



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

EASTERN SUBURBAN REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
CUYAHOGA 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

Eastern Suburban Regional Council of Governments
Cuyahoga County
6154 Mayfield Road
Mayfield Heights, Ohio 44124

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Council members and the management of the Eastern Suburban Regional Council of Governments (the Council) 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

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 Transaction Ledger to the December 31, 2009 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. 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 Transaction Ledger. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the Council's financial institution. 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 five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February statements. 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.

Member Contributions

We haphazardly selected five member contribution cash receipt from the year ended December 31, 2011 and five member contribution cash receipt from the year ended December 31, 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Transaction Ledger. 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 fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Transaction Ledger, we re-footed checks recorded as disbursements for insurance, and checks recorded as traffic unit for 2011. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Transaction Ledger 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 Transaction Ledger 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Transaction Ledger for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for projects requiring the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We identified no projects subject to the aforementioned prevailing wage requirements.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Council'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 Council, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

November 29, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

EASTERN SUBURBAN REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

CUYAHOGA 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
DECEMBER 18, 2012**