



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Fairfield Township
Highland County
200 South Street
Leesburg, Ohio 45135

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Fairfield Township, Highland 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, 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'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 Section 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code Section 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, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2008 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 institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 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.

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 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 2010 and 2009:
 - a. One 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 three receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and four 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 no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
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, nor any debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009.

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 Report and the Payroll Register Detail Report and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and minute record 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 one exception related to steps a. – f. above: the Fiscal Officer did not have a personnel file containing withholding forms. However, the payroll register did disclose withholdings for this employee. We recommend the Township maintain all documentation to support wages paid and deductions withheld.

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). Ohio Revised Code Section 102.03(D) provides that no public official or employee shall use or authorize the use of the authority or influence of office or employment to secure anything of value or promise or offer of anything of value that is of such a character as to manifest a substantial and improper influence upon the public official or employee with respect to that person's duties. Ohio Ethics Commission Advisory Opinion 92-012 states that employment and the compensation and benefits that accompany it are within the definition of "anything of value." We noted that Trustee Kenny Stevens signed the time sheets for employee Kyle Stevens, who is Trustee Kenny Stevens' Grandson. This matter will be referred to the Ethics Commission.
 - 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 and minute record or as required by statute. 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, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2010. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2011	12/31/10	\$885.38	\$885.38
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	12/31/10	\$331.35	\$331.35
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2011	12/31/10	\$854.04	\$854.04

4. For the pay periods ended August 31, 2010 and June 30, 2009, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries to the General and Road 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, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 and determined whether:
- a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. Ohio Revised Code Section 2921.42(A)(1) provides that no public official shall knowingly authorize, or employ the authority or influence of the public official's office to secure authorization of any public contract in which the public official, a member of the public official's family, or any of the public official's business associates has an interest. The Ohio Ethics Commission Advisory Opinion 2010-003 stated that a "Public Contract" is the purchase or acquisition of property or services by or for the use of the public agency. Advisory Opinion No. 2001-002 states that "Authorizing" a contract includes voting on, signing, or taking any other action to award a contract. We noted that the Township purchased materials and services for the Community Park and Cemetery from Duncan Landscaping. Duncan Landscaping is a business owned by Trustee, Jay Duncan. The Township paid \$176.32 in 2010 for materials and services performed by Duncan Landscaping. The transaction was approved for payment in the minutes; however, Trustee Jay Duncan did not abstain from voting when approving the bills. This matter will be referred to the Ethics Commission.
 - 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, except for one instance where the invoice did not contain a date; therefore, we could not determine that prior certification was obtained for that expenditure.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resource, required by Ohio Rev. Code, Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Gas, and Permissive Motor Vehicle License (PMVL) funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the accounting system, for the Gas and PMVL Funds. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Gas fund of \$94,120 for 2009, the amount of the first Amended Certificate. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$84,207. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the PMVL fund of \$8,491 for 2009, the amount of the first Amended Certificate. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$9,000. 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 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Gas, and PMVL 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.
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, Gas, and PMVL. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, Gas, and PMVL funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted that General Fund appropriations exceeded certified resources for 2010 and 2009 by \$2,855 and \$315, respectively, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Trustees should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Township to incur fund balance deficits.
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, and PMVL funds, 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))

We identified a John Deere Tractor with Loader purchased during 2010, exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code, Section 515.07. For this purchase, we noted that the Board used the state purchasing program; and therefore, was exempt from advertising for the machinery in a local newspaper and selecting the lowest responsible bidder. We verified the Township's membership in the cooperative purchasing program. No exceptions noted.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail 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.

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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.

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

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 16, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

FAIRFIELD TOWNSHIP

HIGHLAND 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
JUNE 2, 2011**