



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Paint Township
Wayne County
P.O. Box 178
Mt. Eaton, Ohio 44659

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Paint Township, Wayne 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, 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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We compared the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found a variance of \$5,077 due to the recognition of proceeds and expenses from a 2008 bank construction loan in the amount of \$240,000 and \$234,923, respectively, within the audited financial statements. The Township has failed to record this activity within the accounting system. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 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, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 bank reconciliation. However, the Township did not include the remaining unspent balance of construction loan proceeds (see step 2 above) in the amount of \$4,886 and maintained within a separate bank account in the December 31, 2012 system cash balance. We recommend the Township recognize all depository cash balances within the accounting system and bank reconciliation to ensure Township cash is properly stated and reported.

Cash (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. However, included on the December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation was an "Other Adjusting Factor" in the amounts of \$1,941. Of this balance, we were only able to verify \$842 as "Withholding Vouchers". The remaining balance of \$1,099 was not supported. The Township should ensure all cash reconciling items are properly supported.
 - 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 2012 and one from 2011:
 - 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 fund(s) 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 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipts 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 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - 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 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 loan outstanding as of December 31, 2010. This amount agreed to the Township's January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
First Merit Bank Loan	\$195,345

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail 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.

Debt (continued)

3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Road and Bridge Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report noting the Township paid an additional \$9,349 and \$18,697 in principle payments in 2012 and 2011, respectively. 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 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 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 code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files, 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, 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:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$1,287	\$1,287
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$348	\$348
Local income tax	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$77	\$77
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 27, 2012	\$2,261	\$2,261
OP&F retirement	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$1,138	\$1,138

3. For all of 2012 and 2011, we recomputed the allocation of the Trustees' compensation to the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire Levy Funds per the Employee Detail Adjustment Report. We compared the percentage allocation approved by the Trustees for each year to the actual percentage allocations noting variances between the approved and actual allocations. For 2012, the approved allocation was 10% General Fund, 30% Fire Levy Fund, and 60% Road & Bridge Fund. However, the actual allocation was 3% General Fund, 7% Fire Levy Fund, and 90% Road & Bridge Fund. For 2011, the approved allocation was 20% General Fund, 20% Fire Levy Fund, and 60% Road & Bridge Fund. However, the actual allocation was 3% General Fund, 11% Fire Levy Fund, and 86% Road & Bridge Fund. The majority of the allocation variances were due to the Township allocating 100% of health and dental insurance premiums to the Road & Bridge Fund. We recommend the Township ensure approved fund allocation percentages are implemented and followed (see payroll step 4 for further discussion of Trustee payroll allocation). Furthermore, we also recommend the Township incorporate health insurance premiums into the calculation of Trustee pay allocations.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (continued)

4. For all of 2012 and 2011, the Township Trustees did not certify salary for time or services performed and charged to funds other than the General Fund. Salary certifications for each pay period are required by the Ohio Revised Code for Township Trustee and Fiscal Officer salaries charged to funds other than the General Fund. We recommend the Township ensure salary certifications are implemented and completed for each pay period of the fiscal year as required by the Ohio Revised Code Section 505.24 and discussed in Auditor of State Bulletin 2011-07.

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 Revenue Status Report for the General, Gasoline Tax and Permissive Motor Vehicle funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General, Gasoline Tax and Permissive Motor Vehicle Funds in 2012. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Permissive Motor Vehicle funds of \$65,855, \$87,000, and \$4,203 for 2012. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$70,775, \$84,400, and \$162. 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax and Permissive Motor Vehicle 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, Gasoline Tax, and Permissive Motor Vehicle. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.

Compliance – Budgetary (continued)

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, Gasoline Tax and Permissive Motor Vehicle 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, Gasoline Tax and Permissive Motor Vehicle 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, 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 \$10 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 initial "D".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

September 27, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PAINT 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
NOVEMBER 7, 2013**