Auditor of Public Accounts
Adam H. Edelen

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Stephenie Hoelscher
stephenie.hoelscher.ky.gov
502.564.5841
513.289.7667

Edelen Releases Audit of former Jackson County Sheriff's Tax Settlement

FRANKFORT, Ky. – State Auditor Adam Edelen today released the audit of the sheriff's settlement – taxes for former Jackson County Sheriff Denny Peyman. State law requires the auditor to annually audit the accounts of each county sheriff. In compliance with this law, the auditor issues two sheriff's reports each year: one reporting on the audit of the sheriff's tax account and the other reporting on the audit of the fee account used to operate the office.

This audit will be referred to the Attorney General.

Recent changes in auditing standards require the auditor's letter to communicate whether the sheriff's settlement presents fairly the taxes charged, credited and paid of the former Jackson County Sheriff in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States. The sheriff's settlement is prepared on the regulatory basis, which is described in the auditor's opinion letter. Regulatory basis reporting for the sheriff's settlement is an acceptable reporting methodology, and this reporting methodology is followed for all 120 sheriff settlements in Kentucky.

The report found that the former sheriff did not maintain adequate accounting records of tax account revenues and expenditures for the period April 16, 2013 through April 15, 2014. Also, auditors were unable to obtain required representation letters from the County Attorney and former Sheriff. Therefore, due to an unacceptably high audit risk, an audit opinion could not be expressed and was, therefore, disclaimed.

As part of the audit process, the auditor must comment on non-compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants. The auditor must also comment on material weaknesses involving the internal control over financial operations and reporting.

The audit contains the following comments:

The former Sheriff did not manage the financial activities of his office. The former Sheriff did not account for the financial activities of his office by maintaining complete and accurate financial records. The Settlement given to auditors was not supported by the receipts and disbursements ledgers and did not agree to bank activity for the period. Due to numerous errors noted in the following comments and recommendations, auditors cannot verify the accuracy of the financial statement. Inaccurate and incomplete financial reports can lead to improper financial decision making as well as increase the risk that errors and/or fraud will occur and go undetected.

The former Sheriff needed to improve his financial practices and internal controls, as discussed in Comments 2013-002 and 2013-003, to ensure that proper information was submitted in a timely manner and is not misleading to users of the information. Additionally, complete and accurate financial records can ensure expenditures are made only when sufficient funds are available. The former Sheriff's poor financial practices and weak internal control structure put taxpayer monies at risk, resulted in a known deficit of $15,421, as discussed in comment 2013-006, and created an environment for other potential material misstatements to occur in the financial statements either by error or fraud and go undetected. In addition, the various local and state agencies that rely on and monitor the financial and program activity of the former Sheriff cannot rely on or have any confidence in the reports submitted by the former Sheriff. We recommend the former Sheriff should have prepared complete and accurate financial reports that are supported by the ledgers and bank activity of his office.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. The Former Sheriff asked the Fiscal Court several times for additional staffing in order to implement better internal controls however the Fiscal Court refused every time. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: A small number of staff does not alleviate the former Sheriff's responsibility to comply with the minimum accounting requirements set forth in KRS 68.210.

The former Sheriff's office lacked adequate segregation of duties over tax receipts, disbursements, and reconciliations. The former Sheriff's office lacked adequate segregation of duties over tax receipts, tax disbursements, and reconciliations of tax collections to bank deposits. During our review of internal control, we noted that one (1) individual is primarily responsible for most receipt, disbursement, and reconciliation functions, including opening incoming mail, receiving and recording cash, writing checks, reconciling tax collections to bank deposits, preparing bank deposits, preparing the daily checkout sheets and preparing the financial reports.

A limited budget places restrictions on the number of employees a Sheriff can hire. When faced with these types of restrictions, strong compensating controls should be in place to offset the lack of adequate segregation of duties. Proper segregation of duties, or the implementation of compensating controls, is essential for providing protection from asset misappropriation and/or inaccurate financial reporting, while also protecting employees in the normal course of performing their responsibilities.

