

BLOOMINGGROVE TOWNSHIP

RICHLAND COUNTY

**JANUARY 1, 2010 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011
AGREED UPON PROCEDURES**



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Bloominggrove Township
631 State Route 603 West
Shiloh, Ohio 44878

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Bloominggrove Township, Richland County, prepared by Charles E. Harris & Associates, Inc., for the period January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report 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. Bloominggrove 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

May 29, 2012

This page intentionally left blank.

Charles E. Harris & Associates, Inc.
Certified Public Accountants

Rockefeller Building
614 W Superior Ave Ste 1242
Cleveland, OH 44113-1306
Office phone - (216) 575-1630
Fax - (216) 436-2411

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Bloomington Township
Richland County
631 State Route 603 West
Shiloh, Ohio 44878

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Bloomington Township, Richland County (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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2009 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, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the Township's financial institution. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 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. We noted no exceptions.
6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 no exceptions.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipts Journal. 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 Receipts Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Journal included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected four receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and four from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipts Journal. 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. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following capital lease outstanding as of December 31, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Townships' January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Capital lease	\$53,025

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipts Journal and Cash Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of capital lease debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to gasoline tax fund payments reported in the Cash Journal. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Payroll Record and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Record 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 were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 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 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	12/30/11	\$1,089.62	\$1,089.62
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	12/27/11	\$376.00	\$376.00
Local income tax	January 31, 2012	12/27/11	\$164.87	\$164.87
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	1/10/12	\$707.25 employee \$990.15 employer	\$1,697.40

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

- 1. From the Cash Journal, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for General Government, and checks recorded as Public Works in the Motor Vehicle License Tax fund for 2011. We found no exceptions.
- 2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Cash Journal for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 Cash Journal 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. Since the Township does not utilize an Estimated Receipts ledger, we could not compare the total estimated receipts from the *Amended Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances* required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1). The Fiscal Officer should utilize an Estimated Receipts ledger to compare actual receipts to the estimates, so the Trustees can properly budget and monitor revenues.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax and Cemetery 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 Ledger for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Gasoline Tax, and Cemetery funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger.
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 Cemetery funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Gasoline Tax and Cemetery fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. 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 Receipts Journal for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 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.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger 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 Cash Journal for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21)

- b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (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 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.01 & 515.07)
- e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264)
- f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (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 the purchase of a road grader exceeding \$25,000 subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21. For this purchase, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Cash Journal for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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.

Officials' Response:

The fiscal officer will work to compare budgetary receipts to actual 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 the Auditor of State, and others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



CHARLES E. HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

April 4, 2012

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

BLOOMINGGROVE TOWNSHIP

RICHLAND 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 12, 2012**