



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Village of Millersburg
Holmes County
6 North Washington Street
Millersburg, Ohio 44654

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Millersburg, Holmes 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, 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Status Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports for the primary Village accounts and to the Balance Sheet for the segregated furtherance of justice account. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January 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.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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 and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2012 and one from 2011:
 - 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 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 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the Holmes County Auditor's Cross Reference Reports from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - 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 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the payment amount recorded on the tax return to the amount recorded on the Open Batch Receipts Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We compared the Open Batch Receipts 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 five income tax refunds from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the refund paid from Payment Register Detail Report from 2011 or the Payment Register Vendor – By Name Report from 2012 to the refund amount requested in the tax return. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We noted each of the refunds was approved by the Income Tax Administrator.
 - c. We noted the refunds were paid from the General Fund as is required.

Water Operating Fund, Sewer Operating Fund, Water Enterprise Improvement Fund, Sewer Enterprise Improvement Fund, and Debt Service WWTP Upgrade Fund

1. We haphazardly selected 10 Water Operating Fund, Sewer Operating Fund, Water Enterprise Improvement Fund, Sewer Enterprise Improvement Fund, and Debt Service WWTP Upgrade Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 Water Operating Fund, Sewer Operating Fund, Water Enterprise Improvement Fund, Sewer Enterprise Improvement Fund, and Debt Service WWTP Upgrade Fund collection cash receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the Edit List Report and determined whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount per the Edit List Report, or Pay-In Order agreed to the amount recorded to the credit of the customer's account in the Customer Transaction Summary Report, or excel tracking spreadsheet. Daily totals from the Edit Report, or Pay-In Order were agreed to the postings in the Receipt Register 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 Report, or excel tracking spreadsheet, 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 Aged Accounts Receivable reports.
 - a. We noted this report listed \$254,953 and \$246,995 of accounts receivable as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
 - b. Of the total receivables reported in the preceding step, \$6,626 and \$5,592 were recorded as more than 90 days delinquent.

3. We read the Transaction List Report.
 - a. We noted this report listed a total of \$1,815 and \$1,553 non-cash receipts adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.
 - b. We selected five non-cash adjustments from 2012 and five non-cash adjustments from 2011, and noted that the Village Council or Administrative Assistant approved each adjustment.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3 with the exception of Ohio Public Works Commission Loan CN631. The actual balance was \$1,659 less than the reported amount.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan CN631	\$13,275
Ohio Public Works Commission Loan CN38M	\$190,475
Ohio Water Development Authority Loan 3992	\$3,862,949

Debt (Continued)

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Vendor – By Name Report for 2012 and the Payment Register Detail Report for 2011 for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules or confirmations with the Ohio Water Development Authority to Debt Service Clay / Monroe Storm Sewer Fund and Debt Service WWTP Upgrade Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Vendor – By Name Report for 2012 and the Payment Register Detail Report for 2011. 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 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 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 annual payroll authorization resolution and timesheets. 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, 2012 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 2012. 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	January 31, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$3,739	\$3,739
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$850	\$850
Village of Millersburg income taxes	January 31, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$399	\$399
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 3, 2013	\$11,990	\$11,990
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	January 3, 2013	\$5,731	\$5,731

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

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 Employee Detail Adjustment 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 Vendor – By Name Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended 2011 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 Vendor – By Name Report or 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. We found one instance out of twenty 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 *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, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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 \$1,310,800 for 2012. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$1,309,800. 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Water Operating and Sewer Operating 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General Fund, Water Operating Fund and Sewer Operating Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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, Water Operating and Sewer Operating funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Water Operating and Sewer Operating fund, 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, 2012 and 2011. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Village received new restricted receipts. The Village established the Comprehensive Downtown Revitalization Program Tier 2 Revitalization Grant Fund during 2012 to segregate federal Community Development Block Grant receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of inter-fund transfers exceeding \$10 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

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Vendor – By Name Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 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, 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 initial "D" and a long, sweeping tail on the "y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 5, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF MILLERSBURG

HOLMES 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 9, 2013