To adequately protect against misappropriation of assets and/or inaccurate financial reporting, the former Sheriff should have implemented strong compensating controls including, but not limited to, the following:

- Recount cash at the end of each day and compare cash and checks collected to the tax collection report listing of cash and checks collected, daily checkout sheet, and deposit ticket. The Sheriff should initial the tax collection report, daily checkout sheet and deposit ticket to document agreement.
- Reconcile daily tax collection report to the receipts ledger and deposit ticket. The Sheriff should initial the daily tax collection report, receipts ledger and deposit ticket to document agreement.
- Reconcile monthly tax reports to receipts and disbursements ledgers. The Sheriff should initial the receipts and disbursements ledgers to document agreement.
- The Sheriff could examine checks prepared by the office manager and compare checks to the monthly tax reports, resolve any discrepancies, and document the review by initialing and dating the monthly tax reports.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

Auditor's reply: As stated in the comment, if there is limited staff, strong compensating controls should be in place to offset the lack of adequate segregation of duties.

The former Sheriff should have strengthened internal controls over daily checkout procedures and deposits should have been made intact on a daily basis. While performing the audit, we identified a material weakness related to the preparation of the daily deposits that suggests deposits were not made intact. After testing twelve (12) deposits and daily checkout sheets, auditors found the following issues:

- Deposit 498- $1,249.54 less cash was deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 504- $1,893.91 less cash and $293.43 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 506- The variance in the cash and checks per deposit slip and daily checkout sheet matched indicating the wrong payment method was chosen.
- Deposit 507- The variance in the cash and checks per deposit slip and daily checkout sheet matched indicating the wrong payment method was chosen.

- Deposit 517- $897.07 less cash and $62.51 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 521- The variance in the cash and checks per deposit slip and daily checkout sheet matched indicating the wrong payment method was chosen.
- Deposit 523- The variance in the cash and checks per deposit slip and daily checkout sheet matched indicating the wrong payment method was chosen.
- Deposit 526- $727.99 less cash and $23.06 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 527- $900.01 more cash and $3,443.92 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 528- $490.07 more cash and $1,281.93 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 529- $5,399.99 less cash and $626.38 less checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.
- Deposit 532- $40.39 less cash and $1,760.24 more checks were deposited in the bank than per the daily checkout sheet.

Also during the course of the audit, we noted that deposits were not made in a timely manner. Our review of twelve (12) deposits indicated seven (7) deposits that did not clear the bank within three (3) business days. In addition, the auditor noted that one (1) deposit took almost a month to clear the bank. During our test of daily receipts it was noted that the deposit was started on February 10, 2014 and closed on February 17, 2014 totaling $30,939, clearing the bank on February 26, 2014.
Effective internal control procedures over daily deposits require that deposits be made intact and contain all cash and checks received for payments. The Department for Local Government was given the authority by KRS 68.210 to prescribe a uniform system of accounts. The minimum requirements for handling public funds as stated in the <u>Instructional Guide for County Budget Preparation and State Local Finance Office Policy Manual</u> requires that deposits be made daily and properly documented by a daily checkout sheet. The practice of making daily deposits reduces the risk of misappropriation of cash, which is the asset most subject to possible theft. Also, when deposits are not made timely, the risk that the bank account can be overdrawn is increased.

In addition, batches of receipts should agree to daily deposits and checkout sheets, and should be reconciled to computerized records. Reconciliation procedures should be sufficient to verify computerized records agree to manual records, such as triplicate receipts and daily deposits. We recommend the Sheriff's office immediately implement controls over the deposit process to assure compliance with KRS 68.210. The Sheriff should ensure checkout sheets are prepared, and agree to manual and computerized records so that deposits are made intact on a daily basis.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: A small number of staff does not alleviate the former Sheriff's responsibility to comply with the minimum accounting requirements set forth in KRS 68.210.

Reconciliation procedures should have been performed to ensure adequate monitoring of tax receipts and tax disbursements. During the performance of various audit procedures, it was noted that reconciliation procedures were not performed to ensure tax receipts and tax disbursements were accounted for properly. The nature of tax collections is such that all amounts collected should be distributed monthly, thus, the account should zero out each month. During our review, it was noted that all amounts collected were not distributed each month. The former Sheriff had not distributed the correct amount of 10 percent add-on fees collected during February, March, and April. The former Sheriff also had not distributed December, January, February and March commissions due to the fee account.

The former Sheriff should have ensured the tax account was reconciled monthly. We recommend that at the end of each month, the total collections per the tax collection system are compared to the total deposits per the bank statement to ensure all disbursements written for that month agree to the total collections for the month, thus, zeroing out the tax account each month. By performing these reconciliation procedures, this will help eliminate any surplus or deficit.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: A small number of staff does not alleviate the former Sheriff's responsibility to comply with the minimum accounting requirements set forth in KRS 68.210.

