



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Riley Township
Sandusky County
1829 US Route 6 East
Fremont, Ohio 43420-9583

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Riley Township Sandusky County, Ohio (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 Cash Journal to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Journal. 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 Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the Township's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also compared the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation. The confirmed balances were higher than the reconciled balance by \$19.62 due to savings account interest which was earned in December 2012, but not recorded by the Township until January 2013. We recommend the Township post interest income in a timely manner.
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 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 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. We found 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 2012 and one from 2011:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt 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 Receipt Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipt Journal 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 Sandusky County Auditor's Accounts Payable Invoice Report from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt 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. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010. This amount did not agree to the January 1, 2011 balance on the summary we used in step 3 which listed the following outstanding debt.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
Mortgage Loan	\$35,961.33

We recommend the Township properly disclose all debt activity when it is acquired.

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Journal and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt confirmation to Road and Bridge and General 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.

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 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 records 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)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 12, 2012	\$698.17	\$698.17
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 12, 2012	\$191.74	\$191.74
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 12, 2012	\$1,798.78	\$1,798.78
School District Income Tax	December 17, 2012	December 12, 2012	\$93.48	\$93.48

3. 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 Payroll Record:
 - a. Accumulated leave records
 - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - c. The Township's payout policy.

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

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Appropriation Ledger, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for *Supplies*, and checks recorded as *Equipment Maintenance* in the Motor Vehicle License Tax fund for 2012. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriation Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Appropriation Ledger 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 three 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. We recommend the Fiscal Officer certify disbursements in accordance with Ohio Rev. Code 5705.41(D).

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 Receipt Journal for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the accounting system because the Township's accounting system did not integrate budgetary receipts. Failure to integrate budgetary data into the Township's accounting system could result in the Trustees using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes. We recommend the Township integrate budgetary receipts into their accounting system.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Cemetery, and Zoning 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Road and Bridge, and Gasoline Tax Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger, except for the General fund in 2011 and the General and Road and Bridge funds in 2012. The Appropriation ledgers were less than Approved Appropriations by \$1,000 for the General Fund in 2011 and by \$88,000 and \$10,000 for the General Fund and Road and Bridge Fund, respectively in 2012. The Fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger to amounts recorded on the

Appropriation Resolution to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.

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, Fire District, and Motor Vehicle License Tax funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. We noted that General Fund appropriations exceeded certified resources by \$5,000 and \$1,000 for 2012 and 2011, respectively, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Trustees should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Township to incur fund balance deficits.
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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Fire District 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 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.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Receipts Journal 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 and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger 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.

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

July 12, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

RILEY TOWNSHIP

SANDUSKY 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
JULY 30, 2013**