



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Forest Hill Union Cemetery
Miami County
8660 North State Route 66
Piqua, Ohio 45356

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Forest Hill Union Cemetery (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.

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 Cash Journal to the December 31, 2009 balances in the prior year 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 December 31, 2011 and 2010 cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Cemetery's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balance to the amount appearing on the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.
5. We selected five 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 written to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (continued)

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 noted 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 Taxes, Intergovernmental and Other Confirmable Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2011 and one from 2010:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Ledger. 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. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the Receipt Ledger to determine whether it included the two real estate tax receipts for 2011 and 2010. We noted the Receipt Ledger included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all three receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2011 and all three receipts from 2010.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above report 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.

Sales of Lots and Grave Openings and Closings

We haphazardly selected 10 cash receipts for sales of lots and 10 cash receipts for grave openings and closings from the year ended December 31, 2011 and 10 cash receipts for sales of lots and 10 cash receipts for grave openings and closings 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 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(s), and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. The prior agreed-upon procedures documentation disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Ledger and Appropriation Ledger for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010.

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 Ledger and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Ledger 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(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minutes. 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 and Medicare	January 31, 2012	12/30/11	\$1,932.00	\$1,932.00
State income taxes	January 17, 2012	12/30/11	\$436.18	\$436.18
Local income taxes	January 15, 2012	12/30/11	\$248.57	\$248.57
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employer share)	January 30, 2012	12/30/11	\$3,978.72	\$3,978.72

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Appropriation Ledger, we re-footed checks recorded as disbursements for *supplies* for 2011. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriation Ledger 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 Appropriation Ledger 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 Appropriation Ledger 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 a paving project subject to Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. We read the contract and noted that it required the contractor to pay prevailing wages to their employees as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 4115.04 and 4115.05. The contract included the Ohio Department of Commerce's schedule of prevailing rates.

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 and 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.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

April 16, 2012



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

FOREST HILL UNION CEMETERY

MIAMI 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**