



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



VILLAGE OF NORTH PERRY  
LAKE 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

Village of North Perry  
Lake County  
4449 Lockwood Road  
North Perry, Ohio 44081

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Village Council and Mayor, and the management of North Perry Village (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 Ledger 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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 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, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the Village's financial institution and we observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institutions' websites. 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 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.

Lausche Building, 615 Superior Ave., NW, Twelfth Floor, Cleveland, Ohio 44113-1801  
Phone: 216-787-3665 or 800-626-2297 Fax: 216-787-3361

[www.ohioauditor.gov](http://www.ohioauditor.gov)

6. We selected the only reconciling credit (such as deposits in transit) from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced the credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We agreed the credit amount to the Receipts Register. The credit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. 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 the property tax receipt from three *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2012 and three from 2011:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register. 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 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 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 report 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, 2012 and 2011 Total Statement of Income and Expenditures Report submitted by the Central Collection Agency (CCA), 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, 2012 and 2011 to the Village's funds according to the allocation requirements of Ordinance No.11-08. The allocation agreed with the percentages the Ordinance requires.

**Debt**

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following Ohio Capital Asset Financing Program Beach Enhancement Bond outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Village's January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:</b>
Ohio Capital Asset Financing Program – Beach Enhancement	\$2,620,425

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register and Payment Register 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 bond debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to debt service fund payments reported in the Payment Register. 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 Register 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 recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report. We found no exceptions.
  - c. 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 employee personnel file. 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. Department(s) and fund(s) 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, 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	January 31, 2013	January 2, 2013	\$1,525.70	\$1,525.70
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	January 2, 2013	\$1,056.96	\$1,056.96
Village of North Perry income taxes	January 20, 2013	January 3, 2013	\$402.50	\$402.50
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 10, 2013	\$8,210.09	\$8,210.09
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	January 10, 2013	\$1,634.90	\$1,634.90

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment 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.
  - 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 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.

### 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair, and Debt Service funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Debt Service 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Debt Service. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2012; however, in 2011 we noted that the Appropriation Status Report was not updated for the permanent appropriations approved by the Council.
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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Debt Service 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, Street Construction, Maintenance, and Repair and Debt Service 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. 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 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports 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 Appropriation Status Report 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**

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 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.



**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

August 23, 2013

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VILLAGE OF NORTH PERRY

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  
SEPTEMBER 5, 2013