



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of LaGrange
Lorain County
355 South Center Street
LaGrange, Ohio 44050

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of LaGrange (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, 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 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found the Cash Summary by Fund Report showing \$83 more than the prior audited statements. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2014 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed some of the December 31, 2015 bank account balances with the Village's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We observed the remaining year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation.

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 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 interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2015 and 2014 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. 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 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 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 Lorain County Auditor's Local Government Support Fund Report 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 funds. 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 obtained the December 31, 2015 and 2014 Total Distributions from the Monthly Distribution reports submitted by the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA), the agency responsible for collecting income taxes on behalf of the Village. We agreed the total gross income taxes per year to the Village's Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
2. We compared the allocation of income tax receipts for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 to the Village's funds according to the allocation requirements of Ordinance No. 819. The allocation agreed with the percentages the Ordinance requires.

Water and Sewer Fund Charges for Services

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the Receipt Register 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 Utilities System Monthly Cash Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
 - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Utilities System Monthly Cash Receipts Journal for the billing period. We found no exceptions.
 - 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 Utility System Penalty Journal.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$1,325 and \$1,507 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, there were no accounts recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
OPWC Loan	\$32,648
County Engineer Loan	\$162,500
OWDA Loan	\$1,138,314

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. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

3. We obtained a summary of loan activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to water and sewer 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.

4. For new debt issued during 2014, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds for capital improvements. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village used for capital improvement to water lines in 2014. Noted no new debt was issued in 2015.

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 Detail 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 codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minutes record. 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 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. Departments and funds 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	December 28, 2015	\$3,067	\$3,067
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$558	\$558
Village of Lagrange Income Tax	January 31, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$413	\$413
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$8,744	\$8,744
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2016	December 28, 2015	\$7,858	\$7,858

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 copy of the check remittance 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.

Mayors Court Transactions and Cash Balances

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We compared the reconciled cash totals as of December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 to the Mayor's Court Agency Fund balance reported in the Fund Status Reports. We noted the Fund Status report exceeded the reconciliation balances by \$3,734 and \$439 respectively. We recommend that the Clerk of Courts update the cash reconciliation to include beginning cash balances from previous period to ensure that the proper amount is actually reflected on the reconciliation.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of December 31, 2015 and 2014 listing of unpaid distributions as of each December 31. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all deposits in transit from the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent January and February bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed these deposits' amounts to the court's cash book. Each deposit in transit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
6. 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.

7. From the cash book, we haphazardly selected one month from the year ended December 31, 2015 and one month from the year ended 2014 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 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, Income Tax, and Grant Construction 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 Grant Construction Funds in 2015 and the General Fund in 2014. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund and Grant Construction Fund of \$1,094,377 and \$0, respectively, for 2015 and for the General Fund of \$995,682 for 2014. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$1,118,009 and \$139,083, respectively, in 2015 and \$994,342 in 2014. 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, Income Tax and Grant Construction 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, Income Tax, and Grant Construction Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts reported in the Appropriation Status Report for the General Fund and Grant Construction Fund in 2015 and the General Fund in 2014.
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, Income Tax and Grant Construction Funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded estimated 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, Income Tax and Grant Construction Funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted that Income Tax Fund expenditures for 2014 exceeded total appropriations by \$42,744, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). 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, 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 \$10,000 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.
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/or scanned the Fiscal Integrity Act Portal (<http://www.ohioauditor.gov/fiscalintegrity/default.html>) to determine whether the fiscal officer obtained the training required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 507.12 and 733.81. Fiscal Officer obtained the required training,

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

August 9, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF LAGRANGE

LORAIN 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
AUGUST 23, 2016**