

# Office of Missouri State Auditor Nicole Galloway, CPA

## City of Coffey

## CITIZENS SUMMARY

#### Findings in the Audit of the City of Coffey

Background

The former City Clerk, Mary L. Browning, was solely responsible for financial accounting functions and records of the city.

In early August 2017, a bank official contacted a member of the Board of Aldermen regarding various and frequent bank fees incurred by the city, numerous transfers between city bank accounts, and a lack of cash being deposited. The Board terminated the former City Clerk on August 2, 2017. The Board then contacted the Daviess County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney and requested assistance regarding the suspicious bank activity. The Daviess County Prosecuting Attorney subsequently contacted the State Auditor's Office (SAO) and requested an investigation.

Based on discussions with the Daviess County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney regarding missing cash receipts from utility payments and unsupported checks issued to the former City Clerk, the SAO conducted an initial review of these matters under Section 29.221, RSMo. After completion of this review of documentation and communications provided, the SAO determined further investigation was warranted under Section 29.221, RSMo. On August 16, 2017, the Board passed an ordinance formally requesting and authorizing an audit and the audit began on December 4, 2017.

The SAO is currently working with the Daviess County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney regarding criminal prosecution.

Missing Monies and Unsupported and Falsified Transactions The lack of adequate controls and absence of proper oversight by the Board of Aldermen resulted in missing receipts, improper payments, and over (under) payments going undetected for almost 2 years. Between September 2015 and August 2017, the former City Clerk did not deposit \$33,984 of recorded utility receipts. Improper payroll checks totaling \$24,634 were written to the former City Clerk from the city's water and sewer bank accounts from April 29, 2016, through July 28, 2017. A comparison of the hours reported on timesheets to hours paid according to the payroll reports showed discrepancies and therefore, over (under) payments totaling \$1,556 on 19 of the 42 former City Clerk's regular payroll checks. According to city officials, the former City Clerk created false meeting minutes indicating a special Board meeting was held on February 23, 2017, authorizing a withdrawal from one of the city's savings accounts and subsequent deposit into 3 other city bank accounts; allowing the former City Clerk to conceal a portion of account shortages.

Conflict of Interest, Board Objectivity, Oversight, and Annual Audits

Some activities involving former Alderman Browning created a conflict of interest, and the employment of relatives directly supervised by the Board can compromise the Board's objectivity. Former Alderman Browning created a conflict of interest when he voted to approve salary increases and payroll checks to his wife, the former City Clerk. Despite concerns related to the former City Clerk's handling of disbursements and utility payments and prior audit findings, the Board has not established adequate segregation of duties or supervisory reviews over the various financial accounting functions performed by the City Clerk. The city does not obtain annual audits as required.

## Accounting Controls and Procedures

Significant weaknesses exist in the city's accounting controls and procedures. The city's procedures for receipting and depositing monies are poor. Controls and procedures over bank accounts and reconciliations need improvement. Despite a similar concern in our prior petition audit of the city, the city continues to maintain an excessive number of bank accounts. The former City Clerk did not perform monthly bank reconciliations from March 2017 through July 2017. The Board and the former City Clerk failed to monitor the city's cash balances. Despite a similar concern in our prior petition, city officials do not maintain accurate accounting records and financial statements. The former City Clerk made excessive and unauthorized transfers between various bank accounts, and did not always deposit utility receipts into the proper bank account, which led to commingling of restricted funds. The list of refundable utility deposits was not accurate and not reconciled to the balance of the utility deposit bank account.

#### **Electronic Data Security**

Controls over the city's computer are not sufficient. The city has not established adequate password controls to reduce the risk of unauthorized access to the city's computer and data. The City Clerk was not required to change passwords periodically or have a minimum number of characters in the passwords. Security controls are not in place to lock the city's computer after a specified number of incorrect logon attempts or after a certain period of inactivity. The city did not have antivirus software installed on the city's computer to ensure protection of city data. The City Clerk does not store data backup files at an off-site location. The city did not obtain adequate documentation for 2 disbursements pertaining to software technical support services.

In the areas audited, the overall performance of this entity was **Poor**.\*

**Excellent:** The audit results indicate this entity is very well managed. The report contains no findings. In addition, if applicable, prior recommendations have been implemented.

Good: The audit results indicate this entity is well managed. The report contains few findings, and the entity has indicated most or all recommendations have already been, or will be, implemented. In addition, if applicable, many of the prior recommendations have been implemented.

**Fair:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to improve operations in several areas. The report contains several findings, or one or more findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated several recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, several prior recommendations have not been implemented.

**Poor:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to significantly improve operations. The report contains numerous findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated most recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, most prior recommendations have not been implemented.

<sup>\*</sup>The rating(s) cover only audited areas and do not reflect an opinion on the overall operation of the entity. Within that context, the rating scale indicates the following:

# City of Coffey Table of Contents

State Auditor's Report		2
Introduction	Background	
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings	<ol> <li>Missing Monies and Unsupported and Falsified Transactions</li> <li>Conflict of Interest, Board Objectivity, Oversight, and Annual Audits</li> <li>Accounting Controls and Procedures</li> <li>Electronic Data Security</li> </ol>	8
Organization and Statistical Information		20
	<u>Appendixes</u>	
	A Schedule of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances	2.1
	B Supporting Documentation - Undeposited Utility Receipts	
	C Supporting Documentation - Unsupported and Undeposited Utility Payments Recorded for the Former City Clerk's Utility Account (Account Number 6)	25
	D Supporting Documentation - Improper Payroll Checks Issued to the Former City Clerk	
	E Supporting Documentation - Over (Under) Payroll Payments  Made to the Former City Clerk	
	F Supporting Documentation - Falsified Document	30



To the Honorable Mayor and Members of the Board of Aldermen City of Coffey, Missouri

We have audited certain operations of the City of Coffey as they relate to the city's finances in fulfillment of our duties under Section 29.200.3, RSMo. Due to concerns regarding missing monies and unsupported payments, the State Auditor initiated the audit with the approval of the City of Coffey Board of Aldermen. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the period from September 14, 2015, through August 2, 2017. The objectives of our audit were to:

- 1. Evaluate the city's internal controls over significant management and financial functions.
- 2. Evaluate the city's compliance with certain legal provisions.
- 3. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and procedures, including certain financial transactions.
- 4 Determine the amount of missing monies and unsupported payments to the extent possible.

Our methodology included reviewing minutes of meetings, financial records, and other pertinent documents; interviewing various personnel of the city, as well as certain external parties; and testing selected transactions. We obtained an understanding of internal controls that are significant within the context of the audit objectives and assessed whether such controls have been properly designed and placed in operation. We also obtained an understanding of legal provisions that are significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of applicable contract, grant agreement, or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides such a basis.

The accompanying Organization and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the city's management and was not subjected to the procedures applied in our audit of the city.

For the areas audited, we identified (1) deficiencies in internal controls, (2) noncompliance with legal provisions, (3) the need for improvement in management practices and procedures, and (4) missing monies and unsupported payments totaling at least \$60,174. The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the City of Coffey.

Nicole R. Galloway, CPA State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits: Regina Pruitt, CPA
Audit Manager: Pamela Allison, CPA
In-Charge Auditor: Rex Murdock, M.S.Acct.

Marian Rader, M.Acct., CPA, CFE

Audit Staff: James C. Kayser

Troy Tallman

# City of Coffey Introduction

### **Background**

The former City Clerk, Mary L. Browning, was solely responsible for financial accounting functions and records of the city, including receipting and recording payments received, preparing and making deposits, preparing and cosigning checks, and performing bank reconciliations.

In early August 2017, a bank official contacted a member of the Board of Aldermen regarding various and frequent bank fees incurred by the city, numerous transfers between city bank accounts, and a lack of cash being deposited. The Board terminated the former City Clerk on August 2, 2017. The Board then contacted the Daviess County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney and requested assistance regarding the suspicious bank activity. The Daviess County Prosecuting Attorney subsequently contacted the State Auditor's Office (SAO) and requested an investigation.

Based on discussions with the Daviess County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney regarding missing cash receipts from utility payments and unsupported checks issued to the former City Clerk, the SAO conducted an initial review of these matters under Section 29.221, RSMo. After completion of this review of documentation and communications provided, the SAO determined further investigation was warranted under Section 29.221, RSMo. On August 16, 2017, the Board passed an ordinance formally requesting and authorizing an audit and the audit began on December 4, 2017.

The city's fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the period from September 14, 2015, through August 2, 2017, the time period during which the former City Clerk was employed. We applied procedures to receipts and disbursements to identify the amount of missing monies and unsupported payments made to the former City Clerk and the methods used to perpetrate and conceal the theft. See Appendixes B and C for details regarding undeposited utility receipts and problems with the former City Clerk's utility account, and Appendixes D and E for details regarding improper payroll payments to the former City Clerk.

