



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Clermont County Agricultural Society
Clermont County
P.O. Box 369
Owensville, OH 45160

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of the Clermont County Agricultural Society, Clermont 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 profit and loss statement. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the November 30, 2011 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, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the November 30, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent December bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to November 30. We noted no exceptions.
6. We tested interbank account transfers occurring in November of 2011 and 2010 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found 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 receipts ledger and determined whether the receipt amount agreed to the supporting documentation (ticket recapitulation sheets).

For July 30, 2011, the amount recorded in the receipts ledger for July 29, 2011 was \$42,697.

- a. The ticket sales recapitulation reported 4,359 tickets sold on that date.
- b. The admission price per ticket was \$10.
- c. Therefore the recapitulation sheet multiplied by the admission price supports admission receipts of \$43,590 for July 29, 2011, which was short of the amount deposited by \$893.

For July 29, 2010, the amount recorded in the receipts ledger for July 28, 2010 was \$28,040.

- a. The ticket sales recapitulation reported 2,370 tickets (Adult and Child), 508 senior tickets, 42 adult season passes, 32 senior season passes, and 21 child season passes sold on that date.
- b. The admission price per ticket was \$10 for general admission, \$3 for senior, \$30 for adult season passes, \$15 for senior season passes, and \$25 for child season passes.
- c. Therefore the recapitulation sheet multiplied by the admission price supports admission receipts of \$27,489 for July 28, 2010, which exceeds the amount deposited by \$551.

The gate supervisor did not document any reason for the discrepancies noted above. We recognized that progress has been made with accountability since the last audit however the net of the shortage was \$342. If procedures are not implemented and any shortage of any amount is noted in the next audit, without a verifiable explanation for the shortage, the Auditor of State reserves the right to issue a finding for recovery against the Treasurer. We recommend that the Board of Directors should adopt and implement collection procedures that require any overages or shortages between daily gate collections and daily deposits should be noted by the gate admission supervisor with an explanation for unusual discrepancies.

Rental Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2011 and 10 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 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 report, we noted the following loans outstanding as of November 30, 2009. These amounts agreed to the Societies December 1, 2009 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of November 30, 2009:
2008 Land Purchase Loan	\$94,871
2009 Restroom Loan	\$182,565

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 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. 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 2011 and 2010 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 inquired of management, scanned the receipt ledger, and scanned the prior agree upon procedures report and determined that the Society had loan or credit agreements 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. The Society had total net indebtedness of \$128,692 for 2011 and \$168,041 for fiscal year 2010. We found no exceptions.

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 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. 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 during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes, social security, & Medicare	January 31, 2012	12/5/2011	\$209	\$209
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	11/30/2011	50	50
Local S.D. income tax	February 1, 2012	11/30/2011	35	35

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Check Register 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 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 did not receive a response from Officials to the exception 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 and those charged with governance and the Auditor of State and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 12, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CLERMONT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

CLERMONT 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 1, 2012**