



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Mercer County District Library
Mercer County
303 North Main Street
Celina, OH 45822

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Mercer County District Library (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 Fund Status 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 Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 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, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
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 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.

One First National Plaza / 130 W. Second St. / Suite 2040 / Dayton, OH 45402
Telephone: (937) 285-6677 (800) 443-9274 Fax: (937) 285-6688
www.auditor.state.oh.us

Cash and Investments (Continued)

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 Payment Report from 2010 and two from 2009.

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

Property Taxes

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. We also traced the advances noted on the Statement to the Receipt Register Report. We noted the property tax receipt #61-2010 was posted at net versus gross. The gross amount was \$37,799.67 and the net amount was \$35,049.28. The Library should post all receipts at gross and post all related fees and charges to the appropriate disbursement line account.
 - 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 Register Report to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts, plus one advance

We noted the Receipts Register Report included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for 2010.

Debt

1. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail 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 Employee Detail Adjustment Report and 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.

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. 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:

| Withholding | Date Due | Date Paid | Amount Withheld | Amount Paid |
|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Federal income taxes | January 31, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$2,444.58 | \$2,444.58 |
| State income taxes | January 18, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$1,208.98 | \$1,208.98 |
| Celina Income Tax | January 31, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$ 893.02 | \$ 893.02 |
| St. Henry Income Tax | January 31, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$ 113.79 | \$ 113.79 |
| Ohio School District Income Tax | January 18, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$ 257.90 | \$ 257.90 |
| OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share) | January 31, 2011 | December 22, 2010 | \$9,676.70 | \$9,676.70 |

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 Detail Adjustment 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 Detail 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 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.
2. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2010 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 Appropriation Status Report for 2010 and 2009 for the following funds: General fund and Special Revenue fund (2009) and Capital Projects fund (2010). 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 and Special Revenue (2009) and Capital Projects (2010) funds, 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 Detail 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 did not receive a response from Officials to the exception reported above.

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 "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 17, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MERCER COUNTY DISTRICT LIBRARY

MERCER 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
JUNE 28, 2011