

***VILLAGE OF WEST SALEM***

**WAYNE COUNTY, OHIO**

**AGREED UPON PROCEDURES**

**For the Years Ended December 31, 2015 & 2014**







# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Village Council  
Village of West Salem  
P.O. Box 256  
West Salem, Ohio 44287

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of the Village of West Salem, Wayne County, prepared by Charles E. Harris & Associates, Inc., for the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. The Village of West Salem is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost  
Auditor of State

May 20, 2016

**This page intentionally left blank.**

VILLAGE OF WEST SALEM  
WAYNE COUNTY  
Audit Report  
For the Years Ended December 31, 2015 and 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

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

Village of West Salem  
Wayne County  
P.O. Box 256  
West Salem, Ohio 44287

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of West Salem (the Village) and the Auditor of State 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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2014 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, 2015 and 2014 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the 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 without exception.
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 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.

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 Revenue 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 Revenue Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Revenue 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 County Auditor's Payment by Vendor Report from 2015 and five from 2014.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue 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 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. 10-15. The allocation agreed with the percentages the Ordinance requires, with the exception for \$177 that was erroneously allocated to the Water and Sewer funds in 2014. This was corrected in 2016.
2. We selected five income tax returns filed during 2015 and five from 2014.
  - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the cash register tape. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We compared the cash register tape total from step a. to the amount recorded as income tax receipts in the Revenue Receipt Register Report for that date. The amounts agreed.

3. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the year received. We found no exceptions.
4. We selected five income tax refunds from 2015 and five from 2014.
  - a. We compared the refund paid from 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 Income Tax Administrator.
  - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the General Fund and the Police 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, 2015 and 10 Water and Sewer Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2014 recorded in the Revenue Receipt Register Report and determined whether the:
  - a. Receipt amount per the Revenue Receipt Register Report agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Utilities Accounts Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. Amount charged for the related billing period:
    - i. Agreed with the debit to accounts receivable in the Utilities Accounts Detail Report 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 Utilities Period Summary Report.
  - a. We noted this report listed \$56,565 and \$56,565 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
  - b. The Village was unable to provide the required information regarding the amount of receivables reported in the preceding step that were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent as of December 31, 2015 or 2014 due to a failure to run a proper backup at year end, as the software requires.
3. We read the Utilities Period Summary Report.
  - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$14,099 and \$3,783 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.
  - b. We were unable to select individual non-cash adjustments, as the Village was only able to produce a summary report for each fiscal year, due to a failure to run a proper backup at year end, as the software requires. Further, per discussion with the Fiscal Officer, we noted that non-cash adjustments were not approved by any Village official.

### **Debt**

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following leases and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Village's January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3, with the exception of a promissory note to purchase the water plant property entered into in 2013 that was not included in the prior audited financial statements. The note was for \$112,001 with an interest rate of 3%. As of December 31, 2013, the principal outstanding was \$102,374.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
Combined OWDA Loans	\$2,359,338
1986 OPWC Loan	\$16,000
WSOS Community Action Loan	\$7,674
2014 Ford Taurus Interceptor Lease	\$14,091

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue 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, with the exception of \$55,585 OWDA loan whose proceeds and disbursements were not posted in the UAN system.
3. We obtained a summary of lease and loan activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt service fund, capital improvements fund, and water 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. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the capital improvements fund per the Revenue Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed, with the exception of the \$55,585 OWDA loan proceeds that were not posted in the UAN system.
5. For new debt issued during 2015 and 2014, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Village must use the proceeds for the Main Street water main replacement project. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Village used the proceeds for the Main Street water main replacement project.

#### **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 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 codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files and minute records. 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, 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:

<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 (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2016	December 23, 2015	\$3,082.12	\$3,082.12
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 23, 2015	\$494.63	\$494.63
Village of West Salem income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 23, 2015	\$926.21	\$926.32
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	January 15, 2016	\$4,765.43	\$4,765.43
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2016	January 21, 2016	\$1,556.16	\$1,556.16
Local school district income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 23, 2015	\$222.49	\$222.49

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Wage Detail Report:
  - a. Accumulated leave records
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - c. The Village's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

### **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 December 31, 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 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 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. The balances agreed.
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 balance agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balance to the amount appearing in the December 31, 2015 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, 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 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, State Highway and Special Police 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 Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$329,528 for 2014. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$329,688. 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, State Highway and Special Police 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, State Highway and Special Police. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, State Highway and Special Police funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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 appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 for the General, State Highway and Special Police funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status 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 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 \$500 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.

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, Village Council, the Auditor of State, and others within the Village, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



**Charles E. Harris & Associates, Inc.**

April 3, 2016

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF WEST SALEM

WAYNE 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  
JUNE 2, 2016