



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Washington Township
Stark County
5789 Beachwood Avenue NE
Alliance, Ohio 44601

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Washington Township (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 Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2013 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, 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 institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
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.

Cash and Investments – (Continued)

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. 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. 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 noted the first half 2014 was posted to Homestead and Rollback (535) instead of Real Estate (101)
 - 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 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 Reports from 2014 and five from 2013.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above report(s) 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. The prior audit 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 issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees 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 code(s) 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. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel file was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
 - c. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged
 - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
 - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

3. 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:

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, 2015	January 5, 2015	\$1,338.27	\$1,338.27
State income taxes	January 15, 2015	December 27, 2014	\$244.98	\$244.98
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2015	December 27, 2014	\$2,818.73	\$2818.73

4. For the pay periods ended September 28, 2014 and January 27, 2013, we recomputed the allocation of the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salaries to the General, Fire and Road Fund per the Employee Detail Adjustment Report. We found no exceptions.

5. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salary for time or services performed to supporting certifications the Revised Code requires. We found no exceptions.

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 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 ten 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 *Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances*, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Road and Bridge, and Fire District funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the accounting system, for the following funds tested, General Fund, Road and Bridge Fund and Fire District Fund in 2013 and 2014. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$129,895.78 for 2014 and \$200,535.90 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$94,318.63 in 2014 and \$210,887.14 in 2013. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Road and Bridge fund of \$159,533.05 for 2014 and \$158,702.50 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$156,500.00 in 2014 and \$153,539.00 in 2013. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Fire District fund of \$120,657.88 for 2014 and \$149,963.77 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$109,232.00 in 2014 and \$107,197.00 in 2013. 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, Gas Tax and Road Levy 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 2014 and 2013 for the following funds: General Fund, Motor Vehicle License Fund and Gas Tax Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report. We found no exceptions.

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, Road and Bridge and Road Levy funds for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. We noted that for 2014 General Fund appropriations exceeded certified resources by \$18,842.42, Road and Bridge appropriations exceed certified resources by \$37,351.28 and Road Levy appropriations exceeded certified resources by \$86,064.74. We noted that for 2013 Road Levy appropriations exceeded certified resources by \$100,000, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Trustees should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Township to incur fund balance deficits.
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, Fire District and Road Levy 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, 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 exceeding \$5,000 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 - .16 restrict. We noted there was a transfer out of \$37,905 from the Road Levy. However, this was not a transfer it was payment for a mower and ditcher (check 19832 for \$31,175) and a high pressure ditcher head (check 19748 for \$6,730) this was misclassified to transfers out. No actual transfers occurred.
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, 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.

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

Columbus, Ohio

May 28, 2015



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP

STARK 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**