# 1. Missing Monies and Unsupported and Falsified Transactions

Utility receipts totaling at least \$33,984<sup>1</sup> were received but not deposited. In addition, unsupported payroll checks totaling \$24,634 were written to the former City Clerk, and payroll records indicate the former City Clerk was overpaid an additional \$1,556.

The lack of adequate controls and the absence of proper oversight by the Board of Aldermen, as discussed throughout this report, resulted in the missing receipts, improper payments, and over (under) payments going undetected for almost 2 years.

Undeposited utility receipts

Between September 2015 and August 2017, the former City Clerk did not deposit \$33,984 of recorded utility receipts (see Appendix B).

The former City Clerk recorded payments to multiple different records and did not ensure payments were consistently and properly recorded to all appropriate records. The former City Clerk recorded payments to the computerized utility system, manual receipt slips, utility billing stubs, utility deposit check register, and utility deposit listing. She also prepared unofficial payment stubs on a blank square of paper for some of the monies received. We compared payments recorded in these records to deposits to determine the amount of undeposited utility receipts. City records indicate approximately 98 percent of the undeposited receipts were cash payments.

The former City Clerk recorded unsupported utility payments for herself totaling \$2,645 (see Appendix C). These utility payments could not be traced to a deposit and are included in the total undeposited utility receipts amount mentioned earlier. The computerized utility system shows payments of \$2,523 (\$2,374 cash and \$149 check) recorded on the former City Clerk's personal utility account. Most of these payments were recorded on the last day of the month or the first day of the following month. It is likely this timing was to record payments just prior to preparation of the next month's utility billings. As a result, the former City Clerk's utility account did not show as delinquent and the possibility of a past due billing being generated was eliminated. In addition, a payment stub (sometimes used to record customer utility deposits) indicated she paid a \$122 deposit. The stub did not indicate a method of payment and we could not trace the payment to a deposit. Utility deposits are not recorded in the computerized utility system.

Improper payroll checks

Improper payroll checks totaling \$24,634 were written to the former City Clerk from the city's water and sewer bank accounts from April 29, 2016, through July 28, 2017 (see Appendix D). The former City Clerk wrote 136 payroll checks to herself during this time period, and 94 (69 percent) of these

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Amounts presented in the report findings are rounded to the nearest dollar, whereas amounts presented in Appendixes B, C, D, and E are exact.



checks were not supported by a timesheet or payroll report. In addition, 46 of the 94 improper checks were written for even dollar amounts. The remaining 42 checks were associated with a weekly timesheet and/or amounts recorded on payroll reports; however we noted discrepancies as discussed later in the report. The number of checks written to the former City Clerk and the checks written for even dollar amounts should have caused suspicion and alerted the Board to the misappropriation.

The memo line of some of these checks indicated a different payroll period than the city's actual payroll period, and some of the checks were written a few days prior to and after the regular payroll checks. In addition, one of these checks was not accurately recorded in the computerized accounting system (see MAR finding number 3.3). Regular payroll checks were supported by timesheets prepared by the former City Clerk. Timesheets reported hours worked for a typical work week (4 to 6 hours a day on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) and additional time worked on days of Board meetings and other busy periods (i.e., preparation of utility billings). City payroll checks require 2 signatures, and these improper checks were signed by both the former City Clerk and former Mayor. However, as discussed at MAR finding number 2.2, the former Mayor's practice of signing blank checks in advance allowed the improper payroll checks to occur and go undetected.

Also, \$13,432 of improper payroll payments made during 2016 and \$11,202 of improper payroll payments and \$201 of regular payroll payments made during 2017 were not included on the former City Clerk's W-2 forms and not subject to payroll tax withholdings. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requires employers to report all compensation on W-2 forms and withhold and remit income and payroll taxes.

Payroll over (under) payments

A comparison of the hours reported on timesheets to hours paid according to the payroll reports showed discrepancies and therefore, over (under) payments on 19 of the 42 former City Clerk's regular payroll checks. The former City Clerk was overpaid a net total of \$1,556 from November 2015 through August 2017 (see Appendix E). The over (under) payments occurred because the former City Clerk entered different hours into the payroll report than she recorded as being worked on her timesheets. We determined the over (under) payment amounts assuming the hours recorded on the timesheets signed by the former City Clerk were accurate.

Falsified document

According to city officials, the former City Clerk created false meeting minutes (see Appendix F) indicating a special Board meeting was held on February 23, 2017, authorizing a withdrawal from one of the city's savings accounts and subsequent deposit into 3 other city bank accounts. The Board members signatures affixed to the meeting minutes were copied from another city document and attached to the meeting minutes. The former City Clerk then copied this document and used white out to conceal the line where the original documents were attached. This false document was faxed to the bank



by the former City Clerk to authorize the withdrawal and subsequent deposit of city funds. The unauthorized withdrawal and deposit of monies allowed the former City Clerk to conceal a portion of the shortages in the sewer, water, and solid waste bank accounts caused by the undeposited receipts and improper payments.

The falsified meeting minutes indicate 5 Board members and the former City Clerk were present at the special meeting, where the Board approved withdrawing \$1,500 from the city's savings account and depositing \$850 to the sewer bank account, \$300 to the water bank account, and \$350 to the solid waste bank account. Several Board members confirmed no meeting occurred on February 23, 2017, and they did not approve the withdrawal of monies from the savings account. Also, the former City Clerk's timesheets did not report any hours worked on that date for a Board meeting. This withdrawal from the savings account and subsequent deposits into 2 of the bank accounts indicated above, was not recorded in the computerized accounting system by the former City Clerk and the remaining deposit was not recorded until April 24, 2017 (see MAR finding number 3.3).

Overall conclusion

The lack of segregation of duties, inadequate controls, and the absence of proper oversight by the Board, as discussed in the remainder of this report, resulted in undeposited utility receipts, improper payroll checks, and over (under) payments and allowed these problems to occur without detection for almost 2 years. Given the large amount of utility receipts that were not deposited, the large number of and unusual nature of the improper payroll checks, it is apparent city financial activity was not adequately monitored. In addition, the former City Clerk's husband was a member of the Board and approved some of the payments made to his wife, creating a conflict of interest (see MAR finding number 2.1).

#### Recommendation

The Board of Aldermen work with law enforcement officials regarding criminal prosecution of the undeposited utility receipts, improper payroll checks, payroll over (under) payments, and the falsified meeting minutes, and take the necessary actions to seek restitution. The Board should also ensure payroll taxes are properly withheld and all compensation reported on W-2 forms, and amend W-2 forms for unreported compensation, as appropriate.

### Auditee's Response

We will continue to work with law enforcement regarding criminal prosecution and restitution. We will also contact the IRS and Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations to determine the appropriate reporting methods.



## 2. Conflict of Interest, Board Objectivity, Oversight, and Annual Audits

2.1 Conflict of interest and objectivity

Some activities involving former Alderman Browning created a conflict of interest, and the employment of relatives directly supervised by the Board can compromise the Board's objectivity. Despite similar concerns in our prior petition audit of the city, Report No. 2014-26, released in April 2014, the Board of Aldermen have not established adequate oversight of the City Clerk position or obtained annual audits as required by state law.

Former Alderman Browning created a conflict of interest when he voted to approve salary increases and payroll checks to his wife, the former City Clerk. In addition, the current City Clerk is the daughter of 2 of 4 current Board members, and the Board has not established policies and procedures to address employment and supervision of a related employee. As a result, the objectivity and effectiveness of the Board may be compromised.

The February 12, 2016, meeting minutes indicate the Board (including former Alderman Browning) approved a 50 cent per hour salary increase for the former City Clerk. Former Alderman Browning's action of voting to approve his wife's salary increase violated state law. In addition, meeting minutes for 15 monthly meetings between October 2015 and July 2017, indicate the Board (including former Alderman Browning) approved paying bills, which included improper payroll checks and regular payroll checks, some of which included over (under) payments to the former City Clerk (see Appendixes D and E). These 15 monthly meetings include October through December of 2015; February through April and July, August, and October of 2016; and January through May and July 2017. The November 16, 2015, meeting minutes also indicate former Alderman Browning voted to approve adding his wife as an authorized signer on city bank accounts. Former Alderman Browning was not in attendance or abstained from approving salary increases and payments to his wife in the other 7 months.

The Board directly supervises the duties of the City Clerk, who is solely responsible for the financial accounting functions and records of the city as discussed in section 2.2. The supervision of a relative may compromise a supervisor's objectivity when assigning duties, reviewing and approving records and transactions prepared by the related employee, or evaluating employee performance.

