

**SHALERSVILLE TOWNSHIP
PORTAGE COUNTY
Agreed-Upon Procedures
For the Years Ended December 31, 2010 and 2009**

Perry & Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Shalersville Township
9692 Infirmary Road
Mantua, Ohio 44255

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Shalersville Township, Portage County, prepared by Perry & Associates, Certified Public Accountants, A.C., for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. Shalersville Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

July 11, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.

**SHALERSVILLE TOWNSHIP
PORTAGE COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.

Perry & Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.
www.perrycpas.com

MARIETTA

428 Second Street
Marietta, OH 45750
(740) 373-0056
(740) 373-2402 Fax

PARKERSBURG

1035 Murdoch Avenue
Parkersburg, WV 26101
(304) 422-2203
(304) 428-5587 Fax

ST. CLAIRSVILLE

121 E Main Street
St. Clairsville, OH 43950
(740) 695-1569
(740) 695-5775 Fax

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

June 6, 2011

Shalersville Township
Portage County
9692 Infirmary Road
Mantua, Ohio 44288-9432

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of **Shalersville Township**, Portage County, Ohio (the Township) and the Auditor of State 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.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

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 Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund 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.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as 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 dates written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 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 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 receiptsWe noted the Receipt Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and all from 2009. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Distribution 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 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, 2010 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2009 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 that period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found one exception where an intergovernmental receipt was posted as a miscellaneous receipt in 2010. However, because we did not test all receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.

Debt

1. From the prior audit report, we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2008. The prior audit reflected an inaccurate balance due at December 31, 2008 of \$115,142. The principal outstanding at December 31, 2008 was \$116,605. This amount agreed to the Townships January 1, 2009 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Debt (Continued)

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2008
Building Loan	\$ 116,605

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuance. All outstanding debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of debt activity for 2010 and 2009 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to the General fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the General Fund payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We noted the principal and interest payments for the Building Loan were posted as capital outlay, instead of redemption of principal and interest and other fiscal charges in 2010 and 2009. We found no other 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 Report 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 to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
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 of 2010. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 2,674.52	\$ 2,674.52
State Income Taxes	January 15, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 1,243.82	\$ 1,243.82
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 3,908.65	\$ 3,908.65

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.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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 noted nine instances where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a *Then and Now Certificate* was issued. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D) requires certifying at the time of a commitment, which should be on or before the invoice date, unless a *Then and Now Certificate* is used. Because we did not test all disbursements requiring certification, our report provides no assurance whether or not additional similar errors occurred.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total from the *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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds. 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax 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 Report and Appropriation Status Report for evidence of interfund transfers 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 Report 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 a road maintenance project in 2010 and 2009 exceeding \$45,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01. For these projects, we noted the Board had the Portage County Engineers office handle all proper bidding requirements.

We identified a building construction project in 2010 exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264. For this project, we noted the board had the Portage County Engineers office handle all proper bidding requirements.

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 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.

Official's Response – We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported.

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, those charged with governance, the Auditor of State, and others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Perry & Associates CPAs A.C.".

Perry and Associates
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SHALERSVILLE TOWNSHIP

PORTAGE 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 21, 2011**