



**CRAWFORD COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY
CRAWFORD COUNTY**

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2011 AND 2010



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Crawford County Agricultural Society
Crawford County
610 Whetstone Street
Bucyrus, Ohio 44820

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Crawford County Agricultural Society, Crawford County, Ohio, (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, 2011 and 2010, 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, 2011 and November 30, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the December 1, 2009 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2009 documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the November 30, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balance reported in the Balance Sheet Previous Year Comparison report. We found no exceptions in 2010. We noted a \$104 variance between the November 30, 2011 bank reconciliation balance and the November 30, 2011 Balance Sheet Previous Year Comparison report. A check in the amount of \$104 was written on December 5, 2011 after the reconciliation was completed; however, the check was incorrectly posted to the accounting ledgers with a date of November 30, 2011. This check was incorrectly included on the November 30, 2011 Balance Sheet Previous Year Comparison report.
4. We observed the November 30, 2011 bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balance agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balance to the amount appearing in the November 30, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (outstanding checks) haphazardly from the November 30, 2011 bank reconciliation:

Cash (Continued)

- a. We traced each debit to the subsequent December bank statement. We found no exceptions.
- b. We traced the amounts and dates to the Profit & Loss Detail report, to determine the debits were dated prior to November 30. We noted no exceptions.

Admission/Grandstand Receipts

We haphazardly selected one day of admission/grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 and one day of admission/grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2010 recorded in the Profit & Loss Detail report and determined whether the receipt amount agreed to the supporting documentation (ticket recapitulation sheets).

For July 23, 2010, the amount recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail report was \$4,940.

- a. The ticket sales recapitulation reported 991 tickets sold on that date.
- b. The admission price per ticket was \$5.
- c. Therefore the recapitulation sheet multiplied by the admission price supports admission receipts of \$4,955 for July 23, 2010, which exceeds the amount recorded by \$15.

For July 17, 2011, the amount recorded in the Profit and Loss Detail report for was \$4,535.

- a. The ticket sales recapitulation reported 845 tickets sold on that date.
- b. The admission price per ticket was \$5.
- c. Therefore the recapitulation sheet multiplied by the admission price supports admission receipts of \$4,225 for July 17, 2011, which is \$310 less than the amount recorded.

Privilege Fee Receipts

We haphazardly selected ten privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 and ten privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Profit & Loss Detail report. The amounts agreed.
- b. Amount charged complied with rates in force during the period. The amounts charged agreed to the Board-approved contracts; however, there is no formal rate schedule approved by the Board for privilege fees so we were unable to agree the amount charged to rates in force during the period. We recommend the Board approve a rate schedule for privilege fees and that this approval be formally documented in the minutes.
- c. Receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Rental Receipts

We haphazardly selected ten rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 and ten rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Profit & Loss Detail report. 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 agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of November 30, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Profit & Loss Detail report for evidence of loan or credit agreements, and bonded, note, County, or mortgage debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. We noted no new debt issuances or any debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Payroll Transactions by Payee report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Transactions by Payee report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found one instance where an employee was paid 10 cents per hour over her Board approved rate, which resulted in an overpayment of \$14.25. This increase was verbally approved by the Board; however, there was no formal approval documented in the minutes. Because we did not test all timecards, our report provides no assurance whether or not other similar errors occurred.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended November 30, 2011 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 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes, social security, & Medicare	January 31, 2012	December 7, 2011	\$627.43	\$627.43
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	January 11, 2012	\$125.69	\$125.69
Local income tax	January 31, 2012	January 11, 2012	\$102.06	\$102.06
School district income tax	January 31, 2012	January 11, 2012	\$85.05	\$85.05

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Profit & Loss Detail Report for the year ended November 30, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 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 Profit & Loss Detail report 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.

Officials' Response We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions 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 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large loop at the end of the last name.

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 6, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CRAWFORD COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

CRAWFORD 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 15, 2012**