Section 105.452.1(4), RSMo, mandates that no elected official of any political subdivision shall favorably act on any matter that is so specifically designed so as to provide a special monetary benefit to such official or his spouse. The Missouri Supreme Court has stated, "A public officer owes an undivided loyalty to the public whom he serves and he should not place himself in a position which will subject him to conflicting duties or expose him to the temptation of acting other than in the best interests of the public." *State ex rel. St. Louis County v. Kelly*, 377 S.W. 2d 328, 332 (Mo. 1964) (quoting 43 Am. Jur., Public Officers, § 266, p. 81). Personal interests in



business matters of the city create actual or the appearance of conflicts of interest, and a lack of independence could harm public confidence in the Board and reduce its effectiveness.

## 2.2 Oversight and segregation of duties

Despite concerns related to the former City Clerk's handling of disbursements and utility payments and prior audit findings, the Board has not established adequate segregation of duties or supervisory reviews over the various financial accounting functions performed by the City Clerk. Weaknesses identified throughout this report are significant and demonstrate a lack of segregation and proper oversight by the Board. There is little assurance city monies have been handled and accounted for properly.

The position of City Clerk has been and remains solely responsible for the record-keeping duties of the city, including receiving, recording, and depositing monies; preparing invoices for payment; maintaining payroll records; preparing and distributing payroll and accounts payable checks; preparing and distributing monthly utility billings; generating utility reports; preparing monthly bank reconciliations; transferring monies between bank accounts; preparing financial reports for Board meetings; and preparing budgets and financial statements. Board members indicated the former Mayor was responsible for reviewing the monthly bank statements and reconciliations; however, based on the various problems reported these procedures were ineffective.

In addition, Board members indicated the former Mayor often signed blank checks in advance. Two signatures are required on checks (typically the Mayor and City Clerk). Signing checks in advance is a significant control weakness, diminishes the control intended by multiple signatures, and allowed the improper payroll disbursements to occur.

Proper segregation of duties helps ensure all transactions are accounted for properly and assets are adequately safeguarded. If proper segregation of duties is not possible, timely supervisory or independent reviews of work performed and investigation into unusual items and variances is necessary. Good management practices require extensive and detailed oversight by the Board.

#### 2.3 Annual audits

The city does not obtain annual audits as required. The last independent financial statement audit of city finances occurred for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. City officials contracted for the audit because of a recommendation in our prior petition audit of the city, but regular audits have not become a routine procedure.

Section 250.150, RSMo, requires the city to obtain annual audits of the combined waterworks and sewerage system, and the cost of the audit is to be paid from the revenues received from the system.



#### Overall conclusion

The Board's lack of objectivity and proper oversight and failure to establish adequate controls allowed the undeposited utility receipts, improper payroll payments, and payroll over (under) payments to occur and go undetected for almost 2 years. Had proper controls and oversight procedures been in place and an annual audit obtained, some of the problems noted in this report may have been detected more timely and/or prevented.

#### Recommendations

#### The Board of Aldermen:

- 2.1 Closely examine city transactions to identify apparent and actual conflicts of interest and adopt procedures to address the employment and supervision of relatives.
- 2.2 Segregate accounting duties to the extent possible and implement appropriate reviews and monitoring procedures. In addition, the Board should not allow any check signers to sign checks in advance.
- 2.3 Obtain annual audits of the waterworks and sewerage system as required by state law.

#### Auditee's Response

- 2.1 The Mayor reviews all checks and bills. Additionally, the Mayor and the current City Clerk will sign the timesheets documenting approval.

  The 2 related Board members will abstain from voting on any transactions related to their daughter, the current City Clerk.
- 2.2 The Mayor performs a documented review of the bank statements and reconciliations. The Mayor will not sign any checks in advance and reviews all checks and bills, including timesheets. We review all non-regular bills and question unusual transactions. In the future, the Mayor will review utility and deposit reports and compare them to deposits.
- 2.3 We agree and will ensure annual audits are obtained.

# 3. Accounting Controls and Procedures

Significant weaknesses exist in the city's accounting controls and procedures.

## 3.1 Receipting and depositing procedures

The city's procedures for receipting and depositing monies are poor.

 The former City Clerk did not always issue receipt slips for monies received. City officials indicated the former City Clerk's procedure for the collection of monthly utility payments included issuing manual receipt slips, documenting amounts received on payment stubs, and recording receipts in the computerized utility system. The former City



Clerk's procedures for the collection of utility deposits included issuing manual receipt slips, documenting amounts received on payment stubs, and recording the deposits on a utility deposit listing or on the utility deposit bank account check register. The former City Clerk did not issue receipt slips for property taxes and franchise fees received.

- All copies of some receipt slips were missing from the receipt books.
   Also, the top copy of some voided receipt slips was not retained. From September 14, 2015, through August 2, 2017, 8 receipt slips were missing from the receipt books, and the top copy of 10 voided receipt slips were not retained.
- As noted in our prior petition audit, city personnel do not consistently indicate the method of payment, or reconcile the method of payment to the composition of receipts recorded in the computerized utility system or to the deposit. The method of payment was not recorded for 3 utility deposits received totaling \$365.
- The former City Clerk generally made deposits 4 times a month regardless of the amount of monies on hand. Each deposit was typically more than \$1,000. In addition, she did not deposit receipts intact.

Failure to implement adequate receipting and depositing procedures increases the risk that loss, theft, or misuse of monies will go undetected.

# 3.2 Bank accounts, reconciliations, and fees

Controls and procedures over bank accounts and reconciliations need improvement.

Number of bank accounts

Despite a similar concern in our prior petition audit of the city, the city continues to maintain an excessive number of bank accounts, resulting in cumbersome record keeping. The city maintains 9 checking accounts (an account for each of the city's 9 funds), a savings account, and 4 certificates of deposit. Several transfers between accounts were necessary to ensure restricted utility collections were held in the appropriate account. The high number of bank accounts may have helped conceal the undeposited utility receipts and the improper payroll checks.

Bank reconciliations

The former City Clerk did not perform monthly bank reconciliations from March 2017 through July 2017.

Overdraft and minimum balance fees

The Board and the former City Clerk failed to monitor the city's cash balances. As a result, the city incurred \$280 in overdraft fees and \$170 in minimum balance fees in the general, sewer, sewer depreciation, solid waste, and utility deposit bank accounts. The city began to incur these fees in November 2016, and they continued until July 31, 2017. A bank official contacted a Board member in early August 2017, regarding the various and



frequent bank fees incurred, the number of transfers between bank accounts, and the lack of cash being deposited into city bank accounts.

The city may benefit from combining some bank accounts. A high number of bank accounts require additional record keeping and increases the likelihood that errors may occur. The preparation and retention of formal monthly bank reconciliations is necessary to ensure accounting records are accurate and in balance and to identify errors timely. To prevent bank account overdraft and minimum balance charges, city officials should more closely monitor bank account balances.

## 3.3 Accounting records and financial statements

Despite a similar concern in our prior petition audit of the city, city officials do not maintain accurate accounting records and financial statements.

• Some transactions were not accurately recorded in the computerized accounting system, and the dates recorded on the actual checks differed from those recorded in the computerized accounting system.

As noted in MAR finding number 1, the former City Clerk withdrew \$1,500 from the city's savings account and deposited \$850 in the sewer bank account, \$350 in the solid waste bank account and \$300 in the water bank account, but did not record the \$1,500 withdrawal and \$850 and \$300 deposits in the computerized accounting system. In addition, the \$350 deposited into the solid waste bank account was not recorded in the computerized accounting system until April 24, 2017.

Also, the former City Clerk recorded checks issued to herself incorrectly in the computerized accounting system, and the dates recorded on the actual checks differed from those recorded in the computerized accounting system. For example, the former City Clerk recorded check number 5392 on the sewer account check register on February 17, 2017, for \$303 for the pay period February 1 through February 17, 2017; however, she later voided this transaction. She subsequently recorded a disbursement in this check register (no check number was assigned) dated March 16, 2017, for \$201 for the same pay period of voided check number 5392. Check number 5392 was not actually voided, but was written for \$201 and issued to the former City Clerk. This check cleared the bank on March 17, 2017.

We identified numerous other instances where transfers and disbursements were not properly recorded in the computerized accounting system.

