



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



**GRANVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
LICKING COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures .....	1

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

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

Granville Public Library  
Licking County  
217 East Broadway  
Granville, Ohio 43023

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Granville Public Library, Licking 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 Cash Journal to the December 31, 2010 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found that the ending 2010 cash balance of \$129,375 did not agree to the January 1, 2011 beginning cash balance of \$127,147. We also agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2011 balances in the Cash Journal. 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 Cash Journal. We found that the totals per the bank reconciliations did not agree to the total of the December 31, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal by \$526 and \$7,829, respectively.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Library's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also observed the year-end bank balances on the financial institution's website for those accounts with access. The balances agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 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.

### **Cash and Investments (Continued)**

- 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 all reconciling credits (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the December 31, 2012 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 Receipts Ledger. Each 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 2012 and 2011 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement or reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
8. 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**

1. We selected two State Library and Local Government Support (LLGS) receipts from the County Distribution Transaction Lists from 2012 and two from 2011.
  - a. We compared the amount from the County Distribution Transaction Lists to the amount recorded in the Receipt 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 Receipt Ledger to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2012 and 2011. We found no exceptions.

### **Intergovernmental**

1. We confirmed the amounts paid from the Granville Exempted Village School District to the Library during 2012 and 2011 with the District. We found no exceptions.
  - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper fund. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. The prior agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2010.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Expenditure Ledger 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 Employee Earnings Summary and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Earnings Summary 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 employees' personnel files. 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 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.

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:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes & Medicare <u>(and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system)</u>	January 31, 2013	January 8, 2013	6,352	6,352
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	January 9, 2013	1,328	1,328
Local income tax - Granville	January 31, 2013	January 9, 2013	800	800
Local income tax – School District	January 31, 2013	January 9, 2013	59	59
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2013	January 9, 2013	12,804	12,804

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 Employee Earnings Summary:
  - 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 Expenditure Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2012 and ten from the year ended 2011 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 Expenditure Ledger 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 Annual Appropriation Resolution for 2012 and 2011 for the following funds: *General and Building and Repair*. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Annual Appropriation Resolution.
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 Building and Repair fund, as recorded in the Annual Appropriation Resolution. We noted that General Fund expenditures for 2011 exceeded total appropriations by \$1,033, 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.

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  
Columbus, Ohio

October 21, 2013



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**GRANDVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**LICKING 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  
NOVEMBER 7, 2013**