



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Hopewell Township
Seneca County
P.O. Box 309
Bascom, Ohio 44809

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Board of Trustees and the management of Hopewell Township, Seneca County, Ohio (the Township), on the receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in the Townships cash basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 and certain compliance requirements related to those transactions and balances, included in the information provided to us by the management of the Township. The Township is responsible for the receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in the cash basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances included in the information provided to us by the Township. 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 recalculated the December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to documentation in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2016 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2015 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, 2016 and 2015 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2016 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, 2016 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2016 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. There were no exceptions.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We haphazardly selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2016 and one from 2015:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We inspected the Receipt Register Report to confirm 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 inspected the Receipt Register Report to confirm whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We inspected the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2016 and 2015. The Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We haphazardly selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2016 and all from 2015. We also haphazardly selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Audit Trail by Vendor Report from 2016 and five from 2015.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We inspected the Receipt Register Report to determine that these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We inspected the Receipt Register Report to determine 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, 2016 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2015 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and:

- a. Agreed the receipt amount to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. One exception was noted. On receipt 18-2015, the deposit from Meadowbrook Park agreed to the total on the receipt, however, the receipt did not foot and was actually \$450 higher than the deposited amount. After being notified of the discrepancy, Township officials checked their safe and found the money in the safe and not deposited. A deposit and receipt was posted in 2017 to correct this error. However, because we did not inspect all receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not similar errors occurred. We recommend the Fiscal Officer recalculate the receipts from Meadowbrook Park to ensure they agree to the deposit and deposit all funds timely.
- b. Confirmed the amounts charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found two exceptions. On receipt 77-2016, two campers were charged incorrectly for their sites. Camper receipt 41979 was undercharged \$17. The 2016 rate of \$32 per night for five nights totals \$160, the receipt amount was \$143. Also, Camper receipt 41970 was given a credit on their site from a previous year. There was no evidence supporting this credit

or its approval, although \$46 was taken off of their bill for 2016. However, because we did not inspect all receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not similar errors occurred. We recommend all campers be charged the approved rates and any credits be properly documented and authorized.

- c. Inspected the Receipt Register Report to determine the receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2014.
2. We inquired of management, and inspected the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2016 or 2015 or debt payment activity during 2016 or 2015. There were no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2016 or 2015.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2016 and one payroll check for five employees from 2015 from the Wage Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We inspected the fund and account codes to which the check was posted to determine the posting was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record. We also confirmed the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we inspected the employees' personnel files and the minute record for the following information and compared it 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 and Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found two exceptions related to steps a and c above. A Meadowbrook Park employee was not approved by the township trustees. The funds to which the Meadowbrook Park employee check is posted was also never approved by the trustees. However, because we did not inspect all new employee personnel files, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not similar errors occurred. We recommend the Trustees approve all new employees and the fund to which the check should be charged.

3. We inspected the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2016 to confirm 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 2016. We observed the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2017	December 27, 2016	\$2,130	\$2,130
State income taxes	January 17, 2017	December 27, 2016	368	368
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2017	December 27, 2016	4,463	4,463
School District Tax	January 17, 2017	December 27, 2016	91	91

4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report:
 - a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The Township's payout policy.

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

5. We inquired of management and inspected the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 to determine if township employees and/or trustees were reimbursed for out-of-pocket insurance premiums. No such reimbursements occurred.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2016 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2015 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, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015. The amounts agreed

2. We inspected the appropriation measures adopted for 2016 and 2015 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 Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2016 and 2015 for the following funds: General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge. 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, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015. There were 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, 2016 and 2015 for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. There were no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We inspected the Receipt Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2016 and 2015. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. We observed no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund.
7. For funds existing in prior years, we inspected the fund activity to determine whether the fund is still being used for the statutorily approved purpose and that all the required funds were established. All the required funds were established and no funds for which the statutorily approved purpose was no longer valid were included on the accounting records.
8. We inspected the 2016 and 2015 Interfund Transfer Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$2,000 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.
9. We inquired of management and inspected the Appropriation Status Reports to determine whether the Township elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. The Township did not establish these reserves.
10. We inspected the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) 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. No funds had a negative cash fund balances.

Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and inspected the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 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.

Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires townships to file their financial information in the HINKLE system within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We confirmed the Township filed their complete financial statements, as defined by AOS Bulletin 2016-007, within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 in the Hinkle system. There were no exceptions.

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*. We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the Township's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is for the use of the Township to assist in evaluating its receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances and are not suitable for any other purpose.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

July 24, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

HOPEWELL TOWNSHIP

SENECA 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 15, 2017