• The semiannual financial statements prepared by the former City Clerk were misleading and significantly inaccurate. For example, the semiannual financial statement for the 6 months ending December 31,



2016, overstated the city's cash balances of various checking accounts as follows:

	(	Cash Balances	
		per	
		Semiannual	Actual
		Financial	Reconciled
Bank account		Statement	Cash Balances
General	\$	3,307	52
Street		656	207
Water		8,849	230
Sewer		8,946	700
Sewer Revenue		5,084	4,184
Solid Waste		7,060	516
Utility Deposit		5,284	701
Late Fees	_	3,348	361
Total	\$	42,534	6,951

 The former City Clerk prepared packets for Board members for each monthly meeting and most information contained in the packets was inaccurate. For example, the former City Clerk prepared a report for the Board showing cash balances for each fund as of May 31, 2017, which reported inaccurate bank balances as follows:

	Cash Balances per Board	Reconciled Cash Balances
Bank account	Report	per Audit
General	\$ 3,466	88
Street	1,151	63
Water	8,941	104
Sewer	8,103	(355)
Sewer Revenue	5,684	4,184
Sewer Depreciation	4,516	501
Solid Waste	7,964	(305)
Utility Deposit	5,401	282
Late Fees	4,258	30
Total	\$ 49,484	4,592

In addition, the June 2017 packet included a listing of May 2017 disbursements showing a total of \$6,231 although actual disbursements totaled \$8,948. Most disbursements listed did not agree to the actual checks written and several checks written to the former City Clerk were not included on the list. However, the Mayor and all 4 Board members (including the former City Clerk's husband) initialed this listing documenting their review.



As noted in the previous tables, most of the city's bank account balances were depleted over the course of the former City Clerk's employment; however, she falsely reported bank balances to the Board and to the public. The inaccurate bank balances reported showed a slight increase from balances maintained at July 1, 2015, just a few months prior to her employment, consistent with the Board's expectations of the city's financial condition; thus not identifying the large decline in overall account balances.

It is apparent the Board did not review the semiannual financial statements or financial reports and lists of bills included in the packets for accuracy or compare this information to any supporting documents such as invoices, checks written, or bank statements.

The inaccurate financial activity reported to the Board helped conceal shortages in these bank accounts. To be of maximum assistance to the Board and to adequately inform the public, the city's records should accurately report financial activity and account balances.

3.4 Excessive and unauthorized transfers and commingling of restricted funds

The former City Clerk made excessive and unauthorized transfers between various bank accounts, and did not always deposit utility receipts into the proper bank account, which led to commingling of restricted funds. The excessive and unauthorized transfers and incorrect deposits helped conceal shortages in city bank accounts.

- The city's accounting records indicated 60 transfers totaling almost \$45,000 were made between bank accounts during the period September 14, 2015, through August 2, 2017. Eighty percent of these transfers were for small dollar amounts (less than \$1,000). The majority of these transfers were not approved by the Board and inappropriately made from various restricted funds. Appendix A also shows the amount of transfers made during the year ended June 30, 2017.
- The former City Clerk routinely deposited incorrect amounts of utility receipts into the city's bank accounts. For example, the April 18, 2017, utility report indicated total collections of \$922, of which \$408 was for water services, \$384 was for sewer services, \$115 was for solid waste services, and \$15 was late fees and should have been deposited into those respective bank accounts. However, \$347 was deposited into the water bank account, \$320 was deposited into the sewer bank account, \$114 was deposited into the solid waste bank account, \$20 was deposited into the general bank account, \$0 was deposited into the late fees account, and \$121 (the only cash collected) was not deposited.

To ensure restricted monies are used for the intended purpose, monies received should be deposited into the appropriate bank account. In addition, Section 250.150, RSMo, restricts the use of water and sewer monies for operating the systems, payment of bonds, establishment of a reserve,



fulfillment of any agreements contained in ordinances, and payment of costs of improvements of such systems.

#### 3.5 Utility deposits

The list of refundable utility deposits was not accurate and not reconciled to the balance of the utility deposit bank account.

New customers are required to pay a \$122 refundable deposit for homeowners and a \$222 refundable deposit for renters before receiving utility services.

The city's list of refundable utility deposits totaled \$6,253 as of August 2, 2017; however, the bank balance of the utility deposit account was only \$95, a shortage of \$6,158. In addition, the city had 71 utility customers as of August 2, 2017, but only 41 had refundable utility deposits included on the list.

To ensure all utility deposits received from customers are accounted for properly, the Board should review utility deposit records and bank account balances for accuracy.

#### Recommendations

#### The Board of Aldermen:

- 3.1 Require receipt slips be issued for all monies received with the method of payment indicated, the composition of receipts be reconciled to the composition of amounts recorded and deposited, receipt slips (including the top copy of voided receipt slips) be retained, and monies received be deposited timely and intact.
- 3.2 Review the number of bank accounts. The Board should also ensure monthly bank reconciliations are prepared and reconciled timely, and any differences are promptly investigated and resolved. The Board should also properly monitor bank account balances to avoid bank fees.
- 3.3 Ensure accounting records and financial reports are accurate. The Board should perform adequate reviews of financial reports and checks written before approving.
- 3.4 Monitor and reduce the number of transfers made between bank accounts and ensure monies received are deposited in the appropriate bank accounts.
- 3.5 Reconcile the utility deposit listing monthly to the utility deposit bank account balance. Any discrepancies should be investigated and resolved.

### Auditee's Response

3.1 Manual receipt slips are now issued for all monies received, which indicate the composition of the receipt. Reports now document the



composition of receipts, which are reconciled to deposit slips. All copies of voided receipt slips are now retained, and deposits are now made in accordance with city ordinance, which require funds on hand greater than \$500 to be deposited.

- 3.2 We will consider consolidating bank accounts. Monthly bank reconciliations are now being performed. The Mayor now reviews the bank reconciliations and ensures no bank fees are being incurred.
- 3.3 Monthly financial reports are presented to the Board and are now reviewed by the Board and Mayor and compared to the accounting records for accuracy. In the future, we will review and approve the semiannual financial statements for accuracy. We review all non-regular disbursements and the Mayor reviews all checks he signs and the related bills.
- 3.4 Transfers have been minimized, and we will approve all transfers. The Mayor is reviewing bank statements for transfers. The current City Clerk prepares a deposit report that indicates the amount deposited into each restricted fund.
- 3.5 The current City Clerk has updated the utility deposit list. We transferred monies into the utility deposit account to cover the shortages. Discrepancies will be investigated and resolved.

# 4. Electronic Data Security

Controls over the city's computer are not sufficient. As a result, city records are not adequately protected and are susceptible to unauthorized access or loss of data. In addition, the city made questionable disbursements for software technical support services.

#### 4.1 Passwords

The city has not established adequate password controls to reduce the risk of unauthorized access to the city's computer and data. The City Clerk was not required to change passwords periodically or have a minimum number of characters in the passwords.

Passwords are necessary to authenticate access to computers. The security of computer passwords is dependent upon keeping them confidential. However, since passwords do not have to be periodically changed or contain a minimum number of characters, there is less assurance passwords are effectively limiting access to computers and data files to only those individuals who need access to perform their job responsibilities. Passwords should be unique and confidential and changed periodically to reduce the risk of a compromised password and unauthorized access to and use of the city's computer and data.

#### 4.2 Security controls

Security controls are not in place to lock the city's computer after a specified number of incorrect logon attempts or after a certain period of inactivity.



Logon attempt controls lock the capability to access a computer after a specified number of consecutive invalid logon attempts and are necessary to prevent unauthorized individuals from continually attempting to logon to a computer by guessing passwords. Inactivity controls are necessary to reduce the risk of unauthorized individuals accessing an unattended computer and having potentially unrestricted access to programs and data files. Without effective security controls, there is an increased risk of unauthorized access to computers and the unauthorized use, modification, or destruction of data.

#### 4.3 Antivirus software

The city did not have antivirus software installed on the city's computer to ensure protection of city data. Maintaining adequate antivirus software is critical to a computer's protection.

#### 4.4 Data backup

The City Clerk does not store data backup files at an off-site location. Off-site storage would provide reasonable assurance data could be recovered if necessary. To help prevent loss of information and ensure all essential information and computer systems can be recovered, backup files should be stored at a secure off-site location.

## 4.5 Software technical support service

The city did not obtain adequate documentation for 2 disbursements pertaining to software technical support services. On October 21, 2016, 2 electronic debit withdrawals, one for \$269.99 and another for \$299.99, were made from the city's general bank account payable to a software technical support service company without detailed invoices. The related invoices only indicate "software technical support service 1 computer" and documented the electronic signature of the former City Clerk indicating she was satisfied with the support services provided. These were the only instances noted where the former City Clerk utilized an electronic signature. The electronic signature was a printed signature and the former City Clerk typically wrote her signature in cursive. Our internet search of the software technical support service company indicated the firm has been associated with several technical support scams. Considering the city has only one computer, it is questionable why 2 payments were invoiced for the same software technical support service on the same day.