The former Sheriff should ensure the delinquent tax list is complete and accurate before submitting to the County Clerk. During the audit, auditors spoke with the County Clerk and his employees and were informed that after the Delinquent Tax List was turned over to their office multiple tax payers came in with proof of payment where they had paid their tax bill in the Sheriff's office. These taxpayers provided cancelled checks that showed that the check was actually deposited in the Sheriff's account. Twelve (12) tax bills were confirmed paid that were originally on the Sheriff's delinquent tax list. One (1) tax bill was confirmed paid after auditors had already begun the audit.

Without a complete and accurate delinquent tax list, taxpayers are not getting credit for paying tax bills and it is impossible for auditors to confirm the amount delinquent. Auditors cannot be certain that anymore tax payers will come in with proof of payment. The former Sheriff should have kept accurate receipts and records of tax bills being paid and then verified and checked that the delinquent tax bill list was accurate before submitting it to the County Clerk.

Former Sheriff's response: The computers used by the Former Sheriff's office were very old and crashed often. Due to this issue, there were a few instances as noted by the auditors where individuals were listed as delinquent but had paid their taxes. Paper receipts were kept however reconciling those paper receipts to the computer records would have required more than one staff. As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: KRS 134.122 requires the Sheriff to certify the transfer of delinquent bills to the County Clerk. A small number of staff does not excuse the former Sheriff from certifying an accurate listing.

The former Sheriff has a known deficit of $15,421 in his 2013 official tax account.
Based upon audit procedures, the former Sheriff has a know deficit of $15,421 in his official 2013 tax account. As collector of property taxes, the Sheriff assumes full responsibility for all tax collections and complete distribution of these collections to the proper taxing districts. Internal control procedures were not designed to detect discrepancies in daily and monthly accounting records, reconciliations of manual records to computerized records were not performed, and deposits do not appear to have been made intact.

In order to properly distribute 2013 tax collections, we recommend the former Sheriff eliminate the deficit in the 2013 tax account with a deposit of $15,421 from personal funds. The former Sheriff should also settle other refunds and payments. We further recommend the former Sheriff's office immediately implement controls to ensure tax collections are processed in a manner that produces reliable accounting records. These controls should include timely reconciliations of manual records to computerized records and depositing daily tax collections intact.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

Auditor's reply: Sheriff's response doesn't really address the comment. However, a small number of staff does not excuse the former Sheriff from properly accounting for collections of his office and eliminating any resulting deficit.

The former Sheriff should resolve unsettled 2011 tax receivables and liabilities.
Follow-up procedures determined 2011 tax receivables and liabilities have not been properly settled.

Assets			
Cash in Bank (All Tax Accounts)			$ 4,661
Receivables:			
Commissions Due From 2011 Fee Account		$ 19,265	
School Settlement		425	
Due From 2012 Tax Account		621	20,311
Total Assets			24,972
Liabilities			
Paid Obligations-			
Liabilities	$ 635		
Total Paid Obligations		635	
Unpaid Obligations-			
Payment Made To Kentucky State Treasurer Due To 2012 Fee Account	1,544		
Add-On Fees Due 2012 Fee Account	12,090		
Commissions Due 2012 Fee Account	9,654		
Franchise Payment Paid To The School - Due To 2012 Fee Account	1,008		
School Commission for June Franchise Due To 2012 Tax Account	41		
Total Unpaid Obligations		24,337	
Total Liabilities			24,972
Total Fund Balance as of April 15, 2013			$ 0

We recommend the former Sheriff settle the 2011 tax account by collecting all receivables due the 2011 tax account and paying all liabilities owed.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: This relates to the audit of 2011 taxes. Even with a small number of staff the former Sheriff should have had ample time to take care of this.

The former Sheriff should ensure tax receipts are placed in an interest-bearing account. KRS 134.140 states that the Sheriff should place tax receipts in an interest-bearing account. It further states that the Sheriff should pay the school its portion of the interest earned, on a monthly basis. The Sheriff failed to use an interest-bearing account for 2013 taxes. We recommend the Sheriff's office comply with KRS 134.140 and begin depositing tax receipts into an interest-bearing bank account and ensure that monthly interest payments are made to the school for its portion of interest earned.

