



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**NEW LEXINGTON PIKE TOWNSHIP UNION CEMETERY
PERRY COUNTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

New Lexington Pike Township Union Cemetery
Perry County
440 Swigart Street
New Lexington, Ohio 43764

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the New Lexington Pike Township Union Cemetery, Perry County, Ohio (the Cemetery), agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 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 December 31, 2010 and December 31, 2009 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2009 beginning balance recorded in the Cashbook to the December 31, 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 December 31, 2010 and 2009 cash balances reported in the Cashbook. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2010 bank account balances with the Cemetery's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected both outstanding checks from the December 31, 2010 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each check to the debit appearing in the subsequent January 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 December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Cash (Continued)

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2010 and December 31, 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.

Property Tax Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax Cemetery receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for the City of New Lexington for 2010 and one from 2009:
 - a. We traced the receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger and Cashbook. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Ledger and Cashbook to determine whether it included the proper number of tax receipts for 2010 and 2009:
 - a. Two personal property tax receipts from the City of New Lexington and Pike Township
 - b. Two real estate tax receipts from the City of New Lexington and Pike TownshipWe noted the Receipt Ledger and Cashbook included the proper number of tax settlement receipts for each year.

Sales of Lots

- We haphazardly selected 10 cash receipts for sales of lots from the year ended December 31, 2010 and 10 cash receipts for sales of lots from the year ended 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 posted to the proper account code, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Charges for Services (Burials)

- We haphazardly selected 10 cash receipts for burials from the year ended December 31, 2010 and 10 cash receipts for burials from the year ended 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 posted to the proper account code, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior audit report disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2008.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Cashbook for evidence of debt issued during 2010 or 2009 or debt payment activity during 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 Journal and determined whether the following information in the employees' personnel 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. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged
 - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding
 - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding
 - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.)

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. 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 or legislatively-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the payroll register. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the account code to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel file. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 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	January 31, 2011	December 29, 2010	\$290.27	\$290.27
State income taxes	January 31, 2011	January 5, 2011	\$316.60	\$316.60
Local income tax	February 28, 2011	January 5, 2011	\$.76	\$.76
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 31, 2011	December 28, 2010	\$853.60	\$853.60

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. For the Disbursement Ledger report, we refooted checks recorded as disbursements for Materials and Supplies for 2010. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed total disbursements (non-payroll and payroll) from the Disbursement Journal for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 to the total disbursements recorded in the check register. We found no exceptions.

During our review of non-payroll cash disbursements, we noted the fiscal officer recorded the purchase of an \$85,000 certificate of deposit in June 2010 as a disbursement in the Cemetery records and on the annual financial statement even though these monies were already a part of the Cemetery's cash pool and were just being invested differently. The recording of the purchase of certificates of deposit or other investments is not necessary since these are already funds on the Cemetery's books. The Fiscal Officer has adjusted her records to eliminate this activity.

3. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Disbursement Journal for the year ended December 31, 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 Check Register and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - c. The payment was posted to a proper account code. We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the Disbursement Journal report for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2009 for projects requiring the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We identified no projects subject to the aforementioned prevailing wage requirements.

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 Cemetery'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.

New Lexington Pike Township Union Cemetery
Perry County
Independent Accountant's Report on
Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures
Page 5

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

April 11, 2011

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NEW LEXINGTON PIKE TOWNSHIP UNION CEMETERY

PERRY 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 17, 2011**