

Peer Review Program

July 6, 2009

Bruce H Murphy, CPA
Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp
P.A.
13577 Feather Sound Dr Ste 400
Clearwater, FL 33762-5539

Dear Mr. Murphy:

It is my pleasure to notify you that on July 1, 2009, the Center Peer Review Committee accepted the report on the most recent peer review of your firm. The due date for your next review is November 30, 2011. This is the date by which all review documents should be completed and submitted.

As you know, the reviewer's opinion was unmodified. The Committee asked me to convey its congratulations to the firm.

Sincerely,



Robert Rohweder, Chair
CPCAF Peer Review Committee

cc: Patrick L Gallagher, CPA

Firm Number: 10122061

Review Number: 265114



NATHERSON & COMPANY, P.A.
Certified Public Accountants

1801 Glengary Street 544 Bay Isles Road
Sarasota, Florida 34231 Longboat Key, Florida 34228
(941) 923-1881 (941) 387-8555
Fax 923-0065

Members
American Institute of Certified
Public Accountants
Florida Institute of Certified
Public Accountants

Russell S. Natherson, C.P.A.
Patrick L. Gallagher, C.P.A.
Russell E. Natherson, C.P.A.
Randall L. Natherson, C.P.A.
Eileen A. Sarris, C.P.A.

December 2, 2008

To the Shareholders of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A.
and the Center for Public Company Audit Firms Peer Review Committee

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A. (the firm) applicable to non-SEC issuers in effect for the year ended May 31, 2008. The firm's accounting and auditing practice applicable to SEC issuers was not reviewed by us since the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) is responsible for inspecting that portion of the firm's accounting and auditing practice in accordance with PCAOB requirements. A system of quality control encompasses the firm's organizational structure and the policies adopted and procedures established to provide it with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. The elements of quality control are described in the Statements on Quality Control Standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the AICPA). The design of the system, and compliance with it, are the responsibilities of the firm. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system, and the firm's compliance with that system based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with standards established by the Peer Review Committee of the Center for Public Company Audit Firms and included procedures to plan and perform the review that are summarized in the attached description of the peer review process. Our review would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system of quality control or all instances of lack of compliance with it since it was based on selective tests. Because there are inherent limitations in the effectiveness of any system of quality control, departures from the system may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of a system of quality control to future periods is subject to the risk that the system of quality control may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice applicable to the non-SEC issuers of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A. in effect for the year ended May 31, 2008, has been designed to meet the requirements of the quality control standards for an accounting and auditing practice established by the AICPA, and was complied with during the year then ended to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with applicable professional standards.

Natherson & Company, P.A.

**Attachment to the Peer Review Report of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A.
Description of the Peer Review Process**

Overview

Firms enrolled in the AICPA Center for Public Company Audit Firms (the Center) Peer Review Program have their system of quality control periodically reviewed by independent peers. These reviews are system and compliance oriented with the objectives of evaluating whether:

The reviewed firm's system of quality control for its accounting and auditing practice applicable to non-SEC issuers has been designed to meet the requirements of the Quality Control Standards established by the AICPA.

The reviewed firm's quality control policies and procedures applicable to non-SEC issuers were being complied with to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards.

A peer review is based on selective tests and directed at assessing whether the design of and compliance with the firm's system of quality control for its accounting and auditing practice applicable to non-SEC issuers provides the firm with reasonable, not absolute, assurance of complying with professional standards. Consequently a peer review on the firm's system of quality control is not intended to, and does not, provide assurance with respect to any individual engagement conducted by the firm or that none of the financial statements audited by the firm should be restated.

The Center's Peer Review Committee (PRC) establishes and maintains peer review standards. At regular meetings and through report evaluation task forces, the PRC considers each peer review, evaluates the reviewer's competence and performance, and examines every report, letter of comments, and accompanying response from the reviewed firm that states its corrective action plan before the peer review is finalized. The Center's staff plays a key role in overseeing the performance of peer reviews working closely with the peer review teams and the PRC.

Once the PRC accepts the peer review reports, letters of comments, and reviewed firms' responses, these documents are maintained in a file available to the public. In some situations, the public file also includes a signed undertaking by the firm agreeing to specific follow-up action requested by the PRC.

Firms that perform audits or play a substantial role in the audit of one or more SEC issuers, as defined by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), are required to be registered with and have their accounting and auditing practice applicable to SEC issuers inspected by the PCAOB. Therefore, we did not review the firm's accounting and auditing practice applicable to SEC issuers.

**Attachment to the Peer Review Report of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A.
Description of the Peer Review Process - Continued**

Planning the Review for the Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice Applicable to Non-SEC Issuers

To plan the review of Kirkland, Russ, Murphy & Tapp, P.A., we obtained an understanding of (1) the nature and extent of the firm's accounting and auditing practice, and (2) the design of the firm's system of quality control sufficient to assess the inherent and control risks implicit in its practice. Inherent risks were assessed by obtaining an understanding of the firm's practice, such as the industries of its clients and other factors of complexity in serving those clients, and the organization of the firm's personnel into practice units. Control risks were assessed by obtaining an understanding of the design of the firm's system of quality control, including its audit methodology, and monitoring procedures. Assessing control risk is the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the reviewed firm's system of quality control in preventing the performance of engagements that do not comply with professional standards.

Performing the Review for the Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice Applicable to Non-SEC Issuers

Based on our assessment of the combined level of inherent and control risks, we selected engagements to test for compliance with the firm's system of quality control. The engagements selected for review included audits of Employee Benefit Plans. The engagements selected for review represented a cross-section of the firm's accounting and auditing practice with emphasis on higher-risk engagements. The engagement reviews included examining working paper files and reports and interviewing engagement personnel.

The scope of the peer review also included examining selected administrative and personnel files to determine compliance with the firm's policies and procedures for the elements of quality control pertaining to independence, integrity, and objectivity; personnel management; and acceptance and continuance of clients and engagements. Prior to concluding the review, we reassessed the adequacy of scope and conducted a meeting with firm management to discuss our findings and recommendations.