



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Clarksfield Township  
Huron County  
5085 Eaton Road  
Wakeman, Ohio 44889-9398

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Clarksfield Township, Huron 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, 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

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 Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Fund Ledger Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. 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 balance to the amount 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 Payment Listing Report, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. 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 2013 and one from 2012:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger 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 Revenue Ledger Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2013 and 2012. We noted the Revenue Ledger Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2013 and all from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the Huron County Auditor Confirmation from 2013 and five from 2012.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) to the Township during 2013 with the OPWC. The Fiscal Officer did not record on-behalf-of grant payments in the amount of \$233,088 made by the OPWC directly to the vendor for the Ferry Road Improvement project. We recommend the Township record all memo receipt and disbursement activity for OPWC projects to a separate capital projects fund.

### **Debt**

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2011.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger Report and Appropriation Ledger Report for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. We noted the Township received an on-behalf loan from the OPWC for the Ferry Road Improvement project on September 13, 2013. Neither the loan proceeds of \$23,864, nor the corresponding expenditure were recorded on the Township's accounting system. The Fiscal Officer should have recorded the proceeds of the OPWC Ferry Road Improvement project in the Receipt Register Report in a capital projects fund created for that purpose. In order to properly reflect the benefit received from the proceeds of the loan a disbursement in the amount of \$23,864 should have also been recorded in a capital project fund created for that purpose.

3. For new debt issued during 2013, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds for the Ferry Road Improvement project. We scanned documentation received from OPWC, and noted the Township was the beneficiary of expenditures made on the Ferry Road Project in September of 2013.

**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 Wage Detail Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage 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 as documented in the employees' personnel files, minute record, Clarksfield Township timecard or as required by statute. 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 and 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 and Medicare	January 31, 2014	January 8, 2014	\$141	\$141
State income taxes	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	78	78
School District income tax	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	90	90
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	December 31, 2013	757	757

4. We inquired of management and scanned the Appropriation Ledger Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 to determine if Township employees and/or Trustees were reimbursed for out-of-pocket insurance premiums. We noted no such reimbursements.

#### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 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 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 Revenue Status Report for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax, 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 noted the Township's annual appropriation measures for 2013 and 2012 were adopted at the fund level contrary to the requirements of the Revised Code. The annual appropriation measure should be adopted at the minimum level specified in this section of the Ohio Revised Code.
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 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge. The amounts on the appropriation measures 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 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, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge 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 Revenue Ledger Report and the OPWC Confirmation 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 the Township did not establish a Public Works Commission Project – Issue 2 Fund to account for Issue 2 on behalf grant and loan activity. The Township should establish a Public Works Commission Project – Issue 2 Fund in the capital projects fund type, as outlined in Auditor of State Bulletin 2002-004, to account for Issue 2 monies.
7. We scanned the 2013 and 2012 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.
9. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 for negative cash fund balances. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (l) provides that money paid into a fund must be used for the purposes for which such fund is established. As a result, a negative fund cash balance indicates that money from one fund was used to cover the expenses of another. We noted no funds having a negative cash fund balance.

#### **Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures**

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

Columbus, Ohio

July 30, 2014



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**CLARKSFIELD TOWNSHIP**

**HURON 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  
AUGUST 19, 2014**