



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Portage County Agricultural Society
Portage County
4215 Fairground Rd.
Atwater, Ohio 44201

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Portage County Agricultural Society (the Society) agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended November 30, 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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the November 30, 2012 and November 30, 2011 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the December 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2010 balances in the prior year documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the December 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2012 balances. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the November 30, 2012 and 2011 fund cash balance reported in the Comparative Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the November 30, 2012 bank account balances with the Society's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the November 30, 2012 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the November 30, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent December bank statement. We found no exceptions.

Cash (Continued)

- b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to November 30. We noted no exceptions.
6. We inspected the Comparative Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements at December 1, 2011 and November 30, 2010 to determine whether the undervaluation of the certificates of deposit from the prior year AUP were adjusted on the bank reconciliation and financial accounting system at the beginning of December and we noted the Society appropriately valued those certificates of deposit on their books. The adjustment was properly posted.
7. We tested investments held at November 30, 2012 and November 30, 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.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected all the receipts from the Distribution Transaction Detail Report (State DTL) for 2012 and 2011. We also selected both receipts from the County Auditor's Vendor Invoice List Report from 2012 and both from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper account codes. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Admission/Grandstand Receipts

We haphazardly selected one day of admission and one day of grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30 2012 and one day of admission and one day grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 recorded in the receipts ledger and determined whether the receipt amount agreed to the supporting documentation (ticket recapitulation sheets/cash register tapes, etc). The amounts agreed.

Privilege Fee Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2012 and 10 privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Rental Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2012 and 10 rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. We found no exceptions.
- c. Receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

- 1. The prior year agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of November 30, 2010.
- 2. We noted no debt issuances or 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 Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively approved rate or salary). 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. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
 - d. Federal and State income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

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

- 3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended November 30, 2012 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that 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, social security, & Medicare (<u>and social security for employees not enrolled in pension system</u>)	December 31, 2012	December 6, 2012	\$ 1,898.68	\$ 1,898.68
State income taxes	December 15, 2012	December 7, 2012	220.21	220.21

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Expenditure Report for the year ended November 30, 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. Based on the nature of the expenditure, the account coding is reasonable. We found no exceptions.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Society'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 Society, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 19, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PORTAGE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

PORTAGE 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 23, 2013**