



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Moorefield Township
Clark County
1616 Moorefield Road
Springfield, Ohio 45503

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Moorefield 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 and Investments

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 Status 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 and Fund Ledger Report, respectively. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balance(s) on the financial institution's website. The balance(s) agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation. The confirmed balance for the Township's checking account did not agree to the reconciliation as the Township reported \$2,280 in deposit in transit at December 31, 2013 as bank balance instead of a reconciling item.
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 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 tested investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 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 2013 and one from 2012:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Detail Report (2013) and Receipt Register Report (2012). 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 Receipt Detail Report (2013) and Receipt Register Report (2012) to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2013 and 2012. We noted the 2013 Receipt Detail Report and the 2012 Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for 2013 and 2012.
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 Expense Report from 2013 and five from 2012.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Detail Report (2013) and Receipt Register Report (2012). The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions in 2013 or 2012.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts - "Charges for Service"

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2013 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2012 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Detail Report (2013) and Receipt Register Report (2012). The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2011.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Detail Report (2013), Receipt Register Report (2012), Payment Detail Report (2013) and Payment Register Report (2012) for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012.

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 (2013) and Payroll Register Detail (2012) and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Wage Detail (2013) and Payroll Register Detail (2012) 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 employees' personnel files. 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, 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:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2014	December 31, 2013	44,411	44,411
State income taxes	January 31, 2014	January 9, 2014	22,336	22,336
School income tax	January 31, 2014	January 9, 2014	953	953
Local income tax	March 31, 2014	January 9, 2014	463	463
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2014	December 30, 2013	4,949	4,949

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Detail Report (2013), Payment Register Detail Report (2012), Wage Detail Report (2013) and Payroll Register Detail (2012) 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

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Detail Report (2013) and Payment Register (2012) 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 Detail Report (2013) and Payment Register (2012) 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.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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 two 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 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, Road & Bridge and MVL Permissive Tax funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts on the *Certificate* agreed to the amount recorded in the accounting system, except for the Road & Bridge Fund for 2013 and 2012 and 2013 General Fund. The Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the Road & Bridge Fund of \$978,382 and \$663,431 for 2013 and 2012 respectively. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected estimated revenues of \$1,056,623 and \$664,726 for 2013 and 2012 respectively. Additionally, the Revenue Status Report recorded budgeted (i.e. certified) resources for the General of \$294,593 for 2013. However, the final *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* reflected estimated revenues of \$285,700 for 2013. 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, Road & Bridge and MVL Permissive 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 were unable to compare 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 as appropriation amendments were not submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval. As explained in *C. B. Transportation, Inc. v. Butler County Board of Mental Retardations*, 60 Ohio Misc. 71, 397 N.E.2d 781 (C.P. 1979), and *Burkholder v. Lauber*, 6 Ohio Misc. 152 (1965), when a board or officer is required to exercise judgment or discretion, and the board or officer was chosen because they were deemed fit and competent to exercise that judgment and discretion, absent any independent authority to substitute another in their place, such board or officer cannot delegate these duties to another. Following such reasoning, a local government’s governing board would be prohibited from delegating duties statutorily assigned to it, such as the ability to amend appropriations as provided for in Ohio Rev. Code section 5705.40. The Township Trustees should review and approve all appropriation amendments.
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, Road & Bridge and MVL Permissive Tax funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

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, Road & Bridge and MVL Permissive Tax 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 Detail Report (2013) and Receipt Register Report (2012) 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.
7. We scanned the 2013 and 2012 Revenue Status Reports, Appropriation Status Reports, and Inter-fund Listing Report for evidence of inter-fund transfers for 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. AoS found no evidence that the Township made inter-fund transfers during the audit period.
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 Fund Status 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 Detail Report (2013) and Payment Register (2012) 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 14, 2014



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MOOREFIELD TOWNSHIP

CLARK 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
JULY 29, 2014**