



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Coitsville Township
Mahoning County
3711 Mc Cartney Rd.
Lowellville, OH 44436

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Coitsville Township (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, 2010 and 2009, 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. The Township processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). Government Auditing Standards considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Township because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, Government Auditing Standards permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2010 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, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 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, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash – (Continued)

5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We inspected the Fund Status Report to determine whether the Findings For Adjustment identified in the prior audit report, due from the motor vehicle license tax fund, payable to the general fund, and due from gas tax fund to the general fund, were properly posted to the report. We found no exceptions.
7. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2009 and 2010 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found 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 2010 and one from 2009:
 - 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 2010 and 2009:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts.

We 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 2010 and five from 2009.
 - 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 funds. We found two exceptions. One receipt for law enforcement assistance for \$160 received on 3/23/10 was incorrectly recorded to the general fund instead the police district fund and one receipt for \$105 for a liquor permit was incorrectly recorded in the general fund as revenue from a license and permits instead of as a liquor permit fee. Management has corrected their records to show these adjustments.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts – (Continued)

- c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
- 4. We agreed the amounts paid from the semi-annual apportionment of taxes and the County Vendor Report to the Township receipt register report. 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

- 1. From the prior audit report, we noted the following note outstanding as of December 31, 2008. This amount agreed to the Township's January 1, 2009 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2008</u>
Police Cruiser Note	\$12,480

- 2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or outstanding as of December 31, 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances during 2010 or 2009, nor any debt payment activity during 2010.
- 3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2009 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Police fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. The note payments were not recorded correctly as these debt service payments were paid as police cruiser expenditures instead of payments of principal and interest on the note. See reclassification below:

Special Revenue	Police District Fund	2081-760-750-0000	Police Cruisers	(13,075)
Special Revenue	Police District Fund	2081-820-820-0000	Principal Retirement	12,481
Special Revenue	Police District Fund	2081-810-819-0000	Interest and Other Fiscal Charges	594

- 4. We compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

- 1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Register Detail and:
 - 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 were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the personnel file or as required by statute, if set by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period during 2010. We noted the following:

<u>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</u>	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2011	12/31/10	\$2,421.92	\$2,421.92
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	12/31/10	\$474.41	\$474.41
City of Struthers	January 31, 2011	12/31/10	\$29.75	\$29.75
City of Hubbard	January 31, 2011	12/31/10	\$113.74	\$113.74
City of Campbell	January 31, 2011	12/31/10	\$81.77	\$81.77
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	12/31/10	\$5,192.05	\$5,192.05

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 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 amounts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Resources Available for Appropriation for the General, Gas Tax and Police funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Gas Tax and Police funds, the Trustees appropriated separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services," as 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 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General Fund, Gas Tax and Police Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

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, Road and Bridge and Fire funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources in 2010 or 2009.
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, 2010 and 2009 for the General, Gas Tax and Police 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, 2010 and 2009. 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 2010 and 2009 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 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 & Expenditures

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 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 identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures - (Continued)

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register by Vendor Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 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. No such projects noted

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 others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

July 5, 2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

COITSVILLE TOWNSHIP

MAHONING 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
JULY 26, 2011