

**WABASH TOWNSHIP
DARKE COUNTY**

AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 – 2009



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Wabash Township
14590 Livingston Road
New Weston, Ohio 45348

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Wabash Township, Darke County, prepared by Manning & Associates CPAs, LLC, for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010. 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. Wabash Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 20, 2011


This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.

**WABASH TOWNSHIP
DARKE COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

**Wabash Township
Darke County
14590 Livingston Road
New Weston, Ohio 45248**

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Wabash Township, Darke 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 Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2008 balances in the prior year audited statement. 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(s) with the Township's financial institution(s). We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 and 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation and five from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the debit appearing in the subsequent bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Dayton | 6105 N. Dixie Drive | P.O. Box 13449 | Dayton, Ohio 45414
(937) 898-3167 | Fax (937) 898-9202 | Email: dayton@manningcpallc.com

Sidney | 500 Folkerth Avenue | Sidney, Ohio 45365
(937) 492-0386 | Fax (937) 492-3262 | Email: sidney@manningcpallc.com

America Counts
On CPAs®
www.manningcpallc.com

6. We selected five reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 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.

7. 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 that the Township invested in certificates of deposit with maturities in excess of the time limits imposed by Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 and 135.14. The Township's certificates of deposits have maturities ranging from 26 to 30 months.

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 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. 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 receipts

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction 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 fund(s). We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
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 issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2010 and 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for all employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and determined whether the following information in the minute record 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. Department(s) and fund(s) 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.

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
 - 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 was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
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 during the final withholding period during 2010. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2011	January 11, 2011	\$1,108.08	\$1,108.08
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	January 11, 2011	\$74.44	\$74.44
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	January 3, 2011	\$764.07	\$764.07

Payroll Cash Disbursements, (Continued)

4. For the pay periods ended March 11, 2010 and August 13, 2009, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries to the General and Gasoline 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.

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 noted that liability insurance payments made in 2010 and 2009 were posted entirely to the gasoline fund with no allocation of the expense to the general fund. The Township should devise a method of reasonably determining the amount of the expense to be allocated to the general fund.
 - 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 from 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 and Gasoline 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 Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$66,185 for 2009. However, the final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources reflected \$38,910. 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, Motor Vehicle License and Gasoline 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.

Compliance – Budgetary, (Continued)

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 and Gasoline funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report. The amounts on the resolution agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund. The Appropriation Status Report recorded budgeted appropriations for the General Fund of \$224,131 for 2009. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$196,856. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts approved in the appropriation resolution to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
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 Gasoline 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 and Gasoline 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 Reports and Appropriation Status Reports 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 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 a multi-township exceeding \$25,000 in 2009, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21. For this project, we noted that bidding procedures were performed by the County Engineer. In 2010, we noted no procurements requiring competitive bidding.

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 forced account cost estimate.

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

Manning & Associates CPAs, LLC
Dayton, Ohio

April 30, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

WABASH TOWNSHIP

DARKE 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 5, 2011**