



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Tuscarawas Township
Coshocton County
714 Cedar Street
PO Box 664
Coshocton, Ohio 43812

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Tuscarawas Township, Coshocton 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 Cash Summary by Fund report to the December 31, 2010 balances 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 Cash Summary by Fund report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions. 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(s). 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 inspected the Fund Balance Adjustments report to determine whether the Finding For Adjustment identified in the prior agreed-upon procedures report, due from the General fund, payable to the Road and Bridge fund, was properly posted to the report. We found no exceptions.
7. 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 and Other Confirmable 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 Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s) 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 Revenue Ledger to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Revenue Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all four receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and five from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report 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 fund(s). 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 note outstanding as of December 31, 2010. This amount agreed to the Townships January 1, 2011 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2010:
Ohio Heritage Truck & Equipment Note	\$15,858

Debt (Continued)

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. We noted a new Promissory Note obtained through Ohio Heritage Bank on August 23, 2012 for \$71,697 to purchase a back hoe. We also noted the final principal and interest payment on the truck and equipment loan was made on May 26, 2011 to Ohio Heritage Bank from the Gasoline Tax in the amounts of \$15,858 and \$733, respectively. 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 the principal and interest payment from the related debt amortization schedule to the Gasoline Tax Fund payment 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 with payments. However, the following exception was noted: Ohio Rev. Code Chapter 133 allows various methods for subdivisions to incur debt. Section 133.22 allows a subdivision to issue anticipatory securities; Section 133.10 allows anticipation securities in anticipation of current property tax revenues or in anticipation of current revenues in and for any fiscal year from any source or combination of sources, including distributions of any federal or state monies, other than the proceeds of property taxes levied by the subdivision; Section 133.14 allows the issuance of securities for the purpose of paying all or any portion of the costs of any permanent improvement that the subdivision is authorized, alone or in cooperation with other persons, to acquire, improve, or construct; and Section 133.18 allows the taxing authority of a subdivision by legislation to submit to the electors of the subdivision the question of issuing any general obligation bonds, for one purpose, that the subdivision has power or authority to issue. However, In order to proceed with these allowable securities, Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.262 requires the Resolution adopted to issue notes be by unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees. In 2012, the Board of Trustees and Fiscal Officer signed a promissory note with Ohio Heritage Bank for a back hoe purchase. Since the Resolution to incur this debt was by a 2-1 vote and not a unanimous vote, the promissory note with the financial institution and the Township does not meet the requirements set forth in Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.262.
4. We reviewed the Receipt Register Report for the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded, but the proceeds were not recorded. The Township used the bank issued check for the purchase. Consequently, 2012 note proceeds were understated \$71,694.
5. For new debt issued during 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a back hoe. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township did purchase the back hoe in August of 2012 but the Township used the bank issued check for the purchase. Consequently, 2012 capital outlay expenditures were understated \$71,694.

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 Register - Detail and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll 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(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record and time sheets for road maintenance employees and as required by statute for the elected officials. 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	January 31, 2013	11/9/12, 12/14/12, 1/7/13	\$3,547.08	\$3,547.08
Ohio income taxes	January 31, 2013	12/31/12	\$551.51	\$551.51
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	1/10/13	\$2,594.66	\$2,594.66

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail 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 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. We found three instances out of twenty 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 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, Gasoline Tax and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the General Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General fund of \$108,576 for 2011. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected \$104,576. 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, 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 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report, except for the General fund in 2012. The Appropriation Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. appropriated) expenditures for the General fund of \$255,450 for 2012. However, the appropriation measure reflected \$239,450. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report to amounts approved on the Appropriation measures to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
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 License Tax and Gasoline Tax 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, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Gasoline Tax funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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. The Township established the WODA Road Maintenance Fund, a Capital Projects Fund Type, during 2011 to segregate receipts and disbursements for road maintenance and repairs of roads inside the Olde Hickory Subdivision in compliance with Section 5705.09 and an agreement entered into with the Coshocton County Commissioners. We also noted that the Trustees established the Papermill Road Maintenance Fund, another Capital Projects Fund Type, during 2012 to segregate receipts and disbursements for any repairs or damages to Township Road 270 (Papermill Road) in compliance with Section 5705.09 and an agreement entered into with Enterprise Liquids Pipelin, LLC.
7. We scanned the 2012 and 2011 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$0 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 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 8, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

TUSCARAWAS TOWNSHIP

COSHOCTON 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 9, 2013**