Images of canceled checks payable to this vendor were included with the city's bank statements and the check images did not resemble other city checks. One check had a check number that was within the city's check sequence; however, the city had already issued a check with that number (see the first check on the next page). Check number 2510 was not within the city's check sequence. The checks issued to this vendor also had various differences including the payee listed and the format. Neither of the checks included authorized signatures of city officials. The first check image presented is an actual city check and the second and third checks are the check images for payments made for the software technical support services. The city's bank account, routing numbers, and membership number have been redacted.



CITY OF COFFEY  GENERAL FUND  100 E STATE HIGHWAY B  COFFEY, MO 64636  PAY TO THE ORDER OF  Farmer's Electric Cooperative, Inc. P. O. Box 680  Chillicothe, MO 64601-0680		1620 10/10/2016 \$ "30.64 DOLLARS
10/17/2016	CURITY FEATURES INCLUDED, DETAILS ON BACK.	s 30.64
CITY OF COFFEY  100 EAST STATE HIGHWAY B COFFEY, M0 64636  PAY TO THE Geeks Advise ORDER OF  Two Hundred And Sixty-Nine Dollars And Ninety-Ni	BTC BANK	1620 Date Oct 21, 2016  \$ 269.99
Memo	NO Your account holder has Idemnifies you for paym	SIGNATURE REQUIRED  s authorized this payment to the payee. The payee and of this check. This check shall be deposited agree and the laok of endorsement is
10/25/2016	1620	\$269.99
City of Coffey City of Coffey 100 Ecat Statw Highway B Coffey, MO 64636	80-1630/1019	2510 Date: 10/24/2016
Pay to the Order of: Geak Support  Two Hundred and Ninety-Nine D	ollars and 99/100	\$299.99 Dollars
Geak Support: 1-888-384-6851	by Gesk to as author City of Co	
10/25/2016	2510	\$299.99

As noted throughout the report, a proper review by the Board of bank account information and city disbursement records should have identified these unusual transactions. To ensure obligations were actually incurred and amounts paid were proper, all disbursements should be supported by paid receipts, itemized vendor invoices or other detailed documentation; and undergo a careful review process.



#### Recommendations

#### The Board of Aldermen:

- 4.1 Require employees use unique passwords that are confidential, contain a minimum number of characters, and are periodically changed to prevent unauthorized access to the city's computer and data.
- 4.2 Ensure the city's computer has security controls in place to lock after a specified number of incorrect logon attempts and after a certain period of inactivity.
- 4.3 Ensure the city's computer is adequately protected from computer viruses.
- 4.4 Ensure backup files are stored at a secure off-site location.
- 4.5 Maintain adequate supporting documentation for all disbursements.

### Auditee's Response

- 4.1 The current City Clerk is the only employee with computer access and a unique password is required that is kept confidential. Passwords now require a minimum number of characters and are changed quarterly.
- 4.2 We have controls now for computer inactivity and will consider controls for incorrect logon attempts.
- 4.3 This recommendation has been implemented.
- 4.4 Backups are being stored off-site.
- 4.5 Adequate supporting documentation will be retained for all disbursements and the Mayor will monitor the bank statements for unusual checks.

## City of Coffey

## Organization and Statistical Information

The City of Coffey is located in Daviess County. The city was incorporated in 1965 and is currently a fourth-class city. The city employed 2 part-time employees on June 30, 2017.

City operations include utilities (water, sewer, and solid waste removal).

## Mayor and Board of Aldermen

The city government consists of a mayor and a 4-member board of aldermen. The members are elected for 2-year terms. The mayor is elected for a 2-year term, presides over the board of aldermen, and votes only in the case of a tie. The Mayor and Board of Aldermen, at August 2, 2017, are identified below. The Mayor and Board of Aldermen members are paid \$20 per regular meeting. The compensation of these officials is established by ordinance.

Barbara Miller, Mayor (1) Virgil Griffin, Alderman William Browning, Alderman (2) Julia Bayne, Alderwoman Carolyn Griffin, Alderwoman

- (1) Barbara Miller resigned in October 2017, and the Board appointed Ralph Ray as Mayor.
- (2) William Browning resigned in September 2017, and the Board appointed Maxine Kennedy as Alderwoman.

# Financial Activity and Supporting Documentation

Appendix A is a summary of the city's financial activity for the year ended June 30, 2017. The information was prepared using the city's check registers and bank statements.

Appendixes B, C, D, E, and F provide supporting documentation of undeposited utility receipts, unsupported and undeposited utility payments recorded for the former City Clerk's utility account, improper payroll checks issued to the former City Clerk, over (under) payroll payments made to the former City Clerk, and a falsified document.

Appendix A

City of Coffey Schedule of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash Balances Year Ended June 30, 2017

	 General	Street	Water	Sewer	Sewer Revenue	Sewer Depreciation	Solid Waste	Utility Deposit	Late Fees	Certificates of Deposit and Savings Accounts	Total
RECEIPTS	\$ 7,364	8,385	31,214	26,390	0	5	8,236	633	1,048	370	83,645
TRANSFERS IN	2,470	2,158	7,000	14,039	0	0	1,066	121	0	0	26,854
DISBURSEMENTS	(10,300)	(10,746)	(43,040)	(41,652)	0	(10)	(9,059)	(733)	0	0	(115,540)
TRANSFERS OUT	0	(801)	0	(470)	(3,680)	(4,009)	(5,333)	(4,925)	(6,136)	(1,500)	(26,854)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(466)	(1,004)	(4,826)	(1,693)	(3,680)	(4,014)	(5,090)	(4,904)	(5,088)	(1,130)	(31,895)
CASH BALANCE, JULY 1, 2016	522	1,043	4,961	1,775	4,184	4,510	5,051	5,143	5,133	77,601	109,923
CASH BALANCE, JUNE 30, 2017	\$ 56	39	135	82	504	496	(39)	239	45	76,471 (1)	78,028

<sup>(1)</sup> The balances maintained in the certificates of deposits and savings accounts include \$10,567 for the General Fund, \$8,014 for the Sewer Fund, and \$57,890 for the Water Fund.

Appendix B

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Undeposited Utility Receipts

