



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

New Holland Union Cemetery
Pickaway County
PO Box 75
New Holland, OH 43145

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of New Holland Union Cemetery, Pickaway 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, 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. The Cemetery processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Cemetery because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning balance recorded in the Fund Ledger Report to the December 31, 2009 balances 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 December 31, 2011 and 2010 cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balance with the Cemetery's financial institution. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation. We found no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

5. We selected all reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January 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 December 31. We noted no exceptions.

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 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 agreed amounts paid from Perry Township and the Village of New Holland during 2011 and 2010 in regards to the agreements with these entities, to the Receipt Register Report.
 - a. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper account code. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Charges for Services

We haphazardly selected 10 cash receipts for charges for services from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 cash receipts for charges for services from the year ended 2010 recorded in the duplicate cash receipts book and determined whether the:

- a. Receipt amount agreed to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. 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. From the agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following loan outstanding as of December 31, 2009. The amount agreed to the Cemetery's January 1, 2010 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2009:
House Loan	\$58,348

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of 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 note debt activity for 2011 and 2010 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to General Fund payments reported in the Payment Register Detail Report. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Cemetery made the payments. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for each employee from 2011 and one payroll check for each employee from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard or legislatively-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We determined whether the account code to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the employees' personnel files. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2012	01/17/2012	\$434.44	\$434.44
State income taxes	January 15, 2012	01/14/2012	\$93.14	\$93.14
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2012	01/14/2012	\$508.67	\$508.67

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 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 Payment Register Detail Report 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 Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 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 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.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, and others within the Cemetery, 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 initial "D".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

May 7, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NEW HOLLAND UNION CEMETERY

PICKAWAY 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 29, 2012**