



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Twin Township  
Preble County  
5815 Jordan Road  
Lewisburg, Ohio 45338

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Twin Township, Preble 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, 2010 and 2009, 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, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2008 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, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 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, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 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 2010 and one from 2009:
  - 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 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 to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010 and 2009:
  - a. Two personal property tax receipts
  - b. Two real estate tax receipts

We noted the Revenue Ledger included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

3. We selected three receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010 and four from 2009.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. 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.

#### **Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2010 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2009 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.

- c. Receipt was posted to the proper funds, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

#### **Debt**

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register and Payment Register for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or outstanding as of December 31, 2010 or 2009. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2. We noted that the Township issued notes for the purchase of new mowers and tractors.
2. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2010 and 2009 and noted that the first payment is not due until May 2011.
3. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Road and Bridge Fund per the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
4. For new debt issued during 2010 and 2009, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase new mowers and tractors. We scanned the Payments Register and noted the Township purchased two mowers and tractors in May 2010.

#### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and 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. Departments and funds 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

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay 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 was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2010. We noted the following:

<b>Withholding</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Withheld</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2011	January 10, 2011	\$2,097.05	\$2,097.05
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 30, 2010	410.66	410.66
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2011	December 30, 2010	2,338.23	2,338.23

4. For the pay periods ended April 30, 2010 and September 30, 2009, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board per diem amounts to the General, Road and Bridge, and Cemetery Funds. We found no exceptions.
5. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced Board time or services performed to time or activity sheets. We found no exceptions.

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 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 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 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 Ledger for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Cemetery Funds for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2010 and 2009 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Cemetery 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, Section 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger for 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General, Cemetery, and Permissive Motor Vehicle License Tax. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger.
4. Ohio Rev. Code, Section 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, 2010 and 2009. 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge Funds, 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, 2010 and 2009. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. The Township established the 2008 Windstorm Fund during 2009 to segregate Federal Emergency Management Agency receipts and disbursements, in compliance with Section 5705.09 and 2 CFR Part 176.210.
7. We scanned the 2010 and 2009 Interfund Activity 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 & Expenditures**

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 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. (Ohio Rev. Code, Section 5549.21)
  - b. Construction and erection of a memorial building or monument costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. Code, Section 511.12)
  - c. Equipment for fire protection and communication costs exceeding \$50,000 (Ohio Rev. Code, Sections 505.37 to 505.42)
  - d. Street lighting systems or improvement costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. Code, Section 515.07)
  - e. Building modification costs exceeding \$25,000 to achieve energy savings (Ohio Rev. Code, Section 505.264)

- f. Private sewage collection tile costs exceeding \$25,000 (Ohio Rev. 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 Rev. Code, Section 505.37(A))

We identified a road repair project exceeding \$25,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5549.21. For this project, we noted that the Board advertised the project in a local newspaper, and selected the lowest responsible bidder.

- 2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 to determine if the Township had road construction projects exceeding \$45,000 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 and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

April 11, 2011





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**TWIN TOWNSHIP**

**PREBLE 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 5, 2011**