Former Sheriff's response: The Former Sheriff specifically requested an interest bearing account from the Depository Institution. The Depository Institution indicated that the account for tax receipts was interest bearing however they failed to make the account interest bearing. The Depository Institution would not provide monthly statements to the Former Sheriff. When he inquired about the monthly statements, the Depository Institution wanted to charge $20/ hour to investigate why he was not receiving monthly statements. The Fiscal Court refused to pay the fee therefore the Former Sheriff had no way of knowing that the funds were not earning interest.

The former Sheriff should resolve unsettled 2012 tax receivables and liabilities.
Follow-up Procedures determined 2012 tax receivables and liabilities have not been paid.

Assets			
Cash in Bank (All Tax Accounts)		$ 773	
Deposits in Transit		71,721	
Receivables		39,165	
Receivable Due:			
Ky State Treasurer	$ 260		
Jackson County Fiscal Court	61		
Jackson County Board of Education	676		
Library District	110		
Health District	45		
Extension District	75		
Soil Conservation District	9		
Return Check Due From 2013 Fee Account	636	1,872	
Total Assets			$ 113,531
Liabilities			
Paid Obligations-			
Outstanding Checks	24,978		
Liabilities Paid After April 15, 2013	63,655		
Total Paid Obligations		88,633	
Unpaid Obligations-			
Other Taxing Districts-			
Ambulance	374		
Add-On Fees Due 2013 Fee Account	23,678		
Commissions Due 2013 Fee Account	5,442		
Due To 2011 Tax Account	621		
Total Unpaid Obligations		30,115	
Total Liabilities			118,748
Total Fund Deficit as of April 15, 2013			$ (5,217)

We recommend the former Sheriff settle the 2012 tax account by collecting the receivables identified above, and deposit personal funds to cover the deficit, so that the remaining liabilities can be paid.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: This relates to the audit of 2012 taxes. Even with a small number of staff the former Sheriff should have had ample time to take care of this.

The former Sheriff should have made tax payments to the districts by the 10th of the next month. While recapping the monthly tax payments, auditors found that collections made were not distributed by the 10th of the next month. Also, a distribution for Red Lick Conservation for April in the amount of $22.50 had not been paid. KRS 134.191 states that (1) "the Sheriff must provide monthly reports by the 10th day of each month to the chief executive of the county, the department, and any other district for which the sheriff collects taxes" and (3) "at the time of making the report, the sheriff shall pay to the county treasurer, to the department, and any other district for which the sheriff collects taxes, all funds belonging to the county, the state, or the district that were collected during the period covered by the report." Due to management oversight, the former Sheriff failed to distribute these payments timely, which results in noncompliance with state statutes. We recommend the Sheriff's office comply with KRS 134.191 and distribute payments by the 10th day of each month.

Auditors also noted while recapping the monthly reports that several reports were incomplete. Some monthly reports also had the refund total from the previous month on them, causing the taxes due amount to not be accurate. We recommend the Sheriff ensure monthly tax reports are completely filled out and all information is correct before submitting disbursements to the districts.

Former Sheriff's response: As was previously disclosed to the auditors, the Fiscal Court restricted the Former Sheriff's budget beginning in October 2012 to the point where he could only employ one individual part time besides himself. This created an environment which made it impossible to have good internal controls in place for tax collection and record keeping. Because the additional employee was only part time, it created issues for preparing receipts and disbursement ledgers, monthly reconciliations, and quarterly reports. Individuals employed by the Fiscal Court have admitted under oath that these conditions were intentional and meant to make the Former Sheriff look bad in his audits.

> Auditor's reply: A small number of staff does not alleviate the former Sheriff's responsibility to make timely distributions in accordance with KRS 134.191.

The former Sheriff should improve controls and documentation procedures for waivers of tax penalties and fees. Auditors examined penalty waivers after noticing significant differences in the amount of fees calculated and the fees collected per the receipts ledger. There were 183 total waivers for the 2013 tax year. Of these waivers, some did not have a box checked for a reason for the waiver and most did not have a signature from the Sheriff for approval. Thus, not only were an excessive amount of waivers issued, proper documentation was not maintained for waivers. KRS 131.175 allows for the waiver of penalties when it is shown that the failure to pay is due to “reasonable cause”. The approval of penalty waivers is based on the Sheriff’s judgment, but documentation is required for these waivers. As a result of the excessive waivers, taxpayers were not charged penalties and interest owed, which ultimately resulted in taxing districts receiving less than they otherwise would have.

