



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Mecca Township
Trumbull County
PO Box 567
Cortland, Oh 44410

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Mecca 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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2009 documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. We amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the Township's financial institution. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash – (Continued)

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.
6. We selected all four of the reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Receipts Register. Each credit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from the *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We found no exceptions.
 - 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. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor History List from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s) as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found one receipt in 2011 for \$9,795.02 posted to the EMS fund but it should have been posted to the General Fund, and we found one receipt in 2011 for \$4,641 that was posted to the Fire Fund but should have been posted to the EMS fund. We therefore requested management to adjust this amount to the General Fund and the EMS fund. We noted the fiscal officer adjusted this amount on June 4, 2012. However, because we did not test all receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

1. We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2010 recorded in the Receipt Register Report and determine whether the:
 - a. Receipt amount agreed to detailed documentation attached to receipt. The amounts agreed.
 - b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed upon procedures documentation, we noted the following debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009:

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
OPWC Capital Project Loan	\$51,184
2009 Ambulance Loan	\$69,930

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. The Township did not record the revenue and expenditure of \$283,500 for loan proceeds that were paid directly to the vendor for the purchase of a fire truck.
3. We obtained a summary of debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule 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 to determine that the payments were made on time. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report 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 minute record. 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, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	1/15/12	\$ 1,921.91	\$ 1,921.91
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	1/15/12	\$ 554.91	\$ 554.91
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	1/27/12	\$ 2,878.75	\$ 2,878.75

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 bank statement image 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). There was one instance in 2010 and one in 2011 where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and the *Then and Now Certificate* did not adequately cover the obligation period. 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 estimated receipts from the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources 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 the Fire District funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We found no exceptions for 2010. For 2011, the Gas Tax fund agreed, but the General and Fire District funds on the Revenue Status Report were over the Amended Certificate by \$33 and \$234 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 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax and the Fire District fund, 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.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General Fund, Gasoline Tax and the Fire District fund. We found no exceptions.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire District Fund for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. There were no exceptions in 2010. For 2011 the Gas Tax and Police District funds agreed, but the General Fund Appropriation Status report was over the Amended Certificate by \$17. 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire District fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We found no exceptions.
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, 2011 and 2010. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. We found no evidence of new restricted receipts that ORC Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund.
7. We scanned the 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$2500 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 -- .16 restricts. We noted the Township transferred \$1,771 and \$25,310 from the Gas Tax and EMS funds respectively to the Debt Service Fund for 2010 and transferred \$1,462 and \$25,310 from the Road & Bridge Funds respectively to the Debt Service Fund in 2011. These transfers were used to pay the OPWC and ambulance loan payments in each respective year. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.16 does not permit this transfer without approval of the Tax Commissioner and the Court of Common Pleas. The Township did not obtain this approval. These funds were spent for otherwise allowable expenditures of the original fund that transfer the money, and therefore, no illegal expenditures were made. We recommend that the Township review the ORC regulations for transfers of funds to implement proper controls to ensure compliance.
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 scan the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21)
 - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (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)

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures – (Continued)

- d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.07)
- e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264)
- f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (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 the Phillips Rice Road safety upgrade project exceeding \$45,000 subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01. For this item, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local paper and awarded the contracts to the lowest and best bidder.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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.
3. For the road maintenance project described in step 2 above, we read the contract and noted whether 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.

Officials' Response: The fiscal officer acknowledges the errors and said she will be more diligent in the future.

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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 18, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MECCA TOWNSHIP

TRUMBULL 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 12, 2012**