



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE  
MUSKINGUM COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**TITLE** \_\_\_\_\_ **PAGE**

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 Roseville  
Muskingum County  
107 N. Main Street  
Roseville, Ohio 43777

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Roseville, Muskingum 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, 2014 and 2013, including mayor's court receipts, disbursements and balances, 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, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also 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.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2014 and 2013 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2014 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, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2014 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.

### **Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2014 and one from 2013:
  - 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 §§ 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 2014 and 2013. 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 2014 and five from 2013. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Detail Expense Report from 2014 and five from 2013.
  - 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.

### **Income Tax Receipts**

1. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2014 and five from 2013.
  - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the Income Tax Receipt Journal. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We compared the Income Tax Receipt Journal total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the 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 two income tax refunds from 2014 and three from 2013.
  - a. We compared the refund paid from the 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 Fiscal Officer.
  - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the Income Tax Fund as is required.

### **Water and Sewer Fund**

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2014 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2013 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 Payment Edit List Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
    - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Customer Transaction Summary for the billing period. We found no exceptions.

**Water and Sewer Fund (Continued)**

- 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 Aged Accounts Receivable Report.
    - a. We noted this report listed \$129,263 and \$113,359 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.
    - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$15,137 and \$16,250 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.
  3. We read the Transaction List Report:
    - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$3,956 and \$3,599 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.
    - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2014 and five non-cash adjustments from 2013, and noted that the Village Administrator approved each adjustment.

**Debt**

1. From the prior agreed upon procedures documentation, we noted the following bonds and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2012. These amounts agreed to the Village's January 1, 2013 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2012
USDA – Sewer Mortgage Revenue Bonds 1989	\$685,000
USDA – Sewer Mortgage Revenue Bonds 1997	91,000
OWDA - Water	566,724
OWDA – New Sewer Project	71,250
OWDA- Water Plant Upgrade	56,070
USDA - Water Well Iron Spot Project	79,878
OPWC – Issue II	67,236
Peoples National Bank - Scag Lawn Mower	583
Peoples National Bank - 2007 Cruiser	490
OWDA – Sanitary Sewer Pump Replacement	25,500
OPWC – Sanitary Sewer Pump Replacement	308,750

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. We noted no new debt issuances.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2014 and 2013 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule or invoice to Sewer Debt Service, Water Debt Service, Rose Hill Cemetery and General Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. 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 2014 and one payroll check for five employees from 2013 from the Wage Detail Report and:

**Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

- 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 code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented on the timecards. 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, 2014 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 2014. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare	1/31/15	12/31/14	\$5,506	\$5,506
State income taxes	1/15/15	12/31/14	\$985	\$985
Village of Roseville income taxes	1/31/15	12/31/14	\$454	\$454
OPERS retirement	1/30/15	12/31/14	\$5,767	\$5,767
OP&F retirement	1/31/15	12/31/14	\$1,129	\$1,129

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2014 and ten from the year ended 2013 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 § 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.

**Mayors Court Transactions and Cash Balances**

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We noted there were checks on the outstanding checklist greater than 1 year old and a bank charge of \$51 for the purchase of deposit slips was shown on the outstanding checklist and not recorded as a disbursement on the books. We recommend the Village implement procedures to correct these errors.
2. We compared the reconciled cash totals as of December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 to the Mayor's Court Fund balance reported in the Mayor's Court Cash Book. The balances agreed.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of December 31, 2014 and 2013 listing of unpaid distributions as of each December 31. The amounts agreed.

### Mayors Court Transactions and Cash Balances (Continued)

4. We confirmed the December 31, 2014 bank account balance with the Mayor's Court financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balance to the amount appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We haphazardly selected five cases from the court cash book and agreed the payee and amount posted to the:
  - a. Duplicate receipt book.
  - b. Docket, including comparing the total fine paid to the judgment issued by the judge (i.e. mayor)
  - c. Case file.

The amounts recorded in the cash book, receipts book, docket and case file agreed.

6. From the cash book, we haphazardly selected one month from the year ended December 31, 2014 and one month from the year ended 2013 and determined whether:
  - a. The monthly sum of fines and costs collected for those months agreed to the amounts reported as remitted to the Village, State or other applicable government in the following month. We found no exceptions.
  - b. The totals remitted for these two months per the cash book agreed to the returned canceled checks. 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 cash book.

### Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code § 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Income Tax, and Sanitary Sewer Operating Funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. The amounts on the *Amended Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund for the year ended December 31, 2013. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e., certified) resources for the General Fund of \$242,837. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$236,517. 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 2014 and 2013 to determine whether, for the General, Park and Pool, and Rose Hill Cemetery 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 § 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2014 and 2013 for the following funds: General, Street Construction, Maintenance and Repair, and Water Equipment Replacement Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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, Volunteer Fire/EMS Department, and Water Operating Funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.

### **Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)**

5. Ohio Rev. Code § 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, 2014 and 2013 for the General, Rose Hill Cemetery, and Regional Sewer Operating Funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code § 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, 2014 and 2013. 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 § 5705.09 would require the Village to establish a new fund.
7. We scanned the 2014 and 2013 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10,000 which Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.14 - .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which § 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 § 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, 2014 and 2013 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code § 5705.10(l) 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, 2014 and 2013 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 §§ 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, 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

October 7, 2015

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE**

**MUSKINGUM 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 20, 2015**