



Dave Yost • Auditor of State





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Adams County Public Library  
Adams County  
157 High Street  
Peebles, Ohio 45660

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Adams County Public Library, Adams 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.

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 Cash Summary by Fund 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 Cash Summary by Fund Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 STAR and CD account balances with the Library's financial institutions and we observed the year-end bank balance for the checking account on the financial institution's website. We found the year-end bank balance on-line agreed to the checking account year-end bank statement. However, confirmations obtained by the auditors from the banks revealed that the CD balances at First State Bank were \$8,905.64 higher and the CD balances at Fifth Third Bank were \$3,348 higher than that carried on the books of the Library because the Library had not posted interest earnings to their books. We also agreed the balances confirmed by the banks to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation with the above exception.

We recommend the Library post interest earnings to the accounting system timely.

5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent month of January per the financial institutions website. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and date written to the check register, to determine the checks 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 County Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2010 and two from 2009.

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

#### **Intergovernmental Cash Receipts**

1. We selected the only receipt from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2009.
  - a. We compared the amount from the DTL to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether this receipt was allocated to the proper fund. We found no exception.
  - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exception.

#### **Debt**

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger Report and Payment Register Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or outstanding as of December 31, 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances, nor 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 Payroll Register Detail Report and determined whether the following information in the employee's personnel files and minute records 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 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, 2010 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2010. 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, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$5,287.18	\$5,287.18
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$1,093.17	\$1,093.17
Local income tax West Union	January 15, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$152.09	\$152.09
Local income tax Manchester	January 15, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$75.32	\$75.32
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2011	December 30, 2010	\$10,937.44	\$10,937.44

4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Payroll Register Detail Report:

- a. Accumulated leave records
- b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
- c. The Library's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 and ten from the year ended 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 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 Capital Projects – Gates Foundation 2010 and Capital Projects – Building Manchester for 2009. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status report.
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, CP – Gates Foundation, and CP –Building Manchester fund, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

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

1. We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register 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

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.

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

February 9, 2011

**This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.**





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**ADAMS COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ADAMS 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  
MARCH 3, 2011**