



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  
Tiffin, Ohio 44809-0309

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hopewell Township, Seneca County, Ohio (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, 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. 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, 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 statements. 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 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 dates written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. 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 Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds as required by Ohio Revised 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 Revenue Ledger 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 Revenue Ledger 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. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2010 and five from 2009.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from OPWC to the Township during 2010 and 2009 with the OPWC confirmation. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

5. We confirmed the amounts paid from Hopewell Loudon Board of Education for tax abatement, to the Township during 2010 and 2009 with the Tax Abatement letter from Hopewell Loudon School. We found no exceptions.

- a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
6. We confirmed the amounts paid from Rocky Fowler for farm rent to the Township during 2010 and 2009 to the rental agreement. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
7. We confirmed the donation paid from Bascom Mutual Telephone Co. to the Township during 2010 with the letter from Bascom Mutual Telephone Co. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
8. We confirmed the amounts paid from Chuck Borer for the purchase of the 1987 dump truck, to the Township during 2009 with verbal confirmation from Mr. Borer. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
9. We confirmed the amounts paid from OSS Solid Waste District (OSS) and Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) for the park grants to the Township with the letter and/or check stub from OSS and ODNR. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined 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, for the park, from the year ended December 31, 2010 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts, for the park, from the year ended December 31, 2009 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was 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 Revenue Ledger and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances or any debt payment activity during 2010 or 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 Payroll Register and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register 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 minute record 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 and 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 and fund 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 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 if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2010. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2011	January 12, 2011	\$2,037.48	\$2,037.48
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$413.20	\$413.20
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	December 31, 2010	\$4,418.44	\$4,418.44

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

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriation Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Appropriation Ledger 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. We found three instances 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 Revised 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 amounts 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License 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 Revised Code, Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Revised Code, Sections 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 Tax and Road and Bridge. 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge funds, 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 Revenue Ledger 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 \$1,000 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 Vendor Listing 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, Sections 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)).
  - h. Maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000 (Ohio Revised Code, Section 5575.01).

- i. Construction or reconstruction of a township road exceeding \$15,000/per mile (Ohio Revised Code, Section 5575.01).

We identified a 2009 road program with M&B Asphalt exceeding \$45,000, subject to Ohio Revised Code, Section 5575.01. For this project, we noted the Board advertised the project once in a local newspaper, not later than two weeks prior to letting of contract, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Vendor Listing 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 Revised Code Section 5575.01 requires the county engineer to complete a force account project assessment form (i.e., cost estimate). The Township obtained a force account project assessment form (i.e., cost estimate) from the county engineer, as is also required by Ohio Revised Code Section 5575.01, for the 2010 road widening. The County Engineer noted the total exceeded the \$45,000 limit Ohio Revised Code Section 5575.01 permits for Townships to spend on road construction projects using its own labor force, equipment and supplies.
3. For the road maintenance project described in step 1 above, we read the contract and noted that it required the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Revised Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. The contract included the Ohio Department of Commerce's schedule of prevailing rates.

**Officials' Response:**

In regards to the exceptions listed in the Hopewell Township 2009-2010 audit, it is the intention of this government entity to comply with any and all fiscal procedures such as invoice dates not preceding purchase order dates. The Board will communicate to the park managers and staff the correct procedures to be followed so this incident is not repeated 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 13, 2011

**This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.**



# 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  
JUNE 28, 2011**