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Independent Accountant’s Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures

Mr. Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., Deputy State Auditor
State of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

We have performed the procedures described below, which were agreed to by the governing body and management of the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission (the “Commission”) and the South Carolina Office of the State Auditor (the “State Auditor”), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, in the areas addressed. The Commission’s management is responsible for its financial records, internal controls and compliance with State laws and regulations. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified parties 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.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

1. **Cash Receipts and Revenues**
   - We inspected 15 recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the Commission’s policies and procedures and State regulations.
   - We inspected 5 recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were recorded in the proper fiscal year.
   - We made inquiries and performed substantive procedures to determine if revenue collection and retention or remittance were supported by law.
   - We compared current year recorded revenues at the subfund and account level from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the earmarked and federal funds to ensure that revenue was classified properly in the Commission’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($26,000 – earmarked fund and $18,000 – federal fund) and +/- 10 percent.
• We made inquiries of management pertaining to the Commission’s policies for accountability and security over permits, licenses, and other documents issued for money. We observed Commission personnel performing their duties to determine if they understood and followed the described policies.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

2. Non-Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures

• We inspected 25 recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the Commission’s policies and procedures and State regulations, were bona fide disbursements of the Commission, and were paid in conformity with State laws and regulations; if the acquired goods and/or services were procured in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

• We inspected 18 recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were recorded in the proper fiscal year.

• We compared current year expenditures at the subfund and account level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and federal funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the Commission’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($15,000 – general fund, $26,000 – earmarked fund and $18,000 – federal fund) and +/- 10 percent.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

3. Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures

• We inspected 25 recorded payroll disbursements to determine if the selected payroll transactions were properly described, classified, and distributed in the accounting records; persons on the payroll were bona fide employees; payroll transactions were properly authorized and were in accordance with existing legal requirements and processed in accordance with the Commission’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

• We inspected payroll transactions for 4 new employees and 2 individuals who terminated employment to determine if the employees were added and/or removed from the payroll in accordance with the Commission’s policies and procedures, that the employee’s first and/or last pay check was properly calculated and that the employee’s leave payout was properly calculated in accordance with applicable State law.
• We compared current year payroll expenditures at the subfund and account level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and federal funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the Commission’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($15,000 – general fund, $26,000 – earmarked fund and $18,000 – federal fund) and +/- 10 percent.

• We compared the percentage change in recorded personal service expenditures to the percentage change in employer contributions and computed the percentage distribution of recorded fringe benefit expenditures by fund source and compared the computed distribution to the actual distribution of recorded payroll expenditures by fund source. We investigated changes of +/- 5 percent to ensure that payroll expenditures were classified properly in the Commission’s accounting records.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

4. Journal Entries, Operating Transfers and Appropriation Transfers

• We inspected 5 journal entries, 5 operating transfers, and 5 appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, the purpose of the transactions was documented and explained, the transactions were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the transactions were processed in accordance with the Commission’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

5. Appropriation Act

• We inspected Commission documents, observed processes, and/or made inquiries of Commission personnel to determine the Commission’s compliance with Appropriation Act general and Commission specific provisos.

We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
6. Reporting Packages

- We obtained copies of all reporting packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2012, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Comptroller General. We inspected them to determine if they were prepared in accordance with the Comptroller General's Reporting Policies and Procedures Manual requirements and if the amounts reported in the reporting packages agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance

- We obtained a copy of the Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance for the year ended June 30, 2012, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Auditor. We inspected it to determine if it was prepared in accordance with the State Auditor’s letter of instructions and if the amounts agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

8. Status of Prior Findings

- The fiscal year 2012 agreed-upon procedures engagement is the first agreed-upon procedures engagement performed for the Commission. Therefore, there are no prior year findings.

We were not engaged to and did not conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on specified elements, accounts, or items. Accordingly, we do not express such 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 the Governor, the governing body and management of the Commission, and the South Carolina Office of the State Auditor and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Scott and Company LLC

Columbia, South Carolina
June 27, 2013