



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Ashtabula County Agricultural Society
Ashtabula County
P.O. Box 546
Jefferson, Ohio 44047

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

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the November 30, 2010 and November 30, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
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.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the November 30, 2010 and 2009 fund cash balance reported in the Comparative Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements at November 30, 2010 and 2009 and in the Balance Sheets at November 30, 2010 and 2009. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the November 30, 2010 bank account balances with the Society's financial institutions. We found no exceptions.
5. 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 statements. 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.

Cash and Investments – (Continued)

6. We selected 100% of the deposits in transit (there were only two total for both years combined as there was only one in 2010 and one in 2009) from the November 30, 2010 and November 30, 2009 bank reconciliations:
 - a. We traced each deposit to the credit appearing in the subsequent December bank statements. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We agreed these deposits' amounts to the Receipt Ledger. Each deposit in transit was recorded as a November receipt for the same amount recorded in the reconciliation.
7. 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. 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 admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2010 and one day of 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.

Grandstand Receipts

We haphazardly selected one day of grandstand cash receipts from the year ended November 30 2010 and one day of grandstand 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.

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, nor 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 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.
- 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:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes and social security	January 31, 2011	January 31, 2011	\$ 975.70	\$ 975.70
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	January 31, 2011	\$ 48.96	\$ 48.96
Local income tax	January 31, 2011	January 31, 2011	\$ 72.05	\$ 72.05

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.

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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 18, 2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

ASHTABULA AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

ASHTABULA 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 14, 2011**