

**BURLINGTON TOWNSHIP  
LICKING COUNTY**

**AGREED UPON PROCEDURES**

**FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 AND 2009**

**Wolfe, Wilson, & Phillips, Inc.  
37 South Seventh Street  
Zanesville, Ohio 43701**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees  
Burlington Township  
12160 Smoketown Road NE  
Utica, Ohio 43080

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Burlington Township, Licking County, prepared by Wolfe, Wilson & Phillips, Inc., 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. Burlington 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 20, 2011

**This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.**

**WOLFE, WILSON, & PHILLIPS, INC.**  
**37 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET**  
**ZANESVILLE, OHIO 43701**

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

Burlington Township  
Licking County  
12160 Smoketown Road NE  
Utica, Ohio 43080

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Burlington Township, Licking 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 Publics 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 Cash Journal 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 reconciliation to the total of December 31, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 and 2009 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.
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 bank statement. 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, 2010. 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 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.
  - i. Two personal property tax receipts.
  - ii. Two real estate tax receipts.We noted the Receipt Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
  
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and five from 2009. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs 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 funds. 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 December 31, 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 five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions
  - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employee's duties as documented in the minute record, timesheets or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
  
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. 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.

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:

<b>Withholding</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount W/H</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Federal Income Taxes	January 15, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$ 232.70	\$ 232.70
State Income Taxes	January 31, 2011	December 31, 2010	171.93	171.93
School District Income Tax	January 31, 2011	December 31, 2010	127.65	127.65
OPERS Retirement (withholding plus Employee share)	January 31, 2011	December 31, 2010	526.07	526.07

### **Non-payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Activity Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2009 and determined whether:

- a. In our opinion, the disbursements were for a 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 noted 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 one instance where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date, and there was also no evidence that a Then and Now Certificate was issued. 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 from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Fire Fund 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, Gasoline Tax Fund and Fire Fund in 2009. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted resources for the General Fund of \$107,097; for the Gasoline Tax Fund of \$85,000; and the Fire Fund of \$142,124 for 2010. However, the final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources reflected \$115,357, \$88,336 and \$143,380, respectively for these funds. 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 Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Fire 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 Revised Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Revised 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 Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Fire Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Fire Fund for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.



**Compliance-Budgetary (Continued)**

5. Ohio Revised 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 Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Fire Fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Revised 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 Revised 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 \$5,000 which Ohio Revised 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 Revised Code Section 5705.13. We noted the Township did not establish these reserves.

**Compliance – Contracts and 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 Revised Code Section 5549.21).
  - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Revised Code Section 511.12).
  - c. Equipment for fire protection and communication costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Revised Code Section 505.37 to 505.42).
  - d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Revised Code Section 515.07).
  - e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 to achieve energy savings (Ohio Revised Code Section 505.264).
  - f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Revised 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 Revised Code Section 505.37(A)).

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 had road construction projects exceeding \$45,000 for which Ohio Revised 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.

Official Response: We agree to the exception noted 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 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.

***Wolfe, Wilson, & Phillips, Inc.***  
Zanesville, Ohio  
June 19, 2011



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**BURLINGTON TOWNSHIP**

**LICKING 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 2, 2011**