



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Hartford Township
Trumbull County
PO Box 116
Hartford, Ohio 44424

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hartford 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, 2015 and 2014, 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2013 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, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2014 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, 2015 and 2014 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2015 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, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the Payment Register Detail Report, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 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 Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2015 and one from 2014:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Detail Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Receipt Detail Report. 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 Detail Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts plus 1 advance for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Receipt Detail Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2015 and all four from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's History For 1099 Vendors Report from 2015 and five from 2014.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Detail 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, 2013.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Detail Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2015 or 2014 or debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to debt service fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.
4. For new debt issued during 2015, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a police cruiser. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased a police cruiser in January of 2015.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for five employees from 2014 from the Wage Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage 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 in the employee's 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, 2015 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 2015. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2016	12/31/15	\$ 1,569.25	\$ 1,569.25
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	12/31/15	\$ 317.06	\$ 317.06
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	12/31/15	\$ 2,615.65	\$ 2,615.65

3. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 to determine if township employees and/or trustees were reimbursed for out-of-pocket insurance premiums. We noted no such reimbursements.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and ten from the year ended 2014 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, Police District and Road & Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2015 and 2014 to determine whether, for the General, Police District 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 2015 and 2014 for the following funds: General, Police District and Road & Bridge funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report except for the Police District Fund. The Appropriation Status Report recorded appropriations for the Police District Fund of \$174,678 for 2015. However, the appropriation resolutions reflected \$142,100. A difference of \$32,578. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts recorded on the appropriation resolutions 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, Police District and Road & Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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, 2015 and 2014 for the General, Police District and Road & Bridge fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. We scanned the 2015 and 2014 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports 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.
7. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having negative cash fund balance.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 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.

Other Compliance

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires townships to file their financial information in the HINKLE system formerly known as the Annual Financial Data Reporting System (AFDRS) within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed AFDRS to verify the Township filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

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, the Board of Trustees, 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

Columbus, Ohio

June 24, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

HARTFORD TOWNSHIP

TRUMBULL 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 26, 2016**