



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

New Lyme Township
Ashtabula County
4672 Lenox-New Lyme Road
Jefferson, OH 44047

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of New Lyme 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, 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. 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 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 Fund Ledger Report 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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions. First Merit Bank confirmed a balance in the Bower Memorial Day Fund that was \$32 less than the system balance due to bank service charges not posted by Fiscal Officer. We also agreed the confirmed balances after bank service charges were posted to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash and Investments – (Continued)

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 Revenue Ledger. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to 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 two real estate tax receipts plus one advance for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Revenue Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected one receipt from the State Distribution Transaction List (DTL) from 2011 and one from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor Vendor History Report from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports 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.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2009. This amount agreed to the Township's January 1, 2010 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Dump Truck Loan	\$49,276

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger and Appropriation Ledger 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 note debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Road and Bridge Fund and Cemetery Fund payments reported in the Appropriation Ledger. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Cemetery Fund and Auto Permissive Tax Fund per the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
5. For new debt issued during 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a road truck and mower. We scanned the Appropriation Ledger and noted the Township did purchase a road truck and mower in 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for two employees from 2011 and one payroll check for two employees from 2010 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register Detail Report 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 on timecards, minute record or as required by statute. 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 3rd and 4th quarter withholding periods of 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	October 31, 2011	10/26/11	\$1,415	\$1,415
State income taxes	January 31, 2012	12/31/11	\$281	\$281
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2012	12/31/11	\$1,966	\$1,966

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

3. For the pay periods ended March 31, 2011 and September 30, 2010, we compared documentation and the re-computation supporting the allocation of the Fiscal Officer's salary and the Board's per diem amounts to the General Fund. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We used the UAN AWB pull payments feature to select ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report 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 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 no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts 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 Road & Bridge Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amounts recorded in the accounting system. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Gas Tax and Road & Bridge Funds of \$71,500, \$87,430 and \$83,000 respectively, for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$94,416, \$134,656 and \$126,323, respectively. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Gas Tax and Road & Bridge Funds of \$70,056, \$87,030 and \$81,400, respectively, for 2010. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$94,996, \$127,342 and \$125,207, respectively. 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 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Gas Tax, and Road & 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 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 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Gas Tax, and Road & Bridge. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 and 5705.36(A)(5) prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Gas Tax, and Road & Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.

Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)

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, Gas Tax, and Road & Bridge 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 the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. The Township established the NOPEC Fund during 2011 to segregate NOPEC grant receipts and disbursements in compliance with Section 5705.09 and 2 CFR Part 176.210.
7. We scanned the 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$100 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, 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 no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures – (Continued)

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Vendor Report 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 to the cash and investments exception noted above: Fiscal officer will post bank service charges from May 2011 to the present and will move account from First Merit to Huntington Bank to eliminate monthly service fee.

Officials' Response to the budgetary exception noted above: Fiscal officer will post amounts to the Revenue Status Report as provided by the amended certificate.

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

July 13, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NEW LYME 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 11, 2012**