



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

**SENECA EAST PUBLIC LIBRARY
SENECA COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Agreed Upon Procedures.....	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Seneca East Public Library
Seneca County
14 North Main Street
P.O. Box 572
Attica, Ohio 44807-0572

To the Board of Trustees:

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Seneca East Public Library, Seneca County (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 only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2009 and 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report 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 Fund Status Reports. 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 selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January bank statement. 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, 2009 and December 31, 2008 to determine that they:
 - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Revised Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Revised 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 Seneca County Auditor Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2009 and two from 2008.

- a. We compared the amount from the Seneca County Auditor Vendor Audit Trail Report to the amount recorded in the Revenue 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 Revenue 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 from the year ended December 31, 2009 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 2008 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Revenue Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Receipts were posted to the proper funds, and were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Revenue Ledger and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of bonded or note debt issued during 2009 or 2008 or outstanding as of December 31, 2009 or 2008. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 2.
2. We obtained a summary of note debt activity for 2009 and 2008 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedules to debt service fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Library made the payments. We found no exceptions.

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 Register Detail Report and determined whether the

following information in the employees' personnel files and 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 and Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – e. 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 and minute record. 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:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31, 2010	December 31, 2009	\$962.13	\$962.13
State income taxes	January 15, 2010	January 16, 2010	\$1,432.19	\$1,432.19
School District Income Tax	February 1, 2010	January 16, 2010	\$853.18	\$853.18
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30, 2010	January 12, 2010	\$614.16	\$1,473.98

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended December 31, 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 Payment Register Detail 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 2009 and 2008 for the following funds:

General fund and Debt Service fund. 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, 2009 and 2008 for the General and Debt Service funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

Compliance – Contracts and Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report 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 Revised 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

April 15, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

SENECA EAST PUBLIC LIBRARY

SENECA 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 6, 2010