

Addendum

Request for Proposal FY10-0408 External Auditing and Consulting

Addendum No.: 1 (herein referred to as "Addendum")

This Addendum revises the above-described procurement, and is hereby incorporated and made a part of the above-described procurement as if the Addendum had been included in the original procurement documents. Addendum posted on website at www.orangeburgcounty.org
– Purchasing/Bids - Solicitations

The Addendum is as follows: Questions/Responses Posted March 28, 2011

Question 1. Is the FY 2010 CAFR completed? If so, please provide a copy of the document. (Note: County web site only contained the FY 2009 as the most recent year.)

Response 1. Unfortunately, it is not completed yet.

Question 2. Since the Auditor's Report for the prior 3 years (FY 2009, FY 2008, FY 2007) contained audit opinion dates of February 26, 2010, April 30, 2009, and January 30, 2008, respectively, what assurances does the County warrant that 'all' financial information (inclusive of trial balances, final general ledger, fund-level financial statements, and GASB 34 financial statements, notes, etc., are prepared prior to audit beginning fieldwork and the auditor being able to finalize a report by the RFP deadline of NOVEMBER 30, 2011?

Response 2. County cannot assure this, as the reason(s) for the delay of our audit varies.

Question 3. The CAFR's are noted that they are "Prepared by Finance Department". Since the RFP is somewhat silent on this fact, what is the County's intention to who 'prepares' and 'reproduces' the CAFR document?

Response 3. The Finance Department submits (electronically) all financial reports to the auditors each year and they reproduce it in the CAFR document. The Finance Department prepares the Statistical Section and the MD&A and assists with various tables.

Question 4. How many audit journal entries were required for the prior audit?

Response 4. 52 (Fifty-two)

Questions 5. What were the audit fees for the past 3 years?

Response 5. \$52,930; \$129,686.50; \$84,655, respectively

Question 6. Were any additional services required by the auditors during the past 3 years? If so what were they?

Response 6. Yes; capital assets not in asset system; trial balance issues (merging County's activity with Library's stand alone system); budget vs. actual variances with Library and County personnel; LEC: Calhoun's and Orangeburg's appropriations - budget underfunded; meetings; grant documents not in agreement with general ledger; A/R's not posted; OPEB; numerous assets meeting capitalization criteria not on County's system; depreciation calculation errors.

Question 7. Are any additional services anticipated by the County from the auditor?

Response 7. Yes