



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Hartsgrove Township  
Ashtabula County  
5321 SR 534 South  
Rome, Ohio 44085

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hartsgrove 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, 2012 and 2011, 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

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 Status Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Status Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation 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 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 found no exceptions.

### **Cash - (Continued)**

6. We selected five reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Receipts Register.
7. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2012 and 2011 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement or reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
8. 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 found 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 fund(s) 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 Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipt Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
  - a. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011.  
We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). 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 agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2010

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2012</b>
Paving Loan – 2007	\$333,640

Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133 allows various methods for subdivisions to incur debt. Section 133.22 allows a subdivision to issue anticipatory securities; Section 133.10 allows anticipation securities in anticipation of current property tax revenues or in anticipation of current revenues in and for any fiscal year from any source or combination of sources, including distributions of any federal or state monies, other than the proceeds of property taxes levied by the subdivision; Section 133.14 allows the issuance of securities for the purpose of paying all or any portion of the costs of any permanent improvement that the subdivision is authorized, alone or in cooperation with other persons, to acquire, improve, or construct; and Section 133.18 allows the taxing authority of a subdivision by legislation to submit to the electors of the subdivision the question of issuing any general obligation bonds, for one purpose, that the subdivision has power or authority to issue.

The Township had two signed promissory notes with Andover Bank. One for the purchase of a fire truck, and one for paving Township roads. Due to the fact this debt is promissory notes between a banking institution and the Township, the notes do not meet the requirements set forth in Ohio Revised Code Chapter 133.

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.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agree principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule(s) to Fire Levy Fund and Road and Bridge Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We will also compare 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 Debt fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.

## 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 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 code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files, or minute record 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. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files or 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(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
  - e. Federal, State & 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, 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.

<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 & Medicare <u>(and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)</u>	January 31, 2013	12/26/12	\$779.58	\$779.58
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	12/26/12	\$124.61	\$124.61
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	12/26/12	\$1,530.43	\$1,530.43

4. For the pay periods ended March 16, 2012 and August 26, 2011, we recomputed the allocation of the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salaries Boards' per diem amounts to the General and/or Road Fund per the Employee Detail Adjustment Report. We found no exceptions.
5. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salary for time or services performed to supporting certifications the Revised Code requires. We found no exceptions.
6. For the pay periods described in step 4, we traced the Board's per diem time or services performed to time or activity sheets. We found no exceptions.
7. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report:
  - a. Accumulated leave records. We found no exceptions.
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date. We found no exceptions.
  - c. The Township's payout policy. We found no exceptions.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

### Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. 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 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 *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, General, Road & Bridge, and Fire EMS funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Road & Bridge, and Fire EMS 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Road & Bridge, and Fire EMS. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, Road & Bridge and Fire EMS funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified revenues.
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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Road & Bridge, Fire EMS fund, 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 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 Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund.

### **Compliance – Budgetary**

7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$5,000 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 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**

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 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.



**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

May 16, 2013





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**HARTSGROVE 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  
JUNE 11, 2013**