



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Van Wert County Agricultural Society
Van Wert County
1055 S. Washington St.
Van Wert, OH 45891

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Van Wert 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 and Investments

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 audited statements. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the December 1, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2011 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 institution. 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 and January bank statements. We found no exceptions.
 - 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.

One First National Plaza, 130 W. Second St., Suite 2040, Dayton, Ohio 45402
Phone: 937-285-6677 or 800-443-9274 Fax: 937-285-6688

www.ohioauditor.gov

Cash and Investments (Continued)

6. We selected the only two reconciling credit (such as deposits in transit) haphazardly from the November 30, 2012 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each credit to the subsequent December bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed the credit amounts to the Receipt Ledger. Each credit was recorded as a November receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.

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 Cash Receipts

1. We selected all the receipts from the Distribution Transaction Detail Report (State DTL) for 2012 and 2011. We also selected five receipts from the County Auditor's Appropriation History Report from 2012 and five from 2011.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the General 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 selected general admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30 2012 and general admission 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 General 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 General 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. From the prior audit documentation, we noted the following loan and line of credit outstanding as of November 30, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Societies December 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Principal outstanding as of November 30, 2010:</u>
Consolidation Loan	\$376,431
Line of Credit	\$ 48,500

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the receipt and expenditure records for evidence of loan or credit agreements, and bonded, note, County, or mortgage debt issued during 2012 or 2011 or debt payment activity during 2012 or 2011. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of debt service payments including loan and credit agreements permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 1711.13 owed during 2012 and 2011 and agreed these payments from the expenditure ledger to the related debt amortization schedules. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Society made the payments. We noted that they made late payments on four out of the six debt payments that were due within the audit period. The failure to make debt payments on time could prevent the Society from obtaining any new debt when needed.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the General Ledger. The amounts agreed.
5. We inquired of management, scanned the general ledger, and scanned the prior audit report and determined that the Society had a loan and credit agreement outstanding from a prior year as permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 1711.13(B). We examined the Society's computation supporting that the total net indebtedness from loans and credit did not exceed twenty-five percent of its annual revenues. We noted that net indebtedness of the Society did exceed its annual revenues by thirty-two percent for each year. The failure to abide by required statutes could result in the Society becoming overextended and unable to meet the debt requirements. The Society should review Ohio Rev. Code Section 1711.13 for debt requirements before any new debt is issued.

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 General Ledger and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Register to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-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, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - e. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

We found no exceptions related to steps a – e above, except the W-4 form was not maintained for two employees. However, the payroll register did disclose payroll withholdings for these employees. We recommend the Society maintain all documentation to support wages paid and deductions withheld.

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 and social security, for employees not enrolled in pension system	January 31, 2013	November 29, 2012	\$1,159.90	\$1,159.90
State income taxes	January 15, 2013	November 29, 2012	\$53.54	\$53.54
Van Wert City Income Tax	January 31, 2013	December 28, 2012	\$218.99	\$218.99
Ohio School District Income Tax	January 15, 2013	November 30, 2012	\$85.69	\$85.69

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

April 2, 2013



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VAN WERT AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

VAN WERT 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 9, 2013