			Unknown							
Deposit	Cash	Checks (1)	Method of	Total	Cash	Checks	Total	Cash	Checks	Total
Date	Receipted	Receipted	Payment (2)	Receipts	Deposited	Deposited	Deposited	Long (Short)	Long (Short)	Difference
9/21/2015 \$	341.60	1,156.54	0.00	1,498.14	341.60	1,156.54	1,498.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
10/2/2015	387.19	1,467.02	0.00	1,854.21	387.19	1,467.02	1,854.21	0.00	0.00	0.00
10/16/2015	936.22	2,511.41	0.00	3,447.63	791.78	2,511.41	3,303.19	(144.44)	0.00	(144.44)
10/23/2015	574.33	1,487.07	0.00	2,061.40	0.00	1,487.27	1,487.27	(574.33)	0.20	(574.13)
11/2/2015	651.93	2,218.25	0.00	2,870.18	411.12	2,218.25	2,629.37	(240.81)	0.00	(240.81)
11/10/2015	1,077.47	1,397.89	0.00	2,475.36	453.59	1,397.89	1,851.48	(623.88)	0.00	(623.88)
11/20/2015	505.25	2,730.37	0.00	3,235.62	0.00	2,730.37	2,730.37	(505.25)	0.00	(505.25)
11/30/2015	378.06	1,283.68	0.00	1,661.74	90.00	1,161.93	1,251.93	(288.06)	(121.75)	(409.81)
12/11/2015	914.00	1,886.55	0.00	2,800.55	242.00	2,008.30	2,250.30	(672.00)	121.75	(550.25)
12/21/2015	61.50	2,408.09	0.00	2,469.59	0.00	2,407.48	2,407.48	(61.50)	(0.61)	(62.11)
12/31/2015	456.78	2,633.87	243.50	3,334.15	0.00	2,485.36	2,485.36	(700.28)	(148.51)	(848.79)
Total 2015	6,284.33	21,180.74	243.50	27,708.57	2,717.28	21,031.82	23,749.10	(3,810.55)	(148.92)	(3,959.47)
1/19/2016	1,063.30	3,921.73	0.00	4,985.03	0.00	3,920.53	3,920.53	(1,063.30)	(1.20)	(1,064.50)
1/29/2016	389.90	1,090.03	0.00	1,479.93	0.00	1,090.03	1,090.03	(389.90)	0.00	(389.90)
2/8/2016	150.35	1,770.27	0.00	1,920.62	0.00	1,770.27	1,770.27	(150.35)	0.00	(150.35)
2/12/2016	985.03	2,351.36	121.75	3,458.14	0.00	2,351.37	2,351.37	(1,106.78)	0.01	(1,106.77)
2/22/2016	293.50	1,802.29	0.00	2,095.79	0.00	1,802.29	1,802.29	(293.50)	0.00	(293.50)
2/29/2016	951.34	978.46	0.00	1,929.80	115.00	978.13	1,093.13	(836.34)	(0.33)	(836.67)
3/11/2016	607.15	2,291.63	0.00	2,898.78	591.75	2,291.33	2,883.08	(15.40)	(0.30)	(15.70)
3/21/2016	663.88	1,622.55	0.00	2,286.43	310.00	1,622.55	1,932.55	(353.88)	0.00	(353.88)
3/31/2016	512.62	1,009.99	0.00	1,522.61	250.00	1,009.99	1,259.99	(262.62)	0.00	(262.62)
4/11/2016	322.02	1,446.99	0.00	1,769.01	62.00	1,446.99	1,508.99	(260.02)	0.00	(260.02)
4/15/2016	210.80	2,508.57	0.00	2,719.37	0.00	2,508.57	2,508.57	(210.80)	0.00	(210.80)
4/29/2016	636.37	1,155.14	0.00	1,791.51	0.00	1,155.14	1,155.14	(636.37)	0.00	(636.37)
5/9/2016	401.29	3,005.64	0.00	3,406.93	0.00	3,005.39	3,005.39	(401.29)	(0.25)	(401.54)
5/13/2016	541.51	1,227.78	0.00	1,769.29	0.00	1,227.78	1,227.78	(541.51)	0.00	(541.51)
5/23/2016	115.00	1,359.84	0.00	1,474.84	124.00	1,359.84	1,483.84	9.00	0.00	9.00
5/31/2016	273.67	928.08	0.00	1,201.75	0.00	928.08	928.08	(273.67)	0.00	(273.67)
6/16/2016	1,062.25	3,931.20	0.00	4,993.45	0.00	3,931.20	3,931.20	(1,062.25)	0.00	(1,062.25)
6/24/2016	544.75	938.13	0.00	1,482.88	0.00	938.13	938.13	(544.75)	0.00	(544.75)
7/5/2016	364.75	1,324.05	0.00	1,688.80	0.00	1,324.05	1,324.05	(364.75)	0.00	(364.75)
7/13/2016	252.50	2,130.82	0.00	2,383.32	0.00	2,130.82	2,130.82	(252.50)	0.00	(252.50)
7/15/2016	383.34	1,764.50	0.00	2,147.84	0.00	1,764.50	1,764.50	(383.34)	0.00	(383.34)
7/25/2016	269.01	934.23	0.00	1,203.24	0.00	934.23	934.23	(269.01)	0.00	(269.01)
8/1/2016	132.00	496.45	0.00	628.45	0.00	496.45	496.45	(132.00)	0.00	(132.00)
8/5/2016	1,002.96	2,095.18	0.00	3,098.14	121.75	2,095.18	2,216.93	(881.21)	0.00	(881.21)
8/12/2016	249.75	1,943.90	0.00	2,193.65	0.00	1,943.90	1,943.90	(249.75)	0.00	(249.75)

Appendix B

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Undeposited Utility Receipts

			Unknown							
Deposit	Cash	Checks (1)	Method of	Total	Cash	Checks	Total	Cash	Checks	Total
Date	Receipted	Receipted	Payment (2)	Receipts	Deposited	Deposited	Deposited	Long (Short)	Long (Short)	Difference
8/19/2016	442.33	1,736.49	0.00	2,178.82	0.00	1,736.49	1,736.49	(442.33)	0.00	(442.33)
9/2/2016	511.75	1,768.43	0.00	2,280.18	0.00	1,768.43	1,768.43	(511.75)	0.00	(511.75)
9/13/2016	284.25	1,354.84	0.00	1,639.09	0.00	1,354.84	1,354.84	(284.25)	0.00	(284.25)
9/16/2016	726.25	2,795.85	0.00	3,522.10	0.00	2,795.85	2,795.85	(726.25)	0.00	(726.25)
9/30/2016	133.75	3,890.75	0.00	4,024.50	0.00	3,890.75	3,890.75	(133.75)	0.00	(133.75)
10/11/2016	381.00	1,016.32	0.00	1,397.32	0.00	1,016.32	1,016.32	(381.00)	0.00	(381.00)
10/11/2016	279.25	989.77	0.00	1,269.02	0.00	989.77	989.77	(279.25)	0.00	(279.25)
10/14/2016	344.50	6,102.23	0.00	6,446.73	0.00	6,102.23	6,102.23	(344.50)	0.00	(344.50)
10/31/2016	322.50	1,070.32	0.00	1,392.82	0.00	1,070.32	1,070.32	(322.50)	0.00	(322.50)
11/8/2016	469.50	1,234.25	0.00	1,703.75	0.00	1,134.25	1,134.25	(469.50)	(100.00)	(569.50)
11/14/2016	457.00	3,358.47	0.00	3,815.47	0.00	3,358.47	3,358.47	(457.00)	0.00	(457.00)
11/16/2016	0.00	3,131.13	0.00	3,131.13	0.00	3,131.13	3,131.13	0.00	0.00	0.00
11/23/2016	229.50	1,200.93	0.00	1,430.43	0.00	1,200.93	1,200.93	(229.50)	0.00	(229.50)
12/5/2016	641.55	1,748.67	0.00	2,390.22	0.00	1,748.67	1,748.67	(641.55)	0.00	(641.55)
12/12/2016	691.25	1,362.49	0.00	2,053.74	0.00	1,362.49	1,362.49	(691.25)	0.00	(691.25)
12/15/2016	536.50	1,209.02	0.00	1,745.52	0.00	1,209.02	1,209.02	(536.50)	0.00	(536.50)
12/16/2016	0.00	1,617.73	0.00	1,617.73	0.00	1,617.73	1,617.73	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/27/2016	123.75	994.42	0.00	1,118.17	0.00	994.42	994.42	(123.75)	0.00	(123.75)
12/30/2016	658.25	1,165.00	0.00	1,823.25	0.00	1,164.98	1,164.98	(658.25)	(0.02)	(658.27)
Total 2016	19,611.92	81,775.92	121.75	101,509.59	1,574.50	81,673.83	83,248.33	(18,159.17)	(102.09)	(18,261.26)
1/11/17	183.75	3,256.27	0.00	3,440.02	0.00	3,256.27	3,256.27	(183.75)	0.00	(183.75)
1/17/17	459.50	1,699.25	0.00	2,158.75	0.00	1,699.25	1,699.25	(459.50)	0.00	(459.50)
1/23/17	290.10	1,602.27	0.00	1,892.37	0.00	1,602.27	1,602.27	(290.10)	0.00	(290.10)
1/27/17	0.00	214.91	0.00	214.91	0.00	214.91	214.91	0.00	0.00	0.00
1/31/17	0.00	1,808.38	0.00	1,808.38	0.00	1,808.38	1,808.38	0.00	0.00	0.00
2/6/17	385.50	720.25	0.00	1,105.75	0.00	720.25	720.25	(385.50)	0.00	(385.50)
2/13/17	359.51	1,706.17	0.00	2,065.68	0.00	1,706.17	1,706.17	(359.51)	0.00	(359.51)
2/17/17	293.83	1,921.06	0.00	2,214.89	0.00	1,921.06	1,921.06	(293.83)	0.00	(293.83)
2/21/17	220.25	1,089.49	0.00	1,309.74	0.00	1,089.49	1,089.49	(220.25)	0.00	(220.25)
2/28/17	871.00	380.75	0.00	1,251.75	0.00	380.75	380.75	(871.00)	0.00	(871.00)
3/1/17	463.50	292.26	0.00	755.76	0.00	292.26	292.26	(463.50)	0.00	(463.50)
3/6/17	0.00	97.25	0.00	97.25	0.00	97.25	97.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
3/13/17	778.75	1,562.55	0.00	2,341.30	0.00	1,562.55	1,562.55	(778.75)	0.00	(778.75)
3/16/17	100.00	374.50	0.00	474.50	0.00	374.50	374.50	(100.00)	0.00	(100.00)
3/17/17	307.50	2,407.83	0.00	2,715.33	110.00	2,411.98	2,521.98	(197.50)	4.15	(193.35)
3/23/17	60.00	239.99	0.00	299.99	0.00	239.99	239.99	(60.00)	0.00	(60.00)
4/4/17	323.75	587.00	0.00	910.75	0.00	587.00	587.00	(323.75)	0.00	(323.75)

Appendix B

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Undeposited Utility Receipts

