



**PULASKI TOWNSHIP
WILLIAMS COUNTY**

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2008 AND 2009



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

**PULASKI TOWNSHIP
WILLIAMS COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Pulaski Township
Williams County
15965 County Road F
Bryan, Ohio 43506-8501

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Pulaski Township, Williams County (the Township) agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transactions; and management and the Board are responsible for complying with the compliance requirements. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2007 balances in the prior year audited statement. We noted the following differences in fund balances at January 1, 2008 as compared to prior year audited amounts: General fund was \$8,567 higher, Road and Bridge fund was \$103 lower, Fire Levy fund was \$7,064 lower and Permissive Motor Vehicle License Tax fund was \$1,400 lower. These differences were due to prior audit adjustments, which the client corrected with an interfund transfer made during 2008.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.

4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. The balance(s) agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 to determine that they:
 - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. We noted no exceptions.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2009 and one from 2008:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s) as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2009 and 2008:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receiptsWe noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009 and five from 2008.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the City of Bryan to the Township for tax reparations on Township properties annexed into the City for 2008 and 2009. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2009 or 2008.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
 - c. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged.
 - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
 - e. Federal, State and Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	December 21, 2009	\$639.73	\$630.73
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	December 21, 2009	\$164.06	\$164.06
School District income tax	January 15, 2010	December 21, 2009	\$71.49	\$71.49
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	January 30, 2010	December 21, 2009	\$1,995.31	\$1,995.31

4. For the pay periods ended September 28, 2009 and April 28, 2008, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries per diem amounts to the General Fund. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2008 and determined whether:
 - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - b. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the check number, date, payee name and amount recorded in the Payment Register Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - c. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the restricted purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
 - d. The fiscal officer certified disbursements requiring certification or issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the Final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Special Revenue Fund and the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Special Revenue and the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund, the Trustees appropriated separately for “each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services,” as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2009 and 2008 for the following funds: General Fund, Gasoline Tax Special Revenue Fund and the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report except for the General Fund and Road and Bridge Fund in 2008. The Appropriation Status Report recorded budgeted appropriations of \$655,775 for the General Fund and \$133,089 for the Road and Bridge Fund. However, the final amended appropriation resolution filed with the Williams County Auditor on October 16, 2008 recorded budgeted appropriations of \$609,078 for the General Fund and \$98,592 for the Road and Bridge Fund. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report to amounts recorded on the amended appropriation resolutions to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Special Revenue Fund and the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Special Revenue Fund and the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund, as recorded in the

Appropriation Status Report. We noted the Road and Bridge Fund expenditures exceeded total appropriations by \$21,649 during 2008, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B). The Fiscal Officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Treasurer may request the Trustees to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary and if resources are available.

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipt Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2009 and 2008. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. We noted no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund.
7. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10,000 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 -- .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which Section 5705.16 would require approval by the Tax Commissioner and Court of Common Pleas.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Status Reports to determine whether the Township elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. We noted the Township did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under the following statutes:
 - a. Materials, machinery and tools used in constructing, maintaining and repairing roads and culverts, where costs exceeded \$25,000. (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21)
 - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 511.12)
 - c. Equipment for fire protection and communication costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Sections 505.37 to 505.42)
 - d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.07)
 - e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264)
 - f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Sections 521.02 to 521.05)
 - g. Fire apparatus, mechanical resuscitators, other fire equipment, appliances, materials, fire hydrants, buildings, or fire-alarm communications equipment or service costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37(A))
 - h. Maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01)
 - i. Construction or reconstruction of a township road exceeding \$15,000/per mile (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01)

We noted the Township entered into chip and seal contracts with Bruce Ernst Asphalt Inc. in 2008 and 2009. The Township disbursed \$76,461 in 2008 and \$53,208 in 2009 for chip and sealing Township roads. Each of these totals exceeds the \$45,000 threshold in Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01(A) that, when surpassed, requires townships to competitively bid out contracts for the maintenance and repair of the Township's roads. We recommend all applicable projects exceeding

the bidding requirement be competitively bid by the Township in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 to determine if the Township proceeded by force account (i.e. used its own employees) to maintain or repair roads (cost of project \$15,000-\$45,000) or to construct or reconstruct township roads (cost of project \$5,000-\$15,000/per mile) for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01 requires the county engineer to complete a force account project assessment form (i.e., cost estimate). We identified no projects requiring the county engineer to complete a force account cost estimate.
3. For the chip and seal projects described in step 1 above, the Township did not enter into a formal contract with the contractor. Therefore, the Township did not have documentation to support the contractor paid prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. The Township should enter into a formal contract with contractors. This contract should include provisions requiring applicable prevailing wages be paid and documentation of payments to be provided by the Township.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Township's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

August 6, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

PULASKI TOWNSHIP

WILLIAMS COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
AUGUST 24, 2010**