



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Preble County District Library
Preble County
450 South Barron Street
Eaton, Ohio 45320

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Preble County District 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, 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Report to the December 31, 2010 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Fund Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 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, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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 2012 and two from 2011.

- a. We compared the amount from the County Detail Expense Report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Transaction Listing. 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 Receipt Transaction Listing to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2012 and 2011. We found no exceptions.

Property Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2012 and one from 2011.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Transaction Listing. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Transaction Listing to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2012 and 2011. We noted the Receipts Transaction Listing included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all three receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2012 and all three receipts from 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's DTLs from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Transaction Listing. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund(s). 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 documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Transaction Listing and the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report for evidence of debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2012 and one payroll check for five employees from 2011 from the Payroll Detail Check Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Detail Check Register 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 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. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the minute record 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 Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

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

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2012 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 2012. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	Monthly	12-28-12	\$6,003.28	\$6,003.28
State income taxes	Monthly	12-28-12	\$1,802.51	\$1,802.51
City of Eaton	Monthly	12-28-12	\$855.28	\$855.28
City of New Paris	Monthly	12-28-12	\$50.79	\$50.79
Village of West Alexandria	Quarterly	12-28-12	\$85.41	\$85.41
Village of West Elkton	Quarterly	12-28-12	\$46.21	\$46.21
OPERS retirement	January 31, 2013	1-23-13	\$17,126.23	\$17,126.23

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 Detail Check Register:
- Accumulated leave records
 - The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date
 - The Library's payout policy.

We found that the Library underpaid a termination payment of unused vacation of 4.84 hours to an employee for an amount of \$73.81 (gross amount). We brought this to management's attention and they will pay a check to the employee. Due to the above, we recomputed the payment of the only other employee that received termination payment for the audit period. 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 Monthly Consolidated Check Register for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 and determined whether:
- The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - 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 Monthly Consolidated Check Register 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.
2. We scanned the Memo Expense Register for the year ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 and determined that the proceeds from the levy passed under Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.23, were used for the purpose(s) stated in the resolution.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-8-02, to the amounts recorded in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report for 2012 and 2011 for the General Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolution agreed to the amounts recorded in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report for 2011 including beginning year encumbrances. However, for 2012, the amounts on the appropriation resolution were \$274 less than the amounts recorded in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report. The Fiscal Officer should make sure the Board approved Annual Appropriation Resolutions equals the amounts posted in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense 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, 2012 and 2011 for the General and Capital Project Fund, as recorded in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations

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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 9, 2013

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PREBLE COUNTY DISTRICT 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
MAY 9, 2013