



**WAYNE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY
WAYNE COUNTY**

AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

FOR THE YEARS ENDED NOVEMBER 30, 2010-2009



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Wayne County Agricultural Society
Wayne County
P.O. Box 3
Wooster, Ohio 44691

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of the Wayne County Agricultural Society, Wayne 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, 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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the November 30, 2010 and November 30, 2009 bank reconciliations. The overall balances were calculated correctly; however, there were errors noted in subtotals. We also noted that incorrect balances were used, however, when using the correct balances, the bank balance still equaled the book balance.
2. We agreed the December 1, 2008 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2008 balances in the prior year audited statements. We found no exceptions.

We compared the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the November 30, 2010 and 2009 cash balance reported in the accounting records. The amounts agreed for 2009, however, for 2010, the reconciliation did not include the correct amount; when using the correct amount, the bank balance equaled the book balance.

3. We confirmed the November 30, 2010 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, 2010 bank reconciliation. All confirmed balances agreed to the reconciliation with exception of the checking account.

The balance appearing on the reconciliation for the checking account was determined to be the Society's book balance rather than the bank balance. Once the correct checking account balance was used on the reconciliation, it agreed to the confirmation.

Cash (Continued)

4. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the November 30, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent December 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 November 30. We noted no exceptions.
5. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in November of 2010 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions. There were no interbank account transfers occurring in November of 2009.
6. We tested investments held at November 30, 2010 and November 30, 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.

Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected all the receipts from the Distribution Transaction Detail Report (State DTL) for 2010 and 2009.
 - a. We compared the amount from the DTL/confirmation 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 Receipts

We haphazardly selected one day of gate admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30 2010 and one day of gate admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2009 recorded in the receipts ledger and determined whether the receipt amount agreed to the supporting documentation (ticket reconciliations). The amounts agreed.

Grandstand Receipts

We selected all grandstand admission cash receipts for the year ended November 30, 2010 and all grandstand admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2009 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 in 2009. However; in 2010, the amount of grandstand admissions receipts recorded in the receipt ledger exceeded the gross sales amount recorded on the "Tickets Sold – Detail" report by \$2,323.25.

Privilege Fee Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2010 and 10 privilege fee cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2009 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, 2010 and 10 rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2009 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. 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 2010 or 2009 or outstanding as of November 30, 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances or 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 Payroll Register and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel files and 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. 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.

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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended November 30, 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:

<u>Withholding</u>	<u>Date Due</u>	<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Amount Withheld</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>
Federal income taxes and social security	December 31, 2010	November 28, 2010	\$1,421.98	\$1,421.98
State income taxes	December 15, 2010	November 28, 2010	\$185.43	\$185.43
Wooster City income tax	January 31, 2011	January 16, 2011	\$192.16	\$192.16

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Expenditure Report for the year ended November 30, 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 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.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We scanned the year end expenditure ledger for 2010 and 2009 for evidence of construction projects that exceeded the prevailing wage threshold. In 2010, we noted only one project, painting of the grandstands, which would have required the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. There was no formal contract requiring prevailing wages be paid.

There were no projects in 2009 that would have required the contractor to pay prevailing wages.

Officials' Response: The Society is aware of the exceptions noted in the report and has corrected the 2010 reconciliation, is aware of the grandstand receipt issue in 2010, and will attempt to comply with prevailing wage requirements.

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 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 6, 2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

WAYNE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

WAYNE 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 23, 2011