



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Marlboro Township  
Stark County  
7344 Edison Street NE  
Hartville, Ohio 44632

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Marlboro 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, 2015 and 2014, 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, 2015 and December 31, 2014 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2014 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2013 balances in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2015 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2014 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, 2015 and 2014 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Summary by Fund 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 balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January and February 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.

### **Cash and Investments – (Continued)**

6. We selected the two reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2015 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Cash Journal. Each credit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. We tested investments held at December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 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 2015 and one from 2014:
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. *We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Receipt 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 Receipt Ledger to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts plus 7 advances for 2015 and 2014. We noted the Receipt Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2015 and five from 2014. We also selected five receipts from the Stark County Settlement Reports from 2015 and five from 2014.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt 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.

### **Debt**

1. The prior agreed upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2013.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Cash Fund Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2015 or 2014 or debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2015 or 2014.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2015 and one payroll check for five employees from 2014 from the Warrant History Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Journal 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 minute record or as required by statute. 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, 2015 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 2015. 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 (and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)	January 31, 2016	December 21, 2015	\$4,146.17	\$4,146.17
State income taxes	January 15, 2016	December 21, 2015	\$737.23	\$737.23
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2016	December 21, 2015	\$6,944.99	\$6,944.99

3. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll Journal:
  - a. Accumulated leave records
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
  - c. The Township's payout policy.

The amount paid for unused sick and vacation leave was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above. However, the amount paid for the current year pro-rated vacation leave was not consistent with the information recorded in c. above. Article VIII of the Marlboro Township Employee Handbook provides at the conclusion of employment for Marlboro Township, the Board of Trustees shall make payment for any unused vacation leave including current year pro-rated vacation. However, the Board of Trustees did not pay the employee's fiscal year 2015 pro-rated vacation leave of 71.11 hours at the employee's pay rate of \$16.35. As a result, the employee was underpaid by \$1,162.65.

4. We inquired of management and scanned the Cash Fund Journal for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 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 and federal regulations.

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

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Warrant History Report for the year ended December 31, 2015 and ten from the year ended 2014 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 Warrant History 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, 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 Receipt Ledger for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2015 and 2014 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License 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 found no exceptions for 2015. However, the appropriation measure adopted for 2014 was at the fund level and did not appropriate separately for each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger for 2015 and 2014 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger.
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 Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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, 2015 and 2014 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax and Road and Bridge funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Ledger. 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 Ledger for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2015 and 2014. 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.

### **Compliance – Budgetary – (Continued)**

7. We scanned the 2015 and 2014 Receipt and Appropriation Ledgers for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$10,000 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 Ledgers 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, 2015 and 2014 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 Cash Fund Journal for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 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.

### **Other Compliance**

Ohio Rev. Code Section 117.38 requires townships to file their financial information in the HINKLE system formerly known as the Annual Financial Data Reporting System (AFDRS) within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. We reviewed AFDRS to verify the Township filed their financial information within the allotted timeframe for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. We found no exceptions.

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

Columbus, Ohio

July 6, 2016

**This page intentionally left blank.**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**MARLBORO TOWNSHIP**

**STARK 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 2, 2016**