



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Springfield Township  
Mahoning County  
3475 E. South Range Road  
New Springfield, Ohio 44443

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Springfield 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 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report 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 Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Ledger Report. We found that the Special Revenue funds had a January 1, 2012 balance that was \$1,524.16 greater than the December 31, 2011 balance. This was caused by the Clerk voiding three checks in 2012 within the Special Revenue Funds. They were check number 5565 in the amount totaling \$2.00, check number 9762 in the amount totaling \$743.77 and check number 2676 in the amount totaling \$778.39. When these checks were voided off the outstanding check list, the balance was added back to the January 1, 2012 fund balance.
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 observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.

**Cash and Investments – (Continued)**

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 noted 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 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 for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Revenue Ledger 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 Activity Report from 2012 and five from 2011.
  - 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.
4. We verified the amount paid from the Essroc Cement Corporation to the Township during 2012. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined that this receipt was allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined that this receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### License, Permit and Fee Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 license, permits and fee receipts from the year ended December 31, 2012 and 10 license, permits and fee receipts from the year ended 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following notes and loans outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:</b>
Ohio Public Works Commission	\$64,826
General Obligation Note	\$178,811

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Payment Register Report 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 amortization schedules to the general fund, fire and rescue fund and fire/ems vehicle fund payments reported in the Payment Register Vendor Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We noted that the Township retired the General Obligation Note one year early. In addition, we noted that the Township did not report the proper amounts for principal and interest on the annual reports. Although the payments were correct for the retirement of the Note. In 2011, the Township recorded \$12,000 in interest payments. However, the amount of interest paid was actually \$7,251.76. Also in 2011, the Township retired \$14,594.44 of the General Obligation Note with General Fund money. However, this was posted to the Public Safety line item and should have been posted to Principal Retirement line item. In 2012, the Township recorded \$24,000 in interest payments. However, the amount of interest paid was actually \$4,586.14. This caused the interest line item to be overstated in 2011 by \$4,748.24 and overstated in 2012 by 19,413.86. It also caused the principal line item to be understated by the same amounts. Finally in 2012, the Township retired \$40,639.65 and \$7,002.67 from the General and the Fire & Rescue Funds and posted the expenditures to the line item Public Safety and Capital Outlay respectively. The postings should have been made to Principal Retirement.

**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 Register Adjustment Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate recorded in the Payroll Register 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 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, 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:

<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	January 9, 2013	January 7, 2013	\$3,024.51	\$3,024.51
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$1,326.51	\$1,326.51
Local income tax	January 15, 2013	December 20, 2012	\$381.64	\$381.64
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 17, 2013	\$26,172.97	\$26,172.97

**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 *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Comparison of Budget to Actual Receipts Report for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Police funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The Township had two amendments to the *Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* each year. However, we noted that the amounts recorded in the accounting system were from the first amendment. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the accounting system 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Police 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Police funds. 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Police funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Police fund, as recorded in the Comparison of Disbursements and Encumbrances 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.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$2,000 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.

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

May 30, 2013



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP**

**MAHONING 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 25, 2013**