



**ST. CLAIR TOWNSHIP  
COLUMBIANA COUNTY**

**AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

**FOR THE YEARS ENDED  
DECEMBER 31, 2013 & 2012**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees  
St. Clair Township  
15442 Pugh Road, Suite 1  
Calcutta, Ohio 43920

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of St. Clair Township, Columbiana County, prepared by Canter & Associates, for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. Based upon this review, we have accepted these reports 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. St. Clair 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 31, 2014

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**ST CLAIR TOWNSHIP  
COLUMBIANA COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|--|-------------|
| Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures ..... | 1           |

**This page intentionally left blank.**



6400 Olde Stone Crossing  
Poland, Ohio 44514  
Ph: 330.707.9035  
Fax: 888.516.1186

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

WWW.CANTERCPA.NET

---

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

St. Clair Township  
Columbiana County  
15442 Pugh Road, Suite 1  
Calcutta, Oh 43920

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of St. Clair Township (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, 2012 and 2013, 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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Fund Ledger Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2013 and 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2013 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 tested investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 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 and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2013 and one from 2012:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to 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 two real estate tax receipts plus 14 advances for 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and five from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Report Listing from 2013 and five from 2012.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports 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. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following bonds and notes outstanding as of December 31, 2011. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3, with the exception of the Chase Loan for the administration building. The balance on the summary was \$523,280, a difference of \$782.

| Issue                                      | Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2011: |
|--|--|
| Tax Increment Revenue Bonds-McGuffey Drive | \$918,353                                      |
| Chase Note – Administrative Building       | \$522,498                                      |



2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to general, debt, police, and tax incremental financing fund's 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 no exceptions.
4. For new debt issued during 2013 and 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase police vehicles. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased two police vehicles in June of 2012 and one police vehicle in November of 2013.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 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 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.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2013 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 2013. We noted the following:

| <b>Withholding<br/>(plus employer<br/>share, where<br/>applicable)</b> | <b>Date Due</b>  | <b>Date Paid</b>  | <b>Amount Due</b> | <b>Amount Paid</b> |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Federal income taxes & Medicare  | January 15, 2014 | January 2, 2014   | \$17,396.89       | \$17,396.89        |
| State income taxes   | January 15, 2014 | December 31, 2013 | 2,707.15          | 2,707.15           |
| City of East Liverpool   | January 31, 2014 | December 31, 2013 | 573.89            | 573.89             |
| OPERS retirement   | January 30, 2014 | December 31, 2014 | 18,790.91         | 18,790.91          |

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 to determine if township employees and/or trustees were reimbursed for out-of-pocket insurance premiums. Insurance reimbursements made were in compliance with ORC 505.60 and 505.601.

### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 2012 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 estimated receipts 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, Road and Bridge and Police funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Road and Bridge and Police 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Road and Bridge and Police funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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, 2013 and 2012 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax 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, 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and 2012 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10,000 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.
9. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (1) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

#### **Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 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.

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.



CANTER & ASSOCIATES

June 30, 2014



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**ST. CLAIR TOWNSHIP**

**COLUMBIANA 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  
AUGUST 12, 2014**