



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Mercer County Agricultural Society
Mercer County
PO Box 301
Celina, Ohio 45822

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Directors and the management of Mercer 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, 2014 and 2013, 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, 2014 and November 30, 2013 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the December 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2012 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the December 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded to the November 30, 2013 balances. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the November 30, 2014 and 2013 fund cash balance reported in the Annual Financial Report. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the November 30, 2014 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, 2014 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the November 30, 2014 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent December bank statement. 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 interbank account transfers occurring in November of 2014 to determine if they were properly recorded in the accounting records and on each bank statement. We found no exceptions.
7. We tested investments held at November 30, 2014 and November 30, 2013 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 2014 and 2013. We also selected all the receipts from the Mercer County's Vendor History Report from 2014 and from 2013.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Receipt 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 Receipts

We haphazardly selected one day of admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2014 and one day of admission cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2013 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, 2014 and 10 rental cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2013 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.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended November 30, 2014 and 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended 2013 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. Receipt was posted to the proper fund(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior *agreed-upon procedures* documentation, we noted the following bond and note outstanding as of November 30, 2012. These amounts agreed to the Society's December 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of November 30, 2012:
Fair Ground Improvement Bond	\$23,600
Junior Fair Building Note	\$74,022

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 2014 or 2013 or debt payment activity during 2014 or 2013. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3.
3. We obtained a summary of debt service payments owed during 2014 and 2013 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.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2014 and one payroll check for five employees from 2013 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 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.)

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, 2014 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 2014. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes, social security, & Medicare	January 31, 2015	January 6, 2015	\$1,454	\$1,454
State income taxes	January 30, 2015	January 29, 2015	\$320	\$320
School District Income Tax	January 30, 2015	January 29, 2015	\$122	\$122

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Expenditure Report for the year ended November 30, 2014 and ten from the year ended 2013 and determined whether:
- The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - 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.
 - 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
Columbus, Ohio

May 12, 2015



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

MERCER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

MERCER 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 9, 2015**