



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



HINCKLEY TOWNSHIP  
MEDINA 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

Hinckley Township  
Medina County  
1410 Ridge Road  
P.O. Box 344  
Hinckley, Ohio 44233

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Hinckley Township, Medina 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, 2014 and 2013, 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, 2014 and December 31, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2013 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, 2014 and 2013 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2014 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions for some accounts and we observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website for some accounts. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.

### **Cash and Investments (Continued)**

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2014 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.
6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2014 and 2013 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2013 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 2014 and one from 2013:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to 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 plus seven advances each year for 2014 and 2013. 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 2014 and five from 2013. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Settlement Sheets from 2014 and five from 2013.
  - 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.

**Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2014 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2013 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was 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, 2012.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. We noted no new debt issuance or any debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employee from 2014 and one payroll check for five employees from 2013 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 employees' personnel files or 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, 2014 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 2014. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b><u>Date Due</u></b>	<b><u>Date Paid</u></b>	<b><u>Amount Due</u></b>	<b><u>Amount Paid</u></b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2015	December 29, 2014	\$5,498.62	\$5,498.62
State income taxes	January 15, 2015	December 29, 2014	\$3,260.52	\$3,260.52
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2015	December 29, 2014	\$20,192.40	\$20,192.40

**Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

3. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 to determine if township employees and/or trustees were reimbursed for out-of-pocket insurance premiums. Insurance reimbursements made were in accordance with the negotiated agreement between the Trustees and the police patrolmen.

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2014 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2013 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 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 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 Fund, Road and Bridge Fund, and Police Levy Fund for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not to the amount recorded in the accounting system as noted below:

<u>December 31, 2014</u>	<u>Estimated Receipts Per the Revenue Status Report</u>	<u>Estimated Receipts Per the Amended Certificate</u>	<u>Variance</u>
General Fund	\$638,695	\$537,345	\$101,350
Road and Bridge Fund	339,200	288,400	50,800
Police Levy Fund	1,434,200	1,289,001	145,199



**Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)**

<u>December 31, 2013</u>	<u>Estimated Receipts Per the Revenue Status Report</u>	<u>Estimated Receipts Per the Amended Certificate</u>	<u>Variance</u>
General Fund	\$375,951	\$311,956	\$63,995
Road and Bridge Fund	603,003	582,600	20,403
Police Levy Fund	1,284,005	1,259,711	24,294

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 2014 and 2013 to determine whether, for the General Fund, Road and Bridge and Fund, Police Levy Fund, 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 2014 and 2013 for the General Fund, Road and Bridge Fund, and Police Levy Fund. 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 Fund, Road and Bridge Fund, and Police Levy Fund for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. 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, 2014 and 2013 for the General Fund, Road and Bridge Fund, and Police Levy Fund, 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, 2014 and 2013. 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 2014 and 2013 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.

**Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)**

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 Fund Status Report for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 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**

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 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

May 27, 2015



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**HINCKLEY TOWNSHIP**

**MEDINA 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  
JUNE 23, 2015**