



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Greene County Agricultural Society
Greene County
120 Fairground Road
Xenia, OH 45385

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

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 in the Bank Register Report 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 Reconciliation Detail Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We observed the year-end bank balance on the financial institution's website. The balance agreed. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the November 30, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the November 30, 2010 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 Transaction Detail by Account Report, to determine the debits were dated prior to November 30. 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 Transaction Detail by Account report. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper account code(s). We found one exception where a receipt was improperly posted as an Other Operating receipt instead of State Support.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

2. We confirmed the Local Funding amounts paid from Greene County during the years ended November 30, 2009 and November 30, 2010 with the County Auditor's Office. We found no exceptions.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper account code(s). We found no exceptions.
 - b. 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 2010 and one day of admission/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).

For August 3, 2010 there were no recalculation sheets for the amounts presented for Grandstand tickets. For August 7, 2009 there were no recalculation sheets for the amounts presented for Admissions Tickets. However, because we did not test all receipts, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.

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.

Over-The-Counter Cash Receipts

We haphazardly selected 10 over-the-counter cash receipts from the year ended December 31, 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. Receipt was posted to the proper fund, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior audit report, we noted the following loan outstanding as of November 30, 2008. These amounts agreed to the Societies December 1, 2008 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of November 30, 2008:
Building Mortgage	\$420,217

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 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 2010 or 2009. We noted no new debt issuances; however there was debt payment activity during 2010 and 2009.
3. We obtained a summary of debt service payments owed during 2010 and 2009 and agreed these payments from the expenditure ledger to the related debt amortization schedule. 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 Transaction Detail by Account Ledger, and scanned the prior audit report and determined that the Society had a loan 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. It was noted that in 2009 total debt outstanding at year end equaled \$408,795 and the total 2009 revenues equaled \$801,588. Debt was 51% of total Revenues. It was noted that in 2010 total debt outstanding at year end equaled \$388,055 and the total 2010 revenues equaled \$697,161. Debt was 55% of total revenues.

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 Transaction Detail by Account Register and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Transaction Detail by Account Register to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We noted that not all of the employees had legislatively approved pay rates. However, because we did not test all payroll disbursement, our report provides no assurance regarding whether or not other similar errors occurred.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Transaction Detail by Account Register. We found no exceptions.
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the Tax Information file 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.)

It was noted that the Society did not maintain specific personnel folders for employees at the Society. They maintained Federal and state tax information on file in a tax folder. They did not have folders for each employee that document authorized pay rate, and not all employees had an authorized pay rate.

Payroll Cash Disbursements (Continued)

- 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, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2010. 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, 2011	\$1,388.68 on 11/1/2010 \$1,101.20 on 11/26/10 \$1,570.39 on 12/29/10	\$4,060.27	\$4,060.27
State income taxes	January 15, 2011	\$126.96 on 1/3/2011 \$237.68 on 11/24/2010	\$364.64	\$364.64
Xenia City School District taxes	January 31, 2011	\$96.60 on 11/24/2010 \$57.28 on 1/3/2011	\$153.88	\$153.88
Xenia City Local Income taxes	February 28, 2011	\$76.70 on 11/24/2010 \$67.59 on 1/3/2011	\$144.29	\$144.29

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

- From the Transaction Detail by Account report, we re-footed checks recorded as disbursements for equipment and grounds maintenance for 2010. We found no exceptions.
- We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Transaction Detail by Account Report for the year ended November 30, 2010 and ten from the year ended 2009 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.

Officials' Response - We did not receive a response from Officials to the exceptions 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, 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

August 29, 2011



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

GREENE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

GREENE 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
NOVEMBER 10, 2011**