



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Perry Township  
Lawrence County  
61 Private Drive 338  
Ironton, Ohio 45638

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Perry 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, 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 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balance agreed. 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 and February 2014 bank statements. 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.

**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 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 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and five from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2013 and five from 2012.
  - 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.
4. We confirmed the amounts paid from Armstrong Cable and Time Warner Cable to the Township during 2013 and 2012. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. 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, 2011. This amount agreed to the Townships January 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2011:
Dump Truck Lease/purchase agreement	\$22,114

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of bonded and lease/purchase agreement debt activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to General, Fire District, Gasoline Tax and Road and Bridge 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 note the Fire Truck Acquisition bond payment due date was June 1, 2013 and the check date per the Payment Register was June 4, 2013.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Fire District Fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed. The Township did not record the proceeds in a bond fund (i.e. capital projects fund) as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09(E).
5. For new debt issued during 2013 and 2012, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase two fire trucks. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report and noted the Township purchased two fire trucks with payments in April, June, September and November of 2012.

#### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 from the Wage Detail Report and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and/or Wage Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found one instance where an employee was paid for five hours less than the hours recorded on his timecard. We brought this to management's attention, and the Board of Trustees voted to pay the individual for the five hours. Because we did not test all timecards, our report provides no assurance whether or not other similar errors occurred.
  - 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' timecards 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 minute record and Township records 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(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding

- e. Federal, State & 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 except the state income tax withholding and social security enrollment form was not maintained for one employee. However, the payroll register did disclose social security and state income tax withholdings for this employee. We recommend the Township maintain all documentation to support wages paid and deductions withheld.

- 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 & Medicare	January 31, 2014	February 2, 2014	\$1,145.36	\$1,145.36
State income taxes	January 31, 2014	December 27, 2013	\$419.62	\$419.62
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	December 27, 2013	\$998.62	\$998.62

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail 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. Insurance reimbursements made were in compliance with ORC 505.60 and 505.601.

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

- 1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 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. Due to the Township no longer receiving images of checks on the bank statements, we found nineteen instances where there were no returned, canceled check images provided.

Auditor of State Bulletin 2004-010 states an auditor can regard electronic imaging of checks as evidence when performing an audit. The Bulletin provides, in part, that a bank may use the electronic image to create a "substitute check" for a bank that chooses to continue receiving paper checks. This substitute check has the same legal effect as the original paper check. A substitute check is a paper reproduction of the original check that: contains an image of the front and back of the original check; bears a magnetic ink character recognition (MICR) line containing all of the information appearing on the original check's MICR line, with certain exceptions; conforms, in paper stock, dimension, and otherwise, with generally applicable banking industry standards for substitute checks; and is as suitable for automated processing as the original check. A substitute check that meets these requirements and bears the following legend is considered to be the legal equivalent of the original paper check.

For governments that do not receive their canceled original or substitute checks, AOS suggests these governments request that their banks send images of the front and back of all issued checks. This will enable governments to review and scrutinize the transactions and ensure that the payees as well as the various endorsements are appropriate. As monthly bank statements are received, reconciliation between check numbers and the amounts paid should be conducted promptly. If questionable items are identified, governments should immediately request their bank investigate these items for possible adjustment to the government's account.

Furthermore, a government may want to request a substitute check or the best available source document from the bank (e.g., copy of the front and back of the check) when a questionable item is identified that requires investigation.

The bank did not provide optical images for 19 out of the 20 canceled checks selected for testing. By not having an image of the canceled check, it is not possible to ensure that the payees as well as the various endorsements are appropriate. This could result in a lack of sufficient audit evidence or could relate in a failure to follow the records retention laws.

We recommend the Fiscal Officer consult with their bank to have the bank provide images of both the front and reverse side of each canceled check for disbursements. As an alternative, the bank could send the original canceled checks back to the Township or provide this information in electronic form (i.e. – CD).

- 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 nine 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 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 Estimated Resources, required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the Revenue Status Report for the General, Fire District, and Road and Bridge Funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts on the Amended Certificate agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the Road and Bridge Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Road and Bridge Fund of \$35,326 for 2012. However, the final Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources reflected \$30,326. 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 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Fire District 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 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 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Fire District and Road and Bridge Funds. 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, Fire District 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, Fire District 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 Receipt Register Report 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 no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund except the Township did not record the proceeds for the \$175,000 Fire Truck Acquisition Bonds in a bond fund (i.e. capital projects fund) as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09(E). The proceeds were recorded in the Fire District Fund.
7. We scanned the 2013 and 2012 Revenue Status Reports and Appropriation Status Reports for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$5,000 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.
9. We scanned the Cash Summary by Fund Report for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 for negative cash fund balance. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.10 (I) 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 & 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 initial "D".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

July 24, 2014

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**PERRY TOWNSHIP, LAWRENCE COUNTY**

**LAWRENCE 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**