Deposit Date	Cash Receipted	Checks (1) Receipted	Unknown Method of Payment (2)	Total Receipts	Cash Deposited	Checks Deposited	Total Deposited	Cash Long (Short)	Checks Long (Short)	Total Difference
4/10/17	622.55	1,136.54	0.00	1,759.09	0.00	1,136.54	1,136.54	(622.55)	0.00	(622.55)
4/13/17	423.75	734.04	0.00	1,157.79	0.00	734.04	734.04	(423.75)	0.00	(423.75)
4/14/17	227.20	922.30	0.00	1,149.50	0.00	922.30	922.30	(227.20)	0.00	(227.20)
4/18/17	121.00	801.25	0.00	922.25	0.00	801.25	801.25	(121.00)	0.00	(121.00)
4/21/17	0.00	354.50	0.00	354.50	0.00	354.50	354.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
4/27/17	435.00	224.75	0.00	659.75	200.00	224.75	424.75	(235.00)	0.00	(235.00)
5/1/17	0.00	2,106.66	0.00	2,106.66	0.00	2,106.66	2,106.66	0.00	0.00	0.00
5/8/17	234.00	1,643.93	0.00	1,877.93	0.00	1,643.93	1,643.93	(234.00)	0.00	(234.00)
5/12/17	249.25	903.75	0.00	1,153.00	0.00	903.75	903.75	(249.25)	0.00	(249.25)
5/16/17	589.26	1,512.50	0.00	2,101.76	0.00	1,512.50	1,512.50	(589.26)	0.00	(589.26)
5/22/17	71.00	965.96	0.00	1,036.96	0.00	965.96	965.96	(71.00)	0.00	(71.00)
5/26/17	83.75	418.00	0.00	501.75	0.00	417.95	417.95	(83.75)	(0.05)	(83.80)
5/30/17	136.25	276.50	0.00	412.75	0.00	276.50	276.50	(136.25)	0.00	(136.25)
6/5/17	422.25	279.10	0.00	701.35	0.00	279.10	279.10	(422.25)	0.00	(422.25)
6/7/17	467.20	1,025.26	0.00	1,492.46	0.00	1,025.26	1,025.26	(467.20)	0.00	(467.20)
6/12/17	0.00	574.25	0.00	574.25	0.00	574.25	574.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
6/13/17	223.75	427.50	0.00	651.25	50.00	427.50	477.50	(173.75)	0.00	(173.75)
6/16/17	319.00	1,727.80	0.00	2,046.80	0.00	1,727.80	1,727.80	(319.00)	0.00	(319.00)
6/26/17	362.25	428.39	0.00	790.64	0.00	428.39	428.39	(362.25)	0.00	(362.25)
6/29/17	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7/3/17	465.00	536.50	0.00	1,001.50	0.00	536.50	536.50	(465.00)	0.00	(465.00)
7/5/17	0.00	319.75	0.00	319.75	0.00	319.75	319.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
7/10/17	63.75	290.53	0.00	354.28	0.00	290.53	290.53	(63.75)	0.00	(63.75)
7/11/17	0.00	399.80	0.00	399.80	0.00	401.80	401.80	0.00	2.00	2.00
7/12/17	515.00	687.75	0.00	1,202.75	0.00	687.75	687.75	(515.00)	0.00	(515.00)
7/17/17	397.00	1,209.48	0.00	1,606.48	0.00	1,209.48	1,209.48	(397.00)	0.00	(397.00)
7/20/17	0.00	277.50	0.00	277.50	0.00	277.50	277.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
7/20/17	247.25	1,056.10	0.00	1,303.35	0.00	1,056.10	1,056.10	(247.25)	0.00	(247.25)
7/24/17	0.00	188.00	0.00	188.00	0.00	188.00	188.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7/24/17	287.00	354.50	0.00	641.50	0.00	354.50	354.50	(287.00)	0.00	(287.00)
7/28/17	0.00	238.50	0.00	238.50	0.00	238.50	238.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
8/1/17	70.00	1,404.96	0.00	1,474.96	0.00	1,404.96	1,404.96	(70.00)	0.00	(70.00)
Total 2017	12,129.40	43,486.53	0.00	55,615.93	360.00	43,492.63	43,852.63	(11,769.40)	6.10	(11,763.30)
Total \$	38,025.65	146,443.19	365.25	184,834.09	4,651.78	146,198.28	150,850.06	(33,739.12)	(244.91)	(33,984.03)

<sup>(1)</sup> The term "check" includes checks, cashier's checks, and money orders.

<sup>(2)</sup> The method of payment was not indicated on 3 utility deposit payments. These receipts were included with the cash receipts for the analysis of undeposited receipts.

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Unsupported and Undeposited Utility Payments
Recorded for the Former City Clerk's Utility Account (Account Number 6)

Appendix C

		Composition of		Total Cash Deposited for		
Date	Amount	Payment		all Utility	Deposit	
Recorded	Recorded	Recorded		Receipts (1)	Date (1)	
11/30/2015 \$	166.91	Cash	*	90.00	11/30/2015	ı
12/28/2015	148.51	Check	*	N/A	N/A	(2)
12/28/2015	121.75	Unknown	**	0.00	12/31/2015	
1/29/2016	141.15	Cash	*	0.00	1/29/2016	
2/29/2016	160.42	Cash	*	115.00	2/29/2016	
3/23/2016	125.00	Cash	*	250.00	3/31/2016	
4/29/2016	129.14	Cash	*	0.00	4/29/2016	
6/1/2016	130.52	Cash	*	0.00	6/16/2016	
7/1/2016	152.75	Cash	*	0.00	7/5/2016	
7/29/2016	129.75	Cash	*	121.75	8/5/2016	
8/31/2016	134.75	Cash	*	0.00	9/2/2016	
9/30/2016	141.00	Cash	*	0.00	10/11/2016	
10/31/2016	151.50	Cash	*	0.00	11/8/2016	
11/30/2016	124.25	Cash	*	0.00	12/5/2016	
12/30/2016	127.00	Cash	*	0.00	12/30/2016	
1/31/2017	145.50	Cash	*	0.00	2/6/2017	
3/1/2017	146.75	Cash	*	0.00	3/1/2017	
5/31/2017	136.25	Cash	*	0.00	6/5/2017	
6/30/2017	131.75	Cash	*	0.00	7/3/2017	
\$	2,644.65					

<sup>(1)</sup> The total amount of cash deposited with other monies recorded at these times indicates the former City Clerk's utility payments were not deposited (See Appendix B).

<sup>(2)</sup> This check was not included in any deposits.

<sup>\*</sup> Utility receipts were recorded in the computerized utility system.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The payment was recorded on a manual utility payment stub.

Appendix D

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Improper Payroll Checks Issued to the Former City Clerk

Date of	Check			
Check	Number*	Amount	Purpose per Memo Line of Check	Fund
4/29/2016	3516	\$ 150.00	Pay period 4/16/16-4/29/16	Water
5/20/2016	3528	250.00	Payroll 5/1-5/15	Water
5/20/2016	5272	250.00	Payroll 5/1-5/15	Sewer
5/30/2016	3532	250.00	Payroll 5/15-5/30	Water
5/30/2016	5276	155.00	Payroll 5/15-5/30	Sewer
6/22/2016	3545	155.00	Payroll 6/1-6/15	Water
6/29/2016	3546	351.15	Payroll 6/15-6/30	Water
6/29/2016	5285	349.26	Payroll 6/15-6/30	Sewer
7/1/2016	3548	255.00	Payroll 6/15-6/30	Water
7/6/2016	3552	495.15	Payroll 6/15-7/1	Water
7/6/2016	5287	488.26	Payroll 6/15-7/1	Sewer
7/20/2016	3553	386.15	Payroll 7/1-7/15	Water
7/20/2016	5290	253.26	Payroll 7/1-7/15	Sewer
7/22/2016	3554	575.45	Payroll 7/1-7/22	Water
8/1/2016	3562	255.46	Payroll 7/15-7/31	Water
8/10/2016	3583	252.16	Payroll 8/1-8/10	Water
8/19/2016	3571	153.26	Payroll 8/12-8/19	Water
8/19/2016	5300	136.45	Payroll 8/12-8/19	Sewer
8/26/2016	3587	325.15	Payroll 8/13-8/26	Water
9/2/2016	5301	175.26	Payroll 7/1-7/22	Sewer
9/16/2016	3572	103.26	Payroll 9/1-9/15	Water
9/16/2016	3601	73.00	Payroll 9/1-9/15	Water
9/23/2016	3605	455.26	Payroll Period 9/9-9/23	Water
9/23/2016	3606	150.25	Payroll 9/1-9/23	Water
9/23/2016	5320	150.26	Payroll 9/1-9/23	Sewer
9/30/2016	3609	300.25	Payroll 9/15-9/30	Water
9/30/2016	5323	100.16	Payroll 9/15-9/30	Sewer
10/7/2016	3613	152.16	Payroll 10/1-10/7	Water
10/7/2016	5325	151.24	Payroll 10/1-10/7	Sewer
10/19/2016	3618	400.15	Payroll 10/1-10/19	Water
10/19/2016	5335	503.26	Payroll 10/1-10/19	Sewer
10/24/2016	5336	120.00	Payroll 10/15-10/24	Sewer
10/26/2016	3619	224.21	Payroll 10/1-10/25	Water
10/26/2016	5337	251.35	Payroll 10/1-10/25	Sewer
10/31/2016	3622	250.00	Payroll 10/15-10/31	Water
11/4/2016	3623	151.26	Payroll 11/1-11/4	Water
11/4/2016	5341	149.15	Payroll 10/24-10/31	Sewer
11/10/2016	3630	248.26	Payroll 11/1-11/11	Water
11/10/2016	5344	153.45	Payroll 11/1-11/11	Sewer
11/16/2016	3632	373.50	Payroll 11/1-11/15	Water

