



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

UPPER TOWNSHIP
LAWRENCE COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Upper Township
Lawrence County
1306 Navajo Trail
Ironton, Ohio 45638

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Upper Township, Lawrence 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 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, 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 balance 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.

Cash (Continued)

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 and February bank statements. 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.

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 Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected four receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and three from 2009. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Confirmation's from 2010 and five from 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and Confirmation 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 the following exception. The Fiscal Officer posted a manufactured rollback receipt entirely to the General Fund in 2010 for \$190.52 instead of allocating according to the *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes*. The Fiscal Officer should have allocated the receipt to the following funds: General, Road and Bridge, Emergency Medical Service, and Fire for \$10.24, \$20.83, \$97.79, and \$61.66, respectively. We recommend the Fiscal Officer adjust these funds accordingly to reflect the proper allocation.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from US Bank to the Township during 2009 for a loan to acquire a building. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. 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. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2009 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

| Issue | Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2008: |
|-------------------------|---|
| General Obligation Note | \$58,240 |

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. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2010 and 2009 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to General, Gasoline Tax, and Fire 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 that the Township misclassified principal and interest payments as public works, public safety, or general government for interest payments on the bond anticipation note. We also found that the Township misclassified principal and interest payments as public safety for the general obligation note. The Township issued a bond anticipation note in 2009 with a one-year maturity. A new note was issued in 2010; however, the Township did not post the \$435,000 principal payment to retire the 2009 bond anticipation note. We recommend the Township post principal and interest payments timely as debt service activity.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the General fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed for 2009. A new note was issued in 2010 to retire the 2009 note; however, the Township did not post the \$435,000 proceeds for the 2010 note. We recommend the Township record proceeds of notes upon a new note issuance.
5. For new debt issued during 2010 and 2009, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a building. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased a building in October of 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:
 - 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 were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we 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. Departments and funds 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.

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, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period during 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 | 12/20/2010 | \$628.38 | \$628.38 |
| State income taxes | January 15, 2011 | 12/20/2010 | \$416.64 | \$416.64 |
| Local income tax | December 31, 2010 | 12/20/2010 | \$102.87 | \$102.87 |
| OPERS retirement | January 30, 2011 | 12/20/2010 | \$955.18 | \$955.18 |

4. For the pay periods ended April 30, 2010 and June 30, 2009, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries to the General and Gasoline Tax Funds. We found no exceptions.
5. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced Board time or services performed to time or activity sheets. We found no exceptions.
6. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report:
 - a. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - b. The Township's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through b. above.

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 *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances* required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Gasoline Tax and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds of \$32,178, \$90,016, and \$9,405, respectively, for 2010. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$44,571, \$65,563, and \$7,833. 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, Gasoline Tax and Road and Bridge 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, Gasoline Tax, and Motor Vehicle License. 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 and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted that General Fund and Motor Vehicle License Fund appropriations for 2010 exceeded certified resources by \$27,626 and \$19,695, 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, Gasoline Tax and Road and Bridge funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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 \$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, 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.

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) 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.

Officials' Response – 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, 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, flowing style.

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 4, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

UPPER TOWNSHIP

LAWRENCE 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
MAY 17, 2011**