



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

North Baltimore Public Library
Wood County
230 North Main Street
North Baltimore, Ohio 45872

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the North Baltimore Public Library, Wood 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, 2010 and 2009, 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. The Library processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Library because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2008 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, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 bank account balances with two of the Library's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We observed the year-end bank balances for one of the Library's financial institutions on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 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.
6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 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.

State Library and Local Government Support Receipts

We selected two State Library and Local Government Support (LLGS) receipts from the Wood County Detail Expense Report from 2010 and two from 2009.

- a. We compared the amount from the Wood County Detail Expense Report to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. 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 Revenue Ledger to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2010 and 2009. We found no exceptions.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

We selected all of the receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2010. There were none in 2009.

- a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Revenue Leger. The amounts agreed.
- b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
- c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances or any debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2010 and one payroll check for five employees from 2009 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report 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 Board approved salary schedule. 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, 2010 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 2010. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and Medicare	January 31, 2011	January 14, 2011	\$2,091.02	\$2,091.02
State income taxes	January 18, 2011	December 31, 2010	411.99	411.99
Village of North Baltimore local income tax	January 20, 2011	December 31, 2010	178.50	178.50
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2011	January 28, 2011	4,289.64	4,289.64

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended December 31, 2009 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.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-8-02, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General Fund and the Gates Grant fund in 2010 and the General Fund and Capital Projects fund in 2009. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report except the Gates Grant fund in 2010. In 2010, the Board did not formally approve a specific increase in appropriations for the Gates Grant Fund, as a result appropriations in the accounting system were \$7,272 while the amounts formally approved were \$5,200. We recommend all appropriation amendments be approved by the Board and the amounts in the accounting system agree with the Board approved appropriations.
2. Ohio Admin. 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, 2010 and 2009 for the General Fund and Gates Grant fund in 2010 and the General Fund and Capital Projects Fund in 2009, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. The Gates Grant Fund expenditures for 2010 exceeded total appropriations by \$1,625, contrary to Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-8-02. The Fiscal Officer should deny payment requests exceeding appropriations. The Fiscal Officer may request the Trustees to approve increased expenditure levels by increasing appropriations if necessary and if resources are available.

Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 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 (Ohio Rev. Code, Section 3375.41).

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

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 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 "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

August 9, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NORTH BALTIMORE PUBLIC LIBRARY

WOOD 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 23, 2011**