

LAKWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY

CUYAHOGA COUNTY

**JANUARY 1, 2012 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013
AGREED UPON PROCEDURES**



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Board of Trustees
Lakewood Public Library
15425 Detroit Road
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

We have reviewed the *Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures* of the Lakewood Public Library, Cuyahoga County, prepared by Julian & Grube, Inc., for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. Based upon this review, we have accepted this report in lieu of the audit required by Section 117.11, Revised Code.

Our review was made in reference to the applicable sections of legislative criteria, as reflected by the Ohio Constitution, and the Revised Code, policies, procedures and guidelines of the Auditor of State, regulations and grant requirements. The Lakewood Public Library is responsible for compliance with these laws and regulations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 24, 2014

This page intentionally left blank.



Julian & Grube, Inc.
Serving Ohio Local Governments

333 County Line Rd. West, Westerville, OH 43082 Phone: 614.846.1899 Fax: 614.846.2799

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Lakewood Public Library
Cuyahoga County
15425 Detroit Road
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Lakewood Public Library (the Library) and the Auditor of State 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, 2013 and 2012, 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, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the YTD Fund Report to the December 31, 2011 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the YTD Fund Report to the December 31, 2012 balances in the YTD Fund Report. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2013 and 2012 fund cash balances reported in the YTD Fund Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2013 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, 2013 bank reconciliation, except one certificate of deposit balance was noted to be \$3,285 lower than presented on the Library's year end bank reconciliation, due to accrued interest being recorded on the Library's books.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2013 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 selected the one reconciling credit (such as deposits in transit) from the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Detail Revenue Transaction Report. The credit was recorded as a December receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in December of 2013 and 2012 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
8. We tested investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 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.

Public Library Fund Receipts

We selected two Public Library Fund (PLF) receipts from the YTD Vendor Activity Report from 2013 and two from 2012.

- a. We compared the amount from the YTD Vendor Activity Report to the amount recorded in the Detail Revenue Transactions 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 Detail Revenue Transactions Report to determine whether it included one PLF receipt per month for 2013 and 2012. 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 2013 and one from 2012.
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Detail Revenue Transactions Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Detail Revenue Transactions Report. 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 Detail Revenue Transactions Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts plus six advances for 2013 and six advances for 2012 (one 2012 advance was received in 2011). We noted the Detail Revenue Transactions Report included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.

3. We selected the two receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2013 and the two from 2012.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Detail Revenue Transactions Report. The amounts agreed, except for homestead and rollback fees. No homestead and rollback fees were recorded for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 in the amounts of \$1,246 and \$1,261.
 - 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 documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2011.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Detailed Revenue Transactions Report and Detail Expense Transactions Report for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 from the Payroll Register Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register 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 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, 2013 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 2013. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 2, 2014	December 27, 2013	\$9,351.16	\$9,351.16
State income taxes	January 15, 2014	January 13, 2014	\$3,310.05	\$3,310.05
City of Lakewood Income Tax	January 31, 2014	February 24, 2014	\$2,298.81	\$2,298.81
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	January 29, 2014	\$37,725.67	\$37,725.67

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Detail Expense Transactions Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 2012 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 Expense Transactions 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.
2. We scanned the Detail Expense Transactions Report for the year ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and determined that the proceeds from the levy passed under Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.23, were used for the purposes 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 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General Fund and Endowment Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Combined MTD/YTD Expense Report except for the General Fund in 2012, the appropriation resolution was \$492 higher than 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, 2013 and 2012 for the General and Endowment 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.

Officials Response

The Fiscal Officer has responded that he is in disagreement with the noted exceptions.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, the Auditor of State, and others within the Library, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Julian & Grube, Inc.
May 15, 2014



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

LAKESWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY

CUYAHOGA 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 8, 2014**