



Nicole Galloway, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

CITIZENS SUMMARY

Findings in the audit of Madison County

Sheriff's Controls and Procedures

The sheriff lacks sufficient controls and procedures over two commissary bank accounts. One employee is primarily responsible for handling deposits and disbursements, and the sheriff does not perform documented reviews of accounting records. Receipt slips are not always issued and do not always reflect the method of payment, preventing the reconciliation of receipt slips to deposits. Bank reconciliations are not performed monthly, and a monthly list of liabilities is not prepared to reconcile to the commissary account balance. As a result, an unidentified balance of \$3,323 remains in the account. The sheriff also does not turn over commissary net proceeds to the county Inmate Prisoner Detainee Security Fund, as required by state law. Booking sheets, which record an inmate's cash and property, are not always fully completed, and numerous accounting records have not been retained, including receipt slips for a 6-month period in 2014 and records to support \$8,000 in commissary purchases. Perpetual inventory records are not maintained for commissary items or phone cards and periodic physical inventory counts are not performed. The sheriff and county treasurer do not coordinate efforts to ensure amounts billed for boarding prisoners are received by the county. The sheriff has not entered into written agreements with Fredericktown or surrounding counties for the boarding of prisoners outlining rates and services.

Prosecuting Attorney's Controls and Procedures

Accounting records for 2011 through 2014 have not been retained, as required by state law. The former prosecuting attorney indicated records were left in the office at the end of his term, but the current prosecuting attorney stated he found no records in the office. Auditors were therefore unable to ensure money was handled properly. The missing records prevent the current prosecuting attorney from disbursing money remaining in the accounts, reconciling bank accounts, and monitoring money owed to the office. One employee is primarily responsible for receipting, depositing, and disbursing monies, and the prosecuting attorney does not perform a supervisory review of accounting records. In 2014 and 2015, the prosecuting attorney did not document monthly bank reconciliations for two accounts left open by the previous prosecuting attorney. Balances of \$12,851 and \$16,635 remaining in those accounts are unidentified. The prosecutor also spent \$7,761 from those accounts on a courtroom sound system, lodging, and investigations, circumventing the county's budgetary and disbursement procedures.

Property Tax System

The county collector has access rights in the property tax system that allows her to make changes to individual tax records throughout the tax year. Because the collector is responsible for collecting tax monies, good internal controls require she not have access rights allowing alteration or deletion of tax rates, assessed valuations, and property tax billing information.

Vehicle and Fuel Use

Mileage and fuel logs maintained by the sheriff's office do not indicate when fuel is purchased, so logs cannot be reconciled with statements. The sheriff also does not always document his review of fuel receipts, and the road and bridge supervisor does not reconcile fuel use to fuel purchased.

Additional Comments

Because counties are managed by several separately-elected individuals, an audit finding made with respect to one office does not necessarily apply to the operations in another office. The overall rating assigned to the county is intended to reflect the performance of the county as a whole. It does not indicate the performance of any one elected official or county office.

In the areas audited, the overall performance of this entity was **Fair**.*

*The rating(s) cover only audited areas and do not reflect an opinion on the overall operation of the entity. Within that context, the rating scale indicates the following:

- Excellent:** The audit results indicate this entity is very well managed. The report contains no findings. In addition, if applicable, prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Good:** The audit results indicate this entity is well managed. The report contains few findings, and the entity has indicated most or all recommendations have already been, or will be, implemented. In addition, if applicable, many of the prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Fair:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to improve operations in several areas. The report contains several findings, or one or more findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated several recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, several prior recommendations have not been implemented.
- Poor:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to significantly improve operations. The report contains numerous findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated most recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, most prior recommendations have not been implemented.

All reports are available on our Web site: auditor.mo.gov