



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Freedom Township
Wood County
198 Water Street
P.O. Box 796
Pemberville, Ohio 43450-0796

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Freedom Township, Wood County, Ohio (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 Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Status Report. 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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
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 (such as outstanding checks) 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.

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 and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

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 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.
2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. 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 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the Wood County Auditors DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. 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 loan outstanding as of December 31, 2010. This amount agreed to the Township's January 1, 2011 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
Commercial Loan- Ambulance	\$102,849

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail 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.

3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2012 and 2011 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to the Ambulance and Emergency Medical Services fund and Permissive Motor Vehicle License Tax 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. For new debt issued during 2012 and 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a tractor and a pumper. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased a tractor in May of 2012 and a pumper in December 2012.

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 Payment Register Detail Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payment Register 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 code to which the check was posted was 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. 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 and Medicare and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	\$5,085.76	\$5,085.77
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	595.50	595.50
Village of Pemberville Income Tax	January 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	493.54	493.54
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	December 31, 2012	1,832.33	1,832.35
School District Income Tax	January 15, 2013	December 31, 2012	334.48	334.48

3. For the pay period ended May 31, 2012, we recomputed the allocation of the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salaries to the General and Fire and EMS Fund per the Employee Detail Adjustment Report. We found no exceptions.
4. For the pay period described in the preceding step, we traced the Fiscal Officer's and Boards' salaries for time or services performed to supporting certifications the Revised Code requires. We found no exceptions.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 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 one instance 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 *Amended 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, Gasoline Tax and the Fire and EMS funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts agreed for the Gasoline Tax fund each year. For the other funds tested, the 2011 Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and the Fire and EMS funds of \$108,159 and \$217,070, respectively. However, the final 2011 *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$108,133 and \$218,047, for the General and the Fire and EMS funds, respectively. The 2012 Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General and the Fire and EMS funds of \$103,863 and \$518,082, respectively. However, the final 2012 *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$105,398 and \$525,989, for the General and the Fire and EMS funds, respectively. 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 2012 and 2011 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Fire and EMS 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, Gasoline Tax, and Fire and EMS. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, Gasoline Tax, and Fire and EMS funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Fire and EMS fund, 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, 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 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers 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 and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail 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 "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 13, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

FREEDOM TOWNSHIP

WOOD 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
MAY 28, 2013**