



Mary Taylor, CPA  
Auditor of State





# Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

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

Brown Memorial Library  
Preble County  
101 South Commerce Street  
PO Box 640  
Lewisburg, Ohio 45338

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Brown Memorial Library, Preble 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, 2009 and 2008, 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 describes only exceptions exceeding \$10.

### Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2007 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, 2009 and 2008 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 bank account balances with the Library's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We tested investments held at December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2008 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 County Detail Expense Report from 2009 and two from 2008.

- a. We compared the amount from the County Detail Expense Report to the amount recorded in the Receipts 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 Receipts Ledger to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2009 and 2008. We found no exceptions.

### **Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts**

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts for the period January 1, 2009 to February 4, 2009 and from September 2, 2009 through December 31, 2009 (pre-numbered duplicate receipts from February 4, 2009 through September 1, 2009 were not retained by the Library) and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the receipts ledger. We were unable to trace specific receipt amounts recorded in the receipts ledger for 8 out of 10 transactions tested. The Library did not issue receipts for some amounts recorded in the ledger. The total recorded amount for fines and miscellaneous receipts during 2009 was \$7,169. We recommend the Library develop a policy requiring use of duplicate receipts to support all fines and miscellaneous collections.
- b. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipts Ledger and Appropriation and Authorization Ledger for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2009 or 2008.

### **Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Payroll Ledger and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:
  - a. Name
  - b. Authorized salary or pay rate
  - c. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding

- e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
- f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

2. We tested the checks we selected in step 1, as follows:

- a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary amount used in computing gross pay 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 was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. 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	January 31, 2010	December 28, 2009	\$334.97	\$334.97
State income taxes	February 1, 2010	January 11, 2010	315.48	315.48
Local income tax	January 31, 2010	January 11, 2010	212.80	212.80
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	January 31, 2010	January 11, 2010	949.27	949.27
School district income tax	February 1, 2010	January 11, 2010	24.95	24.95

**Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

- 1. From the Appropriation and Authorization Ledger, we refooted checks recorded as General Fund *salaries*, and checks recorded as *purchased and contractual services* in the General fund for 2009. We found no exceptions.
- 2. We agreed total disbursements (non-payroll and payroll) from the Appropriation and Authorization Ledger for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 to the total disbursements recorded in the check register. We found no exceptions.
- 3. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriation and Authorization Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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 Cash Journal 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 and Authorization Ledger for 2009 and 2008 for the General fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation and Authorization Ledger.
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, 2009 and 2008 for the General fund, as recorded in the Appropriation and Authorization Ledger. Expenditures did not exceed appropriations.

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

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Cash Journal for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 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.

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 and those charged with governance and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



**Mary Taylor, CPA**  
Auditor of State

June 3, 2010



**Mary Taylor, CPA**  
Auditor of State

**BROWN MEMORIAL LIBRARY**

**PREBLE 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  
JUNE 29, 2010**