
ALGER & ASSOCIATES, Inc

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS



EAST UNION TOWNSHIP

WAYNE COUNTY, OHIO

AGREED-UPON-PROCEDURES

A&A

FOR THE YEARS ENDED

DECEMBER 31, 2011 & 2010



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
East Union Township
P.O. Box 222
Apple Creek, Ohio 44606

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of East Union Township, Wayne County, prepared by Alger & Associates, LLC, for the period January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011. Based upon this review, we have accepted these reports in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. East Union Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 26, 2012

This page intentionally left blank.



ALGER & ASSOCIATES, Inc

Certified Public Accountants

EAST UNION TOWNSHIP INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

East Union Township
Wayne County
P.O. Box 222
Apple Creek, OH 44606

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of East Union Township (the Township) and the Auditor of State, 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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2009 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 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, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all the reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 & December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.

6927 Burgundy Ave. NW
North Canton, OH 44720
Phone - 330-353-5851
FAX - 330-526-8778

- 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the 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 Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010. We also selected all the from the County Auditor's Statement of Semi-Appportionment of Taxes (DTL) 2011 and five from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the 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.

Debt

1. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following Capital Lease Agreement outstanding as of December 31, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Township's January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Capital Financing Lease – Fire Truck Tanker	\$382,488

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3. We noted no new debt issuances nor any debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010.
3. We obtained a summary of Capital Lease Agreement debt activity for 2011 and 2010 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 found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail 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 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, 2011 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 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	12/30/2011	\$1,497	\$1,497
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	12/30/2011	\$652	\$652
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2012	12/30/2011	\$6,351	\$6,351

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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. We found two 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.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax 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 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 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 Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax 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, 2011 and 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers 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

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for procurements requiring competitive bidding under the following statutes:
 - a. Materials, machinery and tools used in constructing, maintaining and repairing roads and culverts, where costs exceeded \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21)
 - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 511.12)

- c. Equipment for fire protection and communication costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Sections 505.37 to 505.42)
- d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.01 & 515.07)
- e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264)
- f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Rev. Code Sections 521.02 to 521.05)
- g. Fire apparatus, mechanical resuscitators, other fire equipment, appliances, materials, fire hydrants, buildings, or fire-alarm communications equipment or service costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37(A))
- h. Maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01)
- i. Construction or reconstruction of a township road exceeding \$15,000/per mile (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01)

We identified maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000, and construction or reconstruction of a Township roads exceeding \$15,000/per mile subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01. For these projects, we noted that the Board advertised for bids in the local newspaper and accepted all bids to be used during the year for road work to be done. The bids did not specify any certain projects. When the Trustees determined which projects were to be completed they would select from the bids which company would perform the work.

- 2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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.

Officials' Response

The Township contacted the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office for an opinion on the matter regarding their bidding process. The following is the Wayne County Prosecutor's response:

"As I understand, the issue appears to be with perceived non-compliance with the requirements of §5575.01. This provision requires competitive bidding on road maintenance/repairs costing more than forty-five thousand dollars, and road construction/reconstruction costing more than fifteen thousand dollars per mile.

The Township process goes beyond these prescribed bidding requirements, as it annually requests bids for to obtain bulk materials and complete road maintenance/repairs under unit price contracts. At the time the bids are requested, weather conditions prevent the Township from knowing definitively how many and what portions of its roads will require work. Delaying the bidding process for more favorable weather to make the determination would be detrimental, and could include higher costs and a delay in the roads being repaired. Therefore, without knowing whether or not the expected road repairs will exceed the threshold limits, the Township proactively requests bids. The specifications for the expected work are available from the Township office and the notice is placed in a paper of general circulation as required. The Township accepts the bids, and then obtains the goods/services from the lowest bidder throughout the year.

The only issue of which our office is aware involved the letting of contracts for the 2011 season, and which has been addressed. In 2011, the Township accepted two bids for road resurfacing, one from a company with whom the Township had years of experience, and a slightly lower one from a new company. The Township interpreted the portion of \$5575.01 that contracts were to be given to the lowest responsible bidder, as meaning the lowest *and best* bidder. Therefore, the majority of work went to the first company, with some work being given to the new company so that the Township could evaluate its performance. Our office has had discussions with the Township and advised this was an incorrect reading of the statute, and anticipate no further issues of this nature. "

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, the Auditor of State, and others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Alger & Associates, Inc.
March 30, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

EAST UNION TOWNSHIP

WAYNE 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 10, 2012