



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State



Mary Taylor, CPA

Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Maple Grove Union Cemetery
Portage County
6698 N. Chestnut Street
Ravenna, Ohio 44266

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Maple Grove 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, 2009 and 2008, 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, 2009 and December 31, 2008 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2008 beginning balance recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2007 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, 2009 and 2008 cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2009 and 2008 bank account balances with the Cemetery's financial institutions. We found no exceptions.
5. We selected five outstanding checks haphazardly from the December 31, 2009 and 2008 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, 2009 and 2008 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.

Sales of Lots

We haphazardly selected 10 cash receipts for sales of lots from the year ended December 31, 2009 and 10 cash receipts for sales of lots from the year ended 2008 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 codes, and was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2009 and one payroll check for five employees from 2008 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and determined whether the following information in the minute record 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 and fund to which the check should be charged.
 - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
 - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.

We found no exceptions related to steps 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 determined whether the account code to which the check was posted was reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Payroll Cash Disbursements – (Continued)

3. We scanned one month's remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2009 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and that the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld during the final withholding period during 2009. We noted the following:

Withholding	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Withheld	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes	January 31th	12-31-09	\$1,353	\$1,836
State income taxes	January 15th	12-31-09	\$ 409	\$ 409
Local income tax	January 30th	12-31-09	\$ 332	\$ 333
OPERS retirement (withholding plus employee share)	January 30th	12-31-09	\$4,049	\$4,049

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2009 and ten from the year ended 2008 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 Payment Register Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - 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, 2009 and 2008 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 and those charged with governance and the Auditor of State and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

August 3, 2010



Mary Taylor, CPA
Auditor of State

MAPLE GROVE UNION CEMETERY

PORTAGE 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
SEPTEMBER 14, 2010**