Appendix D

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Improper Payroll Checks Issued to the Former City Clerk

Date of	Check			
Check	Number	Amount	Purpose per Memo Line of Check	Fund
11/16/2016	5353	348.26	Payroll 11/1-11/15	Sewer
11/18/2016	3633	363.26	Payroll 11/1-11/18	Water
11/23/2016	3636	153.25	Payroll 11/15-11/25	Water
11/23/2016	5355	248.25	Payroll 11/14-11/25	Sewer
12/2/2016	3640	150.00	Payroll 11/12-11/30	Water
12/7/2016	5359	100.00	Payroll 12/1-12/5	Sewer
12/14/2016	3645	340.45	Payroll Period 12/1-12/15	Water
12/16/2016	3646	400.00	Payroll Period 12/1-12/16	Water
12/21/2016	5371	200.00	Payroll 12/1-12/21	Sewer
12/23/2016	3647	250.00	Payroll 12/1-12/23	Water
12/27/2016	5372	350.00	Payroll 12/1-12/27	Sewer
12/30/2016	3649	353.00	Payroll 12/15-12/30	Water
12/30/2016	5373	53.26	Payroll 12/15-12/30	Sewer
1/9/2017	3651	90.00	Payroll 1/1/17-1/9/17	Water
1/12/2017	3654	400.00	Payroll 1/1/17-1/12/17	Water
1/12/2017	5374	650.00	Payroll 1/1/17-1/12/17	Sewer
1/17/2017	3661	203.16	Payroll 1/1/-1/17	Water
1/17/2017	5379	253.12	Payroll 1/1/-1/17	Sewer
1/20/2017	3660	373.40	Payroll 1/1-1/20	Water
1/23/2017	3664	101.00	Payroll 1/16-1/23	Water
1/25/2017	5381	252.02	Payroll 1/1-1/25	Sewer
2/10/2017	3669	430.34	Payroll 2/1-2/10	Water
2/17/2017	3674	102.13	Payroll 2/1-2/17	Water
2/17/2017	5392	201.34	Payroll 2/1-2/17	Sewer
2/21/2017	3675	292.10	Payroll 2/1-2/17	Water
2/21/2017	5394	383.05	Payroll 2/1-2/17	Sewer
2/24/2017	5396	100.30	Payroll 2/1-2/24	Sewer
3/10/2017	3680	410.12	Payroll 3/1-3/10	Water
3/23/2017	5398	500.00	Payroll 3/1-3/22	Sewer
3/30/2017	3687	70.00	Payroll 3/15-3/30	Water
4/12/2017	5405	203.00	Payroll 4/1-4/12	Sewer
4/20/2017	3698	550.00	Payroll 4/1-4/19	Water
4/21/2017	5415	253.00	Payroll 4/1-4/20	Sewer
5/5/2017	3700	415.00	Payroll 4/15-4/30	Water
5/12/2017	5417	300.00	Payroll 5/1-5/12	Sewer
5/19/2017	3705	523.00	Payroll 4/17-5/19	Water
5/19/2017	5427	245.00	Payroll 5/1-5/19	Sewer
5/25/2017	5428	298.00	Payroll 5/15-5/25	Sewer
5/26/2017	5431	253.00	Payroll 5/15-5/26	Sewer
5/31/2017	5432	351.26	Payroll 5/1-5/31	Sewer

Appendix D

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Improper Payroll Checks Issued to the Former City Clerk

Date of	Check			
Check	Number	Amount	Purpose per Memo Line of Check	Fund
6/2/2017	3710	203.00	Payroll 5/15-5/31	Water
6/9/2017	5419	249.00	Payroll 6/1-6/9	Sewer
6/22/2017	5434	250.00	Payroll Period 6/12/17-6/21/17	Sewer
6/23/2017	3721	100.00	Payroll Period 6/16-6/23	Water
6/26/2017	3714	203.00	Payroll Period 6/1-6/23	Water
6/26/2017	5435	150.00	Payroll Period 6/19-6/26	Sewer
7/3/2017	3724	103.00	Payroll Period 6/1-6/30	Water
7/5/2017	3727	153.00	Payroll Period 6/1-6/30	Water
7/10/2017	5437	103.00	Payroll Period 7/3-7/7	Sewer
7/19/2017	3728	122.00	Payroll Period 7/1-7/18	Water
7/19/2017	5441	250.00	Payroll Period 7/1-7/18	Sewer
7/21/2017	3736	402.00	Payroll Period 6/1-7/21	Water
7/21/2017	5442	403.00	Payroll Period 6/1-7/21	Sewer
7/28/2017	5452	308.00	Payroll Period 7/15-7/28	Sewer
	Total	\$ 24,633.92		

<sup>\*</sup> Two different check sequences were used for payroll checks, one for the Sewer Fund and the other for the Water Fund.

Appendix E

City of Coffey
Supporting Documentation - Over (Under) Payroll Payments Made to the Former City Clerk

	Hours	Hours Paid per		
	Recorded on	Payroll	Hours Over	Amount Over
Month and Year	Timesheets	Reports	(Under) Paid	(Under) Paid*
November 2015	66.25	67.25	1.00 \$	10.00
January 2016	66.00	107.00	41.00	410.00
April 2016	70.50	86.00	15.50	162.75
May 2016	71.50	65.50	(6.00)	(63.00)
June 2016	76.50	129.00	52.50	551.25
July 2016	62.50	119.00	56.50	609.50
August 2016	78.50	93.50	15.00	165.00
September 2016	72.75	82.00	9.25	101.75
October 2016	75.50	85.00	9.50	104.50
November 2016	64.50	90.50	26.00	286.00
December 2016	64.50	35.00	(29.50)	(359.00)
January 2017	65.00	37.75	(27.25)	(327.00)
February 2017	62.00	33.25	(28.75)	(345.00)
March 2017	68.50	31.75	(36.75)	(441.00)
April 2017	55.75	40.50	(15.25)	(183.00)
May 2017	65.50	74.75	9.25	111.00
June 2017	70.00	138.50	68.50	822.00
July 2017	62.50	62.00	(0.50)	(6.00)
August 2017	4.50	0.00	(4.50)	(54.00)
Total	1,222.75	1,378.25	155.50 \$	1,555.75

<sup>\*</sup> The former City Clerk was paid \$10.00 an hour from September 2015 until February 12, 2016; \$10.50 an hour from February 13, 2016, until July 12, 2016; \$11.00 an hour from July 13, 2016, until December 12, 2016; and \$12.00 an hour from December 13, 2016, until August 2, 2017.

#### Appendix F

City of Coffey Supporting Documentation - Falsified Document

The city's bank account numbers have been redacted.

# February 23, 2017 CITY OF COFFEY SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES Mayor Barbara Miller called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Council members present: Mayor Barbara Miller, Aldermen Virgil Griffin, William Browning, Julia Bayne and Carolyn Griffin. Others present were Mary Lou Browning, City Clerk. The council was in an open special session to discuss withdrawing monies from the Savings Account and apply monies into Water, Sewer and Solid Waste Accounts with BTC Bank. The Council discussed withdrawing \$1,500.00 from the Savings Account and apply \$850.00 into the Sewer Fund Account and the Solid Waste Account Julia Bayne made a motion to transfer monies as and apply mentioned and stated above, Carolyn Griffin seconded with all in favor. Voting went as follows: Julia Bayne, Aye; Carolyn Griffin, Aye, William Browning, Aye, and Virgil Griffin, Aye. The Council unanimously decided to adjourn the Special Meeting. Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m. Next Meeting is set for March 13, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.