



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF WALDO
MARION COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Waldo
Marion County
P.O. Box 202
Waldo, Ohio 43356

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of Village of Waldo, Marion 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, 2011 and 2010, 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. The Village processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Village because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2009 balances in documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 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, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February bank statements. 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 the Village had four certificates of deposit with maturity period of 24-36 months. The maximum maturity period for a certificate of deposit (interim deposit) is no longer than 12 months.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Distribution of Receipts Report* (the Report) for 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the Report 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 2011 and 2010. 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 2011 and five from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Expenditure History by Vendor Report from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - 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 found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2011 and 2010. There were no payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report and no required payments for 2011 or 2010 in the related debt amortization schedule.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Capital Projects/Sewer fund per the Receipt Register Report. We found the Village recorded \$50 more in debt proceeds than the amount on the debt documents in 2010. The amounts agreed for 2011. We recommend the Village properly code all receipts.
5. For new debt issued during 2011 and 2010, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds for the design of a new wastewater collection and treatment system. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village spent the proceeds during 2011 and 2010 on the design of a new wastewater system. At December 31, 2011, unspent proceeds totaled \$15,720.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files, minute record, or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1, we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files or minute record 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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 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 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal Income Taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	January 20, 2012	\$85.90	\$85.90
State Income Taxes	January 31, 2012	January 18, 2012	\$18.89	\$18.89
OPERS Retirement	January 30, 2012	January 17, 2012	\$710.40	\$710.40

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 fifteen 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 *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The Village did not record estimated receipts to the Revenue Status Report for 2011 or 2010. The fiscal officer should record in the Revenue Status Report the amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* and periodically review these amounts to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Council may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and to monitor spending.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. The Appropriation Status Report recorded appropriations for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds of \$135,525, \$11,150, and \$100,000, respectively for 2011. However, the appropriation resolutions reflected \$86,211, \$400, and \$0 for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds, respectively. Additionally, the Appropriation Status Report recorded appropriations for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds of \$91,880, \$18,940, and \$370,672, respectively for 2010. However, the appropriation resolutions reflected \$88,710, \$29,000, and \$0 for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to the amounts recorded on the appropriation resolutions 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 Council approved appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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 Council approved appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Street and Maintenance, and Capital Projects/Sewer funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted that General and Capital Projects/Sewer fund expenditures for 2011 exceeded total Council approved appropriations by \$23,370 and \$52,248, respectively, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). We also noted that Capital Projects/Sewer fund expenditures for 2010 exceeded total Council approved appropriations by \$205,213. 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, 2011 and 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$5,000 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for material or labor procurements which exceeded \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011), 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 Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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.

Officials' Response

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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

August 14, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF WALDO

MARION 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
SEPTEMBER 4, 2012