



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Bettsville Public Library  
Seneca County  
233 State Street, P.O. Box 385  
Bettsville, Ohio 44815-0385

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Bettsville Public Library, Seneca County, Ohio (the Library), 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 and Investments

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 Trial Balance – Combined Totals Report to the December 31, 2009 balances in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. 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 Trial Balance – Combined Totals Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Library'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 five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly 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 to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

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 Revised Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
  - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Revised Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. We noted no exceptions.

### **State Library and Local Government Support Receipts**

We selected two State Library and Local Government Support (LLGS) receipts from the Seneca County Audit Trail Report from 2011 and two from 2010.

- a. We compared the amount from the Seneca County Audit Trail Report to the amount recorded in the Journal of Cash Receipt Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. We determined whether these receipts were posted to the General Fund. We found no exceptions.
- c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
- d. We scanned the Journal of Cash Receipt Report to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2011 and 2010. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. The prior agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Journal of Cash Receipt Report and Detail General Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2011 or 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 Check Register and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Summary Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
  - c. 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 minute record. 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 Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2012	January 3, 2012	\$286.62	\$286.62
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	December 31, 2011	290.00	290.00
Local income tax (school)	January 31, 2012	December 31, 2011	144.90	144.90
Local income tax (village)	January 31, 2012	December 31, 2011	115.02	115.02
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	December 31, 2011	917.31	917.31

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Detail General Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Detail General Ledger 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.

**Compliance – Budgetary**

1. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Administrative Code Section 117-8-02 to the amounts recorded in the spreadsheets maintained by the Library that included budget vs actual amounts with no exceptions. Since the Library's accounting system does not integrate budgetary information, we could not compare total appropriations required by Ohio Administrative Code Section 117-8-02 to the amounts recorded in the Detail General Ledger for 2011 and 2010.
2. Ohio Administrative Code Section 117-8-02 prohibits spending in excess of budgeted amounts. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for the General Fund, as recorded in the Detail General Ledger and Appropriation Resolution. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

**Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures**

We inquired of management and scanned the Detail General Ledger report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for procurements requiring competitive bidding to construct, demolish, alter, repair, or reconstruct a library or make any improvements or repairs, the cost of which exceeded \$25,000, except in cases of urgent necessity or for the security and protection of library property (ORC 3375.41). We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

**Officials' Response:**

The budgetary monitoring has been external and the library did not overspend its appropriation levels.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Library'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 Library, 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

June 19, 2012



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**BETTSVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**SENECA 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 17, 2012**