



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Perry Township
Lawrence County
61 Private Drive 338
Ironton, Ohio 45638

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Perry Township, Lawrence County (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

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 Ledger Report to the December 31, 2013 balances 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 Ledger Report to the December 31, 2014 balances in the Fund Ledger 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 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, 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 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.

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 2015 and one from 2014:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue Receipt Register 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 Revenue Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Revenue Receipt 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 2015 and five from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Audit Trail from 2015 and five from 2014.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue 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.
4. We scanned the Revenue Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included other confirmable receipts above 10% of total funds' receipts for 2015 and 2014 that were not previously tested. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Time Warner and Armstrong Cable Companies to the Township during 2015 with the Companies. We also noted for 2015 a receipt in the amount of \$22,249 that was posted as Taxes in the Permissive Motor Vehicle License Fund that was a reimbursement for a check written out of the Permissive Motor Vehicle License Fund in 2015 to the Lawrence County Engineer for the Township's share of an Ohio Public Works Commission County/Township Joint Resurfacing Project which did not take place.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
 - b. 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 bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Township's January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
Fire Truck Bonds	\$132,200

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Receipt Register 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 bonded debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Fire District 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 noted that the Township made an extra principal payment in 2014 which resulted in the debt being repaid fully in 2015 instead of 2016 as indicated in the amortization schedule.

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 an exception during 2015 where the Trustees and Fiscal Officer were over-paid due to a change in budgetary receipt amounts between the Official Certificate of Estimated Resources and the Amended Certificate of Estimated Resources. The budget increased from \$388,405 to \$590,920, thus causing the statutory established salary rates of the Township Officials to fall into a lower budget category for the first month of 2015 and then return to the rate that was used by the Township for the entire year. The first month's budget being lower caused an overpayment of Trustees at \$43 for each Trustee, and the Fiscal Officer was over-paid \$118.
 - 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 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, 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	March 29, 2016	\$1,001	\$1,001
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 31, 2015	\$413	\$413
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	December 31, 2015	\$1,935	\$1,935

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. Insurance reimbursements made were in compliance with ORC 505.60 and 505.601.

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. The Township did not receive images of checks identified on the bank statements. We found 19 instances where there were no returned, cancelled check images provided by the bank to the Township.

Auditor of State Bulletin 2004-010 states an auditor can regard electronic imaging of checks as evidence when performing an audit. The Bulletin provides, in part, that a bank may use the electronic image to create a “substitute check” for a bank that chooses to continue receiving paper checks. This substitute check has the same legal effect as the original paper check. A substitute check is a paper reproduction of the original check that: contains an image of the front and back of the original check; bears a magnetic ink character recognition (MICR) line containing all of the information appearing on the original check’s MICR line, with certain exceptions; conforms, in paper stock, dimension, and otherwise, with generally applicable banking industry standards for substitute checks; and is as suitable for automated processing as the original check. A substitute check that meets these requirements and bears the following legend is considered to be legal equivalent of the original paper check.

For governments that do not receive their cancelled original or substitute checks, Auditor of State suggest these governments request that their banks send images of the front and back of all issued checks. This will enable governments to review and scrutinize the transactions and ensure that the payees as well as the various endorsements are appropriate. As monthly bank statements are received, reconciliation between check numbers and the amounts paid should be conducted promptly. If questionable items are identified, governments should immediately request the bank investigate these items for possible adjustment to the government’s account.

Furthermore, a government may want to request a substitute check or the best available source document from the bank (e.g., copy of the front and back of the check) when a questionable item is identified that requires investigation.

The bank did not provide optical images for 19 out of the 20 cancelled checks selected for testing. By not having an image of the canceled check, it is not possible to ensure that the payees as well as the various endorsements are appropriate. This could result in a lack of sufficient audit evidence or could relate in a failure to follow the records retention laws.

We recommend the Fiscal Officer consult with their bank to have the bank provide images of both the front and reverse side of each cancelled check for disbursements. As an alternative, the bank could send the original cancelled checks back to the Township or provide this information in electronic form (i.e. – CD).

- 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 disbursements requiring certification were not certified, 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.

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, Fire District, and Road and 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, Fire District, and Road and 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, Fire District, and Road and Bridge. 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, Fire District, and Road and 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, Fire District, and Road and Bridge Funds, 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, 2015 and 2014. 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 2015 and 2014 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 Ohio Rev. Code 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.
9. 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 a negative cash fund balance.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

1. 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.

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

Columbus, Ohio

March 31, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PERRY TOWNSHIP

LAWRENCE 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
APRIL 19, 2016