



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

**SHEFFIELD TOWNSHIP
LORAIN COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Sheffield Township
Lorain County
5166 Clinton Avenue
Lorain, Ohio 44055

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Sheffield Township, Lorain County, Ohio (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 statements. We found no exceptions.
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. 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 interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2009 and 2008 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.

7. 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 funds as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included 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.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2009 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2008 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. 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. For 2009, we noted a new OPWC Loan for \$15,000 and a related OPWC Grant for \$83,345 that the Township did not record in the Road and Bridge Fund. In addition for 2009, we noted two principal payments totaling \$2,426 that were improperly recorded in the Gas Tax Fund; the payments should have been posted to the Road & Bridge Fund. In accordance with the foregoing facts, we hereby issue a finding for adjustment against the Gas Tax Fund in favor of the Road & Bridge Fund in the amount of \$2,426 for 2009. For 2008, we noted no new debt issuances; however we noted two principal payments in the amount of \$2,977 that were improperly posted to the Gas Tax Fund; these payments should have been posted to the Road & Bridge Fund. In accordance with the foregoing facts, we hereby issue a finding for adjustment against the Gas Tax Fund in favor of the Road & Bridge Fund in the amount of \$2,977 for 2008.
2. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt service fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.
3. For new debt issued during 2009 and 2008, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds for the Dunton Road improvement. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township disbursed the debt proceeds for the Dunton Road improvement in May of 2009.

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 & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above, except one employee did not have a personnel file.

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 code(s) 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 31, 2009	\$2,842.96	\$2,842.96
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	December 31, 2009	\$551.79	\$551.78
Local income tax	January 31, 2010	December 31, 2009	\$1,793.08	\$1,793.08
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	January 30, 2010	December 31, 2009	\$3,758.09	\$3,758.09

4. For the pay periods ended March 31, 2009 and August 31, 2008, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries 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 2008 and determined whether:
- The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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 Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances for 2009 and Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources for 2008, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the accounting system for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds of \$0 in each fund for 2009. However, the final *Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$431,510, \$83,657, and \$32,837 for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds, respectively. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds of \$437,936, \$82,858, and \$32,354, respectively, for 2008. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$384,552, \$80,813, and \$32,332 for the General, Road & Bridge and Street Lighting funds, respectively. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2009 and 2008 to determine whether, for the General, Ambulance Levy and Fire Levy funds, 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 for 2009. However, for 2008, the appropriation measures adopted for the General, Ambulance Levy, and Fire Levy funds were appropriated by fund and not separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services."
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, Ambulance and EMS, and Fire Equipment Levy funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report. The Appropriation Status Report for 2009 had \$381,883, \$193,000, and \$143,000 for the General, Ambulance and EMS, and Fire Equipment Levy funds, respectively. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$400,000, \$200,000, and \$146,000 for the General, Ambulance and EMS, and Fire Equipment Levy funds, respectively. The Appropriation Status Report for 2008 had \$230,000 for the General Fund. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$228,000 for the General Fund. For 2008, the Ambulance and EMS, and Fire Equipment Levy funds were recorded correctly.
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, Ambulance Levy and Fire Equipment Levy funds 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, Ambulance Levy and Fire Equipment Levy fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipt Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2009 and 2008. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. We noted evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund. The Township received a FEMA grant (Assistance to Firefighters Grant) for \$54,725, of which \$51,988 was the Federal share, but did not establish a new fund to account for the grant. In accordance with the foregoing facts, we hereby issue a finding for adjustment for the Township to adjust its accounting records to segregate activity for this grant into a separate fund in the amount of \$54,725.
7. We scanned the 2009 and 2008 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$100 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 & 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))

We identified two road construction projects exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21. For these projects, we noted that the Board advertised the projects in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

We identified a purchase of fire equipment exceeding \$50,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37(A), that was not properly bid. The total purchase of \$55,067 (\$51,988 expended in March 2008 and \$3,079 expended in December 2007) was made up of two separate invoices (\$40,937 dated December 31, 2007 and \$14,130 dated January 4, 2008) due to items that were on backorder. The Township should have competitively bid this purchase as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37(A).

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 had road construction projects exceeding \$45,000 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 road maintenance project described in step 2 above, we read the contract and noted that it required the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. The contract included the Ohio Department of Commerce's schedule of prevailing rates.

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

March 16, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

SHEFFIELD TOWNSHIP

LORAIN 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
APRIL 6, 2010**