



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Richmond Township
Ashtabula County
6489 Footville-Richmond Road
Andover, Ohio 44003

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Richmond Township (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 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, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash – (Continued)

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 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 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 receiptsWe noted the Revenue Ledger included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected one receipt from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and one from 2009. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor History Report from 2010 and five from 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL and County Auditor Vendor History 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 agreed the amounts paid from Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council (NOPEC) to the Township during 2010 to supporting documentation. 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.

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 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 or 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees including elected officials from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees including elected officials from 2009 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (time sheet, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We noted the following exceptions.

In accordance with Ohio Rev. Code § 505.24, members of the Board of Trustees are compensated per diem at \$42.45 per day not to exceed 200 days per year. Each Board Member notifies the Fiscal Officer of the number of days spent in service of the Township and the kinds of services rendered on those days.

We found Trustee Allen Slater was paid twice for services rendered on May 20, 2010 resulting in overcompensation of \$42.45. Also, we found Trustee David Ballantine was paid twice for services rendered on March 14, 2010 and three times for services rendered on May 24, 2010 resulting in overcompensation of \$127.35. In accordance with the foregoing facts, and pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code § 117.28, a Finding for Recovery for public money illegally expended is hereby issued against Trustee Allen Slater and Trustee David Ballantine, and in favor of Richmond Township, in the amounts of \$42.45 and \$127.35 respectively.

We brought this to management's attention, and the overcompensation amounts have since been repaid to the Township by Trustee Slater and Trustee Ballantine on July 19, 2011.

As a result of our findings, we expanded our tests to include 100% of Trustees' per diem entries for 2010 and 2009. We found no further exceptions.

Officials' Response

The overcompensation of the Trustees was caused by an oversight of the Fiscal Officer. The Fiscal Officer concentrated more on work descriptions and overlooked duplicating of dates Trustees entered in their per diem books. When the Fiscal Officer does payroll now, she highlights dates and will double check that no dates are duplicated. The Fiscal Officer has instructed the Trustees to write the dates and description of work more legibly so questions do not arise on what was done and when.

- b. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the trustees and employees' duties as documented in the trustee per diem books or employee time sheets, respectively, or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

2. 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:

<u>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</u>	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2011	January 5, 2011	\$165.68	\$165.68
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$82.92	\$82.92
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$1,370.98	\$1,370.98

3. For the pay periods ended June 30, 2010 and September 30, 2009, we compared documentation and the re-computation supporting the allocation of Board per diem amounts to the General and Road & Bridge Funds. We found no exceptions.
4. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced Board time or services performed to per diem books. We found 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 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 two 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 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 amounts 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, Gas Tax and Ambulance Levy 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 as noted below. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Gas Tax and Ambulance Levy Funds of \$76,540, \$87,175, and \$20,540, respectively, for 2010. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected budgeted resources for the General, Gas Tax, and Ambulance Levy Funds of \$172,330, \$185,768, and \$26,028, respectively, for 2010.

The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and Ambulance Levy Funds of \$62,587 and \$20,100, respectively for 2009. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected budgeted resources for the General and Ambulance Levy Funds of \$155,155 and \$24,279, respectively for 2009.

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.

Officials' Response

The Fiscal Officer will post amounts to the Revenue Status Report as provided by/reflected on the final (most recent) Amended Certificate.

2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Gas Tax and Ambulance Levy 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 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General, Gas Tax, and Ambulance Levy Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, Gas Tax and Ambulance Levy 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, Gas Tax and Ambulance Levy 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 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. The Township established the Other Local Grants fund during 2010 to segregate NOPEC grant receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09 and 2 CFR Part 176.210.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Revenue Ledger 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 Vendor 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 street paving project exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.07. For this project, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

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 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, and others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

August 8, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

RICHMOND TOWNSHIP

ASHTABULA 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
SEPTEMBER 20, 2011**