We recommend the Sheriff follow the guidelines as established by KRS 131.175 by completing and maintaining the forms to document waiver of penalty and reduction of interest and fees. If the Sheriff does not feel comfortable making waiver decisions, he may refer the taxpayer to the Revenue Cabinet for a determination to be made.

Former Sheriff’s response: Any waivers that did not have the Former Sheriff’s signature were inadvertent.

The former Sheriff should have required depository institutions to pledge or provide sufficient collateral to protect deposits. On December 5, 2013, $513,115 of the former Sheriff’s deposits of public funds in depository institutions were uninsured and unsecured. According to KRS 66.480(1)(d) and KRS 41.240(4), the depository institution should pledge or provide sufficient collateral which, together with Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insurance, equals or exceeds the amount of public funds on deposit at all times. The former Sheriff and Depository Institution had a written agreement stating the Depository Institution would provide adequate collateral to protect the former Sheriff’s deposits. Even though this written agreement existed, the Depository Institution did not provide enough collateral. We recommend the former Sheriff’s office should ensure the Depository Institution is pledging and providing collateral in an amount sufficient to secure deposits of public funds at all times.

Former Sheriff’s response: The Former Sheriff followed all the laws in this regards. The Depository Institution failed to comply with the written agreement.

The former Sheriff should collect/disburse amounts due/owed based upon audit. The former Sheriff should collect/disburse amounts due/owed as determined by our audit.

Assets

Cash in Bank (All Tax Accounts)		$ 158,675	
Receivables		26,975	
Receivables Due:			
Service Charges Due from 2013 Fee Account	$ 30		
NSF Fees Due from 2014 Fee Account	21		
Overpayment to State	122	173	
Total Assets			$ 185,823

Liabilities

Paid Obligations-			
Outstanding Checks	$ 127,624		
Liabilities Paid After April 15, 2014	27,575		
Total Paid Obligations		$ 155,199	
Unpaid Obligations-			
Other Taxing Districts-			
County	1,597		
School	14,097		
Library	2,744		
Health	1,141		
Extension Service	1,473		
Soil Conservation	579		
Ambulance	1,368		
Red Lick Conservation	23		
Additional 10% Add-on Fees Due 2014 Fee Account	440		
Commissions Due 2014 Fee Account	22,583		
Total Unpaid Obligations		46,045	
Total Liabilities			$ 201,244
Total Fund Deficit as of April 15, 2014			$ (15,421)

We recommend the former Sheriff settle the 2013 tax account by collecting the receivables identified above, and deposit personal funds to cover the deficit, so that the remaining liabilities can be paid.

Former Sheriff's response: All of the funds from the Sheriff's Office have been accounted for.

Auditor's reply: Based on the former Sheriff's records, these amounts remain to be taken care of.

The former Sheriff's County Revenue Bond was not adequate. Based on our test of the Sheriff's County Revenue Bond, the highest amount of tax collections on hand for 2013 was $1,944,375 on December 5, 2013. On that date, the former Sheriff's County Revenue Bond was set at $500,000, leaving the County to assume a potential loss of $1,444,375. KRS 134.230 gives the Fiscal Court the authority to require the Sheriff to have a county revenue bond. An adequate County Revenue Bond would cover all funds in the Sheriff's possession. The Fiscal Court pays the premium on the Sheriff's County Revenue Bond. Failure to acquire an adequate County Revenue Bond is likely due to the increased cost that the Fiscal Court would have to pay. We recommend the Sheriff's office discuss this matter with the Fiscal Court to determine if the Fiscal Court would be willing to increase the Sheriff's County Revenue Bond.

Former Sheriff's response: The Former Sheriff did discuss this issue with the Fiscal Court and they refused to pay the increase in cost.

The sheriff's responsibilities include collecting property taxes, providing law enforcement and performing services for the county fiscal court and courts of justice. The sheriff's office is funded through statutory commissions and fees collected in conjunction with these duties.

The audit report can be found on the auditor's website.

###

The Auditor of Public Accounts ensures that public resources are protected, accurately valued, properly accounted for, and effectively employed to raise the quality of life of Kentuckians.

Call 1-800-KY-ALERT or visit our website to report suspected waste and abuse.