Madison Township
Scioto County
Agreed-Upon Procedures
For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010

Phone: (740) 876.8548 Fax (888) 876.8549



Board of Trustees Madison Township P.O. Box 253 Minford, Ohio 45653

We have reviewed the Agreed-Upon Procedures report of Madison Township, Scioto County, prepared by Millhuff-Stang, CPA, Inc., for the period January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011. 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. The Madison Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

Dave Yost Auditor of State

July 16, 2012



Madison Township Scioto County Table of Contents

For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010

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





Madison Township Scioto County P.O. Box 253 Minford, Ohio 45653

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees (the Board) and the management of Madison Township, Scioto 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, 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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2009 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, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
- 4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 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, 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 bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the Cash Journal, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Millhuff-Stang, CPA, Inc. 1428 Gallia Street, Suite 2 Portsmouth, Ohio 45662 Phone: 740.876.8548 ■ Fax: 888.876.8549

Website: www.millhuffstangcpa.com ■ Email: natalie@millhuffstangcpa.com

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 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We also traced the advances noted on the *Statement* to the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds as required by Ohio Revised 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 and one advance for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
- 3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and all from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2011 and five from 2010.
 - 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 audit documentation we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2009. This amount agreed to the Township's January 1, 2010 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

	Principal		
	outstanding as of		
Issue	December 31, 2009:		
Truck Loan	\$10,168,21		

- 2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
- 3. We obtained a summary of loan debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Gasoline 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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 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 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 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, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period during 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer	Amount	Amount		
share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Due	Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2012	January 4, 2012	\$892.88	\$892.88
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	January 4, 2012	435.05	435.05
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	January 3, 2012	1,981.34	1,981.34

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

- 1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 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 Revised Code Section 5705.41(D). We found four instances 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 Revised 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 Official Certificate of Estimated Resources*, required by Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire Special Levy Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts agreed.
- 2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire Special Levy 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 Revised Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.

- 3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Revised Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Gasoline Tax and Fire Special Levy Funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report.
- 4. Ohio Revised Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibit appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire Special Levy Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
- 5. Ohio Revised 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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Gasoline Tax and Fire Special Levy Funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.
- 6. Ohio Revised 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, 2011 and 2010. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. The Township established the FEMA special revenue fund during 2011 to segregate Federal Emergency Management Agency receipts and disbursements in compliance with Section 5705.09.
- 7. We scanned the 2011 and 2010 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers which Ohio Revised 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 Revised Code Section 5705.13. We noted the Township did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

- 1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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. (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Revised Code Section 5549.21)
 - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Revised Code Section 511.12)
 - c. Equipment for fire protection and communication costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Revised Code Sections 505.37 to 505.42)
 - d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Revised Code Section 515.01 and 515.07)
 - e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) to achieve energy savings (Ohio Revised Code Section 505.264)
 - f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (\$50,000 effective September 29, 2011) (Ohio Revised 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 Revised Code Section 505.37(A))
- h. Maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000 (Ohio Revised Code Section 5575.01)
- i. Construction or reconstruction of a township road exceeding \$15,000/per mile (Ohio Revised Code Section 5575.01)

We identified asphalt paving contracts exceeding \$45,000, subject to Ohio Revised Code Section 5575.01. For these projects, we noted that the Township advertised the projects in the local newspaper, competitively bid the projects, and awarded the projects to the lowest responsive and responsible bidders.

- 2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 Revised 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.
- 3. For the road maintenance projects described in step 1 above, we noted that the Township did not prepare or obtain signed contracts; however, we noted that certified payroll reports were submitted documenting that the contractors paid prevailing wages as required by Ohio Revised Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05.

Officials' Response

We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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.

Natalie Millhuff-Stang, CPA

Natalii Whillhuff Stanz

President/Owner

Millhuff-Stang, CPA, Inc.

April 9, 2012





MADISON TOWNSHIP

SCIOTO 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 JULY 26, 2012