 2009 exceeded certified resources by \$2,683, 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, 2009 and 2008 for the General Fund; Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Fund; and Sewer Fund, as recorded in the Expense Statement – By Account # 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 Pay-in Summary Journal 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.

Compliance – Budgetary (continued)

7. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Statement – By Account # reports and Expense Statement – By Account # 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 Expense Statement – By Account # report 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Check Posting Journal 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.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Check Posting Journal 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.

Officials' Response: The Village is aware of these issues and will take appropriate corrective action.

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

April 22, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF SAVANNAH

ASHLAND 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 27, 2010**