

**HANOVER TOWNSHIP
LICKING COUNTY**

AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND 2011

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



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Hanover Township
18088 Crawmer Road SE
Fresno, Ohio 43824

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Hanover Township, Licking County, prepared by Wolfe, Wilson & Phillips, Inc., for the period January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012. 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. Hanover 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

September 17, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.

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

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Hanover Township
Licking County
18088 Crawmer Road SE
Fresno, Ohio 43824

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hanover 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, 2012 and 2011, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transaction; 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2010 documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Ledger Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliation to the total of December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 and 2011 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, 2012 and 2011 bank reconciliations without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit appearing in 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 found no exceptions.
6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes (the Statement) for 2012 and one from 2011:
 - 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 two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2012 and five from 2011:
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports 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 agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity for 2012 or 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment 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 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. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 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 2012. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share Where applicable)	Due Date	Date Paid	Amount W/H	Amount
Federal Income Taxes	January 31, 2013	January 22, 2013	\$ 3,990.21	\$ 3,990.21
State Income Taxes	January 31, 2013	December 27, 2012	221.29	221.29
School District Inc. Tax	January 31, 2013	December 27, 2012	72.71	72.71
OPERS Retirement	January 31, 2013	December 27, 2012	2,404.62	2,404.62

Non-payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 image 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 one instance where the certification date was after the vendor invoice date and there was 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 estimated receipts 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 Road & Bridge Fund for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the Certificate agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system except for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and Road and Bridge Fund in 2012. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$104,229, the Gasoline Tax Fund of \$85,585 and for the Road and Bridge Fund of \$105,253. However, the final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources reflected \$38,924 for the General Fund, \$0 for the Gasoline Tax Fund and \$112,792 for the Road and Bridge Fund. The amounts on the Certificate agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system except for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and Road and Bridge Fund in 2011. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$125,832, Gasoline Tax Fund of \$86,360 and for the Road and Bridge Fund of \$103,542. However, the final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources reflected \$37,445 for the General Fund, \$0 for the Gasoline Tax Fund and \$113,175 for the Road and Bridge Fund. 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Road & Bridge 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 appropriations certified by the County Auditor.

Compliance-Budgetary (Continued)

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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Road & Bridge Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions did not agree to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Revised Code Section 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 Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Road & Bridge Fund for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General Fund, Gasoline Tax Fund and the Road & Bridge Fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted that the General Fund expenditures for 2012 exceeded total appropriations by \$155,510 and expenditures for 2011 exceeded total appropriations by \$155,219. We noted that the Gasoline Tax Fund expenditures for 2012 exceeded total appropriations by \$56,926 and expenditures for 2011 exceeded total appropriations by \$99,409. We noted that the Road & Bridge Fund expenditures for 2012 exceeded total appropriations by \$89,271 and expenditures for 2011 exceeded total appropriations by \$123,978. The fiscal officer should not certify the availability of funds and should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Treasurer may request the Trustees to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations and amending estimated resources, if necessary, and if resources are available.
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, 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and 2011 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, 2012 and 2011 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). 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.

Client Response: We agree with exceptions stated above.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance and 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.

Wolfe, Wilson, & Phillips, Inc.
Zanesville, Ohio
July 19, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

HANOVER 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
OCTOBER 1, 2013**