



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



VILLAGE OF WAITE HILL  
LAKE COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
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 Waite Hill  
Lake County  
7215 Eagle Road  
Waite Hill, Ohio 44094

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of the Village of Waite Hill (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 Cash Journal 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 Journal to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Journal. 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 Cash Journal. 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 balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all three of the reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January 2013 bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the cash journal, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Lausche Building / 615 Superior Ave., NW / Twelfth Floor / Cleveland, OH 44113-1801  
Telephone: (216) 787-3665 (800) 626-2297 Fax: (216) 787-3361

[www.auditor.state.oh.us](http://www.auditor.state.oh.us)

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, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable 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 cash journal. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the cash journal. 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 Cash Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts plus two advances for 2012 and 2011. We noted the cash journal 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 County Auditor's confirmation of local government funding and inheritance tax revenue from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the cash journal. 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.

**Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts, interest income, from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the cash journal and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

**Debt**

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Villages January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010
Village Hall Construction General Obligation Bonds	\$ 2,100,000

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Cash Journal and "Monthly Summary of Operations Report" (MORP) for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt payments noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of general ledger entries for principal and interest payments for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to the Capital Improvement fund payments reported in the MORP. 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 payroll journals and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the payroll journals to timecards and Council-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. 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:

<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, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$ 3,589.23	\$ 3,589.23
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$ 636.29	\$ 636.29
OPERS retirement: Employer and Employee	January 30, 2013	January 28, 2012	\$ 5,145.53	\$ 5,145.53
OP&F retirement: Employer	January 31, 2013	January 28, 2012	\$ 15,754.82	\$ 15,754.82
Employee	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$ 2,741.58	\$ 2,741.58

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Cash Journal we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for *security of persons and property*, and checks recorded as *public works* in the General and SCMR funds for 2012. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the check register for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 and determined whether:
  - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions. 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 journal and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - b. 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.
  - c. The fiscal officer issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.

### 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 MORP for the General, SCMR and Capital Improvement funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed or were less.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General fund, 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 MORP for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, SCMR and Capital Improvement funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts, or were less than amounts recorded in the MORP 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 all 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 all village funds as recorded in the MORP 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 cash journal and MORP 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. 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 2012 and 2011 cash journal and MORP for evidence of interfund transfers 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 compilations, by the Clerk-Treasurer, of the categorization of fund balances in accordance with GASB 54 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.

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 14, 2013

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**VILLAGE OF WAITE HILL**

**LAKE 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 29, 2013**