



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SUGARCREEK TOWNSHIP
TUSCARAWAS COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Sugarcreek Township
Tuscarawas County
225 Rhine St.
Sugarcreek, Ohio 44681

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Sugarcreek Township, Tuscarawas 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, 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found one exception wherein the Permanent Fund balance and the Investment Trust fund balance did not agree. The Cemetery Endowment and Mausoleum Trust Funds with balances of \$1,755 and \$785, respectively, were improperly recorded to two separate Investment Trust Funds. We brought this to management's attention. The Township corrected the balances of the Investment Trust, Cemetery Endowment and Mausoleum Trust fund balances for these items. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund to the December 31, 2014 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report. 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 balance to the amount appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.

Cash (Continued)

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 and Intergovernmental 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 Receipt Detail Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds as required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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 for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Receipt Detail Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all four 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 AP Disbursements with Description 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 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 audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2013. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2014 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2013:
Excavator Loan	\$20,845

The Excavator Loan does not meet the criteria for any of the debt allowed in Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133. The Ohio Rev. Code contains various methods of incurring debt for Townships. Installment loans and promissory notes with banking institutions are not legal methods of debt for Townships. The Township should consult with legal counsel when the Board of Trustees anticipates incurring future debt.

Debt (Continued)

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. However, we noted one instance where the Township did not post debt proceeds of \$25,000 for a materials loan to the Township's Receipt Detail Report. To properly report debt activity on the financial statements, the Fiscal Officer should record debt proceeds and related expenditure for each debt instrument to the Township ledgers. Additionally, the material loan does not meet the criteria for any of the debt allowed in Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133. This non-compliance was also identified in step 1 above.
3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2015 and 2014 and a Commercial & Savings Bank invoice attached to the voucher packet for warrant #17174 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule and invoice to miscellaneous 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. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in Receipt Detail Report to ensure the correct amounts are posted to the correct funds. The debt proceeds of \$25,000 from the materials loan were not recorded in the Receipt Detail Report, as noted in step 2 above.
5. For new debt issued during 2015 and 2014, we inspected the October 21, 2014 minutes, noting the Township used the proceeds to purchase materials for chip and seal projects. We noted the Township spent the loan proceeds according to the provisions stated in the October 21, 2014 minutes; however, the Township did not record the expenditure of \$25,000 for the purchase of the chip and seal materials in the Township's ledgers.

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 Payment Register Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the 2015 Payroll Records Reports 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 employee's timesheet 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. 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	January 31, 2016	January 12, 2016	\$1,570	\$1,570
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 29, 2015	\$385	\$385
Local income tax	February 29, 2016	January 12, 2016	\$59	\$59
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	January 20, 2016	\$2,183	\$2,183

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

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 § 5705.41(D). We found one instance 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 § 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 § 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General and Road and Bridge Funds for 2015 and the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance Funds for 2014. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and Road and Bridge funds of \$111,138 and \$139,250, respectively for 2015. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$111,170, and \$113,944, respectively. The Revenue Status

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance funds of \$114,688, \$136,050, and \$74,800, respectively, for 2014. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$114,804, \$131,950, and \$79,500, respectively. The Fiscal Officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report 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 2015 and 2014 to determine whether, for the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance 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 § 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2015 and 2014 for the following funds: General, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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 and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code § 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, Road and Bridge, and Fire & Ambulance funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
6. Ohio Rev. Code § 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 § 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 \$10 which Ohio Rev. Code §§ 5705.14 - .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these §§ prohibit, or for which § 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 § 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 § 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

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 § 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 § 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. No exceptions noted.

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

August 1, 2016



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

SUGARCREEK TOWNSHIP

TUSCARAWAS 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
AUGUST 23, 2016**