



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Southington Township  
Trumbull County  
3419 State Route 534  
Southington, Ohio 44470

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Southington 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, 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Summary by Fund Report. We noted exceptions of \$268 and \$217, respectively.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 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 investments held at December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2012 and one from 2011:
  - 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 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipt Journal included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011:
  - a. We compared the amount from the above report 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 audit documentation, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
First Place Bank – Town Hall Basement	116,252
Deutsche Bank – 2005 Rosenbauer Pumper Truck	113,568
First Place Bank – Squad Loan	69,272

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Check Register Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.

**Debt – (Continued)**

3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt service fund payments reported in the Check Register Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Journal - Employee Detail Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Journal - Employee Detail 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 documented in the employees' personnel files 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, 2012 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 2012. 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, 2013	12/5/12	1,304.94	1,304.94
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	12/10/12	260.49	260.49
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	1/8/13	3,261.86	3,261.86

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Check Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 Check Register 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 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 Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Receipts for the General, Road/Bridge, and Fire District funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The Fiscal Officer did not enter any of the estimated resources into the accounting system in 2011 as shown below. The Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Receipts recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and the Road/Bridge fund however, they did not agree to the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* as shown below.

2011	Official Certificate of Estimated Resources	Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Receipts	Variance
General Fund	\$158,336	\$0	\$158,336
Road/Bridge	\$106,641	\$0	\$106,641
Fire District	\$39,649	\$0	\$39,649

2012	Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources	Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Receipts	Variance
General Fund	\$295,010	\$298,010	\$3,000
Road/Bridge	\$102,673	\$106,342	\$3,669

The Fiscal Officer should enter estimated receipts into the accounting system and periodically compare amounts recorded in the Budgeted and Actual Reports 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Road/Bridge, and Fire District 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Road/Bridge, and Fire District. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report.

**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/Bridge, and Fire District funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. Contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39, we noted that General and Fire District fund appropriations for 2011 exceeded certified resources by \$10,570 and \$37,051, respectfully. We also noted that the General and Road/Bridge fund appropriations for 2012 exceeded certified resources by \$19,303 and \$10,000, respectively. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Road/Bridge and Fire District fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Reports. 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 Journal Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and 2011 Receipt Journal Report and Appropriation 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.
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.

**Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

We inquired of management and scanned the Check Register Report for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 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

October 9, 2013





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**SOUTHINGTON TOWNSHIP**

**TRUMBULL 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  
NOVEMBER 7, 2013**