ROSS TOWNSHIP GREENE COUNTY

AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010 – 2009



Board of Trustees Ross Township 6272 Grape Grove Road Jamestown, Ohio 45335

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Ross Township, Greene County, prepared by Manning & Associates CPAs, LLC, for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010. 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. Ross Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

Dave Yost Auditor of State

July 28, 2011



ROSS TOWNSHIP GREENE COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE	
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1	





INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Ross Township Greene County 6272 Grape Grove Road Jamestown, Ohio 45335

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Ross Township, Greene County (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, 2010 and 2009, 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, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
- 2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2008 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, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
- 4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 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, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
- 5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates written 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 2010 and one from 2009:
 - 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.
- We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010 and 2009:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

- 3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and all from 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL 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 report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
- 2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
- 3. We obtained a summary of bond debt activity for 2010 and 2009 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to Bond 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.
- 4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Road and Bridge Fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed. The Township did not record the proceeds in a bond fund as required by Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.09(E). The proceeds were recorded to the Road and Bridge Fund, as previously stated.
- 5. For new debt issued during 2009, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a dump truck. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased a dump truck in September 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

- 1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary).
 We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the fund and account code 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. No exceptions noted, except for the posting of the Trustees' salaries to proper funds. Further review was conducted below in section 4.
- 2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2010 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 2010. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income	January 31,	December		
taxes & Medicare	2011	31, 2010	\$1,708.94	\$1,708.94
State income taxes	January 31,	December		
	2011	31, 2010	\$309.54	\$309.54
School District	January 31,	December		
Income Tax	2011	31, 2010	\$172.47	\$172.47
OPERS retirement	January 30,	December		
	2011	29, 2010	\$1,509.63	\$1,509.63

We found no exceptions.

- 3. For the pay periods ended March 9, 2010 and August 11, 2009, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries to the General, Gasoline Tax, and Motor Vehicle License Tax Funds. We found exceptions. Further review was conducted below in section 4.
- 4. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced Board time or services performed to time or activity sheets. We found exceptions.

The Trustees' maintained calendars that documented the activity performed on a given day, it did not appear they were being utilized to calculate the allocations charged to the funds. Two of the Trustees salaries had been charged 100% General Fund and one 100% to Motor Vehicle License Tax Fund for the time period ended March 9, 2010. For the pay period ended August 11, 2009, one of the trustee's salaries was charged 100% to the General, one to the Gasoline Tax, and one to the Motor Vehicle License Tax Funds. Further review of Trustee salaries indicated 67% was charged to General Fund and 33% was charged to special revenue funds for 2010 and 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

A review of Trustees' calendars against the time charged to the General and Special Revenue funds determined that the total amount paid from each fund was appropriate when considering the entire year and did not result in the General Fund being undercharged either year. The Trustees' calendars should be utilized in calculating the allocation and a diligent approach taken to properly allocate the salaries to the funds on a monthly basis.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

- 1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 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 amounts 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 and Gasoline Tax funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund in 2010. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General Fund of \$64,591 for 2010. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$59,613. 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 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License 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 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle License and Gasoline Tax funds. The amounts in the resolution agreed to the amounts recorded on the Appropriation Status Report, with the exception of the General Fund in 2009. The Appropriation Status Report recorded budgeted appropriations for the General Fund for 2009 of \$229,631. However, the appropriation resolution reflected \$229,031 in total General Fund appropriations. The Fiscal Officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to the amounts approved in the appropriations resolution to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.

Compliance - Budgetary (Continued)

- 4. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Motor Vehicle License and Gasoline funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General, Motor vehicle License and Gasoline 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, 2010 and 2009. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. The Township established a Debt Service Fund during 2009 to segregate bonds proceeds and related debt service payments, in compliance with Section 5705.09 and 2 CFR Part 176.210.
- 7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$1,000 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.

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, 2010 and 2009 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 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21)
 - Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (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 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.07)
 - e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.264)
 - f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (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)

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures (Continued)

We identified a purchase of a new dump truck exceeding \$50,000 in 2009, subject to the Ohio Rev. Code Section 515.07. For this purchase, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 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 Trustees and Fiscal Officer will review the Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.24(C) and make the necessary changes to their current procedures in order for the Trustees' salaries to be properly allocated based on the duties performed in a given month.

The Fiscal Officer will also periodically review the budgetary amounts filed with the County Auditor to the amounts recorded in the UAN System and make any necessary adjustments.

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.

Manning & Associates CPAs, LLC Dayton, Ohio

May 23, 2011



ROSS TOWNSHIP

GREENE 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.

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

Susan Babbitt

CERTIFIED AUGUST 9, 2011