

***BLOOMINGGROVE TOWNSHIP***

***RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO***

**AGREED UPON PROCEDURES**

**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012**







# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees  
Bloominggrove Township  
466 State Route 603 West  
Shiloh, Ohio 44878

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Bloominggrove Township, Richland County, prepared by Charles E. Harris & Associates, Inc., for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report 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. Bloominggrove Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost  
Auditor of State

March 17, 2014

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**BLOOMINGGROVE TOWNSHIP  
RICHLAND COUNTY  
Audit Report  
For the Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

Bloomington Township  
Richland County  
466 State Route 603 West  
Shiloh, Ohio 44878

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Bloomington Township (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, 2013 and 2012, 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, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2011 balances to documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Cash Journal. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2013 and 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2013 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, 2013 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2013 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 investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 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 and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2013 and one from 2012:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal. 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 Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2013 and 2012. We noted the Receipts Journal included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected four (all) receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2013 and four (all) from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2013 and five from 2012.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Journal. 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.

**Debt**

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following capital lease outstanding as of December 31, 2011. These amounts agreed to the Township's January 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2011:
Capital Lease	\$17,675

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Receipt Journal and Cash Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of capital lease and promissory note debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to general, gasoline tax, road and bridge, and motor vehicle fund payments reported in the Cash Journal. 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 attempted to agree the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Receipt Journal. The amounts did not agree due to the Township failing to record the receipt.
5. For new debt issued during 2013 and 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a truck. We scanned the Cash Journal but were unable to verify the Township purchased a truck due to the bank paying the vendor directly and the Township failed to record the receipt and disbursement in the Cash Journal.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 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 recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
  - c. 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 minute record. 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 files and minute record 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 and fund 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, 2013 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 2013. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	\$1,148.71	\$1,148.71
State income taxes	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	\$397.00	\$397.00
Local income tax	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	\$192.70	\$192.70

OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	January 13, 2014	\$708.99 employee \$992.58 employer	\$1,701.57
------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--	------------

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. From the Cash Journal, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for general government, and checks recorded as public works in the Road and Bridge fund for 2013. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Cash Journal for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 2012 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 Cash Journal 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. Since the Township does not utilize an Estimated Receipts ledger, we could not compare the total estimated receipts from the Amended Certificate of the Total Amount From All Sources Available For Expenditures and Balances required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1). The Fiscal Officer should utilize an Estimated Receipts ledger to compare actual receipts to the estimates, so the Trustees can properly budget and monitor revenues.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle and Road and Bridge 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 Ledger for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle, and Road and Bridge funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation ledger.
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, Motor Vehicle, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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, 2013 and 2012 for the General, Motor Vehicle, and Road and Bridge fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. 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 Receipts Journal for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and 2012 Receipts Ledger and Appropriation Ledger 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.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger 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 Cash Journal for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 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, 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.

*Charles Harris Associates*

**CHARLES E. HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC.**

February 21, 2014

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**BLOOMINGGROVE TOWNSHIP**

**RICHLAND 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  
MARCH 27, 2014**