



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



**CUYAHOGA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY  
CUYAHOGA COUNTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed Upon Procedures.....	1

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Cuyahoga County Agricultural Society  
Cuyahoga County  
614 Eastland Road  
Berea, Ohio 44017

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Cuyahoga 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, 2011 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2010 balances in documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the December 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2011 balances. We noted the fund balance was \$142 more than the November 30, 2011 balance. The Society should ensure that all financial activity is properly recorded and any changes or variances are properly documented.
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 for 2012 and 2011. We noted the November 2011 cash balance was \$579 less than the cash reconciliation. We also noted that at November 30, 2012 the Society excluded one bank account from its ledgers and the reconciliation. The total of the bank balance excluded was \$2,668. The Society should ensure that all reconciliations are timely and accurately performed and all variances are properly documented. In addition all activity of the Society should be included on their ledgers and reconciliations. The Society made a subsequent adjustment to bring the account onto their books.

4. We confirmed the November 30, 2012 Huntington bank account balance with the Society's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We observed the year-end PNC bank balances on the financial institution's website. The balances agreed. 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.
6. 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.
  - a. We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper account code(s). 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/grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30 2012 and one day of admission/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. From the prior agreed-upon procedures' documentation, we noted the Society had a line of credit totaling \$48,000 outstanding as of November 30, 2010. These amounts agreed to the Society's December 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.
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 mortgage debt and loan/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 found no exceptions.
4. We agreed the amount of debt proceeds from the debt documents to amounts recorded in the Receipt Ledger. The amounts agreed.
5. For new debt issued during 2012 and 2011, we inspected the debt legislation, noting the Society must use the proceeds as start up cash for Fair Week.
6. We inquired of management, scanned the receipt ledger, and scanned the prior agreed upon procedures report and determined that the Society had a loan or 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 found no exceptions.

#### **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 or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
2. For the two 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.)

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:

<b>Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Paid</b>	<b>Amount Due</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
Federal income taxes, social security, & Medicare	January 31, 2013	January 23, 2013	\$18,036.17	\$18,036.17
State income taxes	December 17, 2012	December 12, 2012	\$523.03	\$523.03
Local income tax	December 31, 2012	December 17, 2012	\$471.96	\$471.96

**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

May 30, 2013





# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY**

**CUYAHOGA 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 11, 2013**