



**Nicole Galloway, CPA**  
Missouri State Auditor

# CITIZENS SUMMARY

## Findings in the audit of Wellston Municipal Division

<p><b>Bond Procedures</b></p>	<p>Monies totaling \$1,232 for bonds were not transmitted to the municipal division from the former police department and, as a result, may be missing. Auditors were also unable to determine whether some bond receipts recorded as paid by credit card totaling \$3,398 were deposited into city accounts because the former police department and current police cooperative did not always properly record the method of payment. In addition, municipal division procedures for identifying, reconciling, and monitoring bond liabilities need significant improvement, and there is an apparent significant shortage in the bond account. Also, the municipal division does not review the status of open bonds held and some bond monies are not properly restricted.</p>
<p><b>Accounting Controls and Procedures</b></p>	<p>Neither the Municipal Judge nor city personnel perform adequate supervisory or independent reviews of court accounting functions and records. Receipts were not transmitted intact or timely to the city for deposit, receipts were entered in the case management system in the wrong amounts, and refunds were not issued for overpayments. The city also did not require adequate detail from a vendor to ensure the city received all monies due, and the city and vendor did not comply with state policies governing the use of speed cameras on state highways. City officials did not disburse amounts collected for certain court surcharges monthly, and the Court Clerk did not accurately report the amounts of some surcharges collected to the city, resulting in underpayments to the state of approximately \$2,250 for certain surcharges.</p>
<p><b>Municipal Division Procedures</b></p>	<p>The Court Clerk does not periodically review accrued costs owed to the municipal division. The municipal division has not taken timely or appropriate actions to implement a court order issued by the Municipal Judge in 2015 and, as a result, the division's caseload remains very high, the city is not able to collect monies owed timely, and the judge's intent to change court practices in response to Senate Bill 5 (effective August 28, 2015) has not been met. The municipal division regularly collects court costs, fees, and surcharges on dismissed cases, in violation of state law. There is little assurance certain court surcharges were properly authorized and used in accordance with state law. The former police department and the municipal division did not adequately account for the numerical sequence or ultimate disposition of all traffic tickets issued, and the municipal division and policing cooperative have not established current procedures to ensure ticket accountability. Court records are not maintained in an accurate, complete, and organized manner. The Municipal Judge does not approve the final disposition of cases, the Prosecuting Attorney does not sign tickets, and the municipal division does not always assess fines and court costs in accordance with the violation bureau schedule.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring of Excess Revenues</b></p>	<p>The Municipal Division does not have procedures in place to identify minor traffic violation tickets and the associated fines and court costs collected. In addition, the city's procedures to calculate whether excess revenues are due to the Department of Revenue are not adequate to ensure compliance with state law. The city's calculation for the year ended June 30, 2015, was inaccurate, using a misstated total general operating revenue amount.</p>

---

## Records and Reporting

The former city police department did not submit annual vehicle stops data to the Attorney General's Office as required by state law. In addition, monthly reports submitted to the Office of the State Courts Administrator were not complete and accurate, the Court Clerk did not file a monthly report of cases heard with the city, and the municipal division could not locate some case records.

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

\*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:

- 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.

**All reports are available on our Web site: [auditor.mo.gov](http://auditor.mo.gov)**