

**FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP  
MERCER COUNTY  
Agreed-Upon Procedures  
For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010**

***Perry & Associates***  
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees  
Franklin Township  
6805 State Route 219  
Celina, Ohio 45822

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of Franklin Township, Mercer County, prepared by Perry & Associates, Certified Public Accountants, A.C., for the period January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. Franklin Township is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost  
Auditor of State

May 3, 2012

**This page intentionally left blank.**

**FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP  
MERCER COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures .....	1

**This page intentionally left blank.**

***Perry & Associates***  
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.  
www.perrycpas.com

MARIETTA  
428 Second Street  
Marietta, OH 45750  
(740) 373-0056  
(740) 373-2402 Fax

PARKERSBURG  
1035 Murdoch Avenue  
Parkersburg, WV 26101  
(304) 422-2203  
(304) 428-5587 Fax

ST. CLAIRSVILLE  
121 E Main Street  
St. Clairsville, OH 43950  
(740) 695-1569  
(740) 695-5775 Fax

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

March 30, 2012

Franklin Township  
Mercer County  
6805 St. Rt. 219  
Celina, OH 45822

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of **Franklin Township**, Mercer County, Ohio (the Township) and the Auditor of State 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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Summary by Fund Report to the December 31, 2009 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, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Summary by Fund Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Township's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected all reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and dates written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

**Cash (Continued)**

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 2011 and one from 2010:
  - 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 noted 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 the proper number of tax receipts for 2011 and 2010:
  - a. Two personal property tax receipts
  - b. Two real estate tax receipts
 We noted the Receipt Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.
3. We selected five receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Distribution Lists (DTL) from 2011 and five from 2010.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL 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.

**Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. 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 fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

**Debt**

1. From the prior audit report, we noted the following loans outstanding as of December 31, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Township's January 1, 2010 balance on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
Dump Truck Loan	\$100,000

**Debt (Continued)**

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipts Journal and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt schedule to the Road and Bridge Tax fund and Fire fund payments reported in the Appropriation Ledger. We also compared the date the loan debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We found no exceptions.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Road and Bridge Fund and Fire fund per the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
5. For new debt issued during 2010, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Township must use the proceeds to purchase a fire truck. We scanned the Appropriation Ledger and noted the Township purchased a fire truck in April of 2010.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Payroll Register Detail Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register Detail Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate of salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the fund and account code 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, 2011 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 2011. 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 & Medicare	January 31, 2012	December 16, 2011	\$ 1,327.31	\$ 1,327.31
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	December 14, 2011	\$ 323.91	\$ 323.91
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2012	December 14, 2011	\$ 1,365.30	\$ 1,365.31
Local income taxes	January 31, 2012	December 14, 2011	\$ 120.25	\$ 120.24

3. For the pay periods ended February 28, 2011 and July 31, 2010, we compared documentation and the recomputation supporting the allocation of Board salaries to the General and Gasoline Tax Funds. We found no exceptions.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)**

4. 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 Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 the 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 Status Report for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. The amounts agreed.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2011 and 2010 to determine whether, for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds, the Trustees appropriated separately for “each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for person 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 Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the following funds: General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds. The appropriations budget recorded appropriations for the Motor Vehicle License Tax Fund of \$11,900 for 2010. However, the final Appropriation Status Report reflected \$11,608 for the Motor Vehicle License Tax Fund for 2010. No other exceptions were noted.
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, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline Tax Funds for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010. We noted that the Motor Vehicle License Tax Fund appropriations for 2010 exceeded certified resources by \$292, contrary to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.39. The Trustees should not pass appropriations exceeding certified resources. Allowing this to occur could cause the Township to incur fund balance deficits.
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, 2011 and 2010 for the General, Motor Vehicle License Tax, and Gasoline 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 Register Report for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2011 and 2010.

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

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 2011 and 2010 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.

### **Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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))
  - h. Maintenance and repair of roads exceeding \$45,000 (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01).
  - i. Construction or reconstruction of a township road exceeding \$15,000/per mile (Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01).

We identified road maintenance materials purchased in 2011 and 2010 exceeding \$45,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01. However, for these projects, the Township entered into this contract as part of the Joint Mercer County Township Application for District 13 of the OPWC in cooperation with the Mercer County Engineer's Office. The Mercer County Engineer's Office handles all bidding and contract compliance.

We identified new fire protection equipment purchased in 2010 exceeding \$50,000, subject to Ohio Rev. Code Section 505.37 to 505.42. However, the Township was not required to obtain bids as the equipment was purchased through the state purchasing pool under the state contract with a government subdivision.

2. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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.

**Officials' Response** – We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions reported above.

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, the Auditor of State and others within the Township and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Perry & Associates CPAs A.C.".

**Perry and Associates**  
Certified Public Accountants, A.C.



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP**

**MERCER 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 17, 2012**