



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CARROLL COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Independent Auditors' Report.....	1
Recoverable Findings – 2010 Paid Claims.....	8
Recoverable Findings – 2011 Paid Claims.....	8
Appendix A: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2010.....	13
Appendix B: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2011.....	15

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Independent Auditor's Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures

Halina Schroeder, Audit Chief
Division of Fiscal Administration, Audit Office
Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities
30 E. Broad Street, 13th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Ms. Schroeder:

As permitted by Ohio Rev. Code § 5123.05 and as required by the *Application for a § 1915(c) Home and Community Based Services Waiver*, Appendix 1-2(c), the Auditor of State's Office performed the procedures enumerated below, to which the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD) agreed. The purpose is to assist you in evaluating whether the Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities (County Board) prepared its *Income and Expenditure Report* for the years ended December 31, 2010 and 2011 (Cost Reports) in accordance with DODD's Guide to Preparing Income and Expenditure Reports for 2010 and 2011 (Cost Report Guides) and to assist you in evaluating whether reported receipts and disbursements complied with 2 CFR 225 (OMB Circular A-87 *Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments*), and other compliance requirements described in the procedures below. The County Board's management is responsible for preparing these reports. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of DODD. 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.

The Auditor of State, under the same authority noted above, also performed the Acuity Testing procedures below for the 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 Cost Reports.

Statistics – Square Footage

1. DODD requested us to tour the facilities to identify how space was used by County Board programs and to identify new, closed or empty buildings along with rented or idle space and, if final 2009 square footage totals are the same and no significant changes in the floor plan have occurred, to perform no additional procedures.

We toured the facilities to identify how space was used by County Board programs and to identify new, closed or empty buildings along with rented or idle floor space. We found no unreported rented or idle floor space.

We also compared 2010 and 2011 square footage totals to final 2009 square footage totals, discussed square footage changes with the County Board, and noted no significant changes have occurred except for the Supported Employment-Enclave in 2010 and 2011 and Children's Speech/Audiology in 2011. Therefore, we performed limited procedures below in those areas where the square footage has changed since 2009.

2. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's square footage for three rooms varied by more than 10 percent of the square footage reported in the summary which rolls up to *Schedule B-1, Section A, Square Footage*.

We measured three rooms in those areas where the square footage changed and compared the square footage to the County Board's square footage summaries.

We found no square footage variances for rooms that were measured exceeding 10 percent.

3. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's square footage for one floor plan varied by more than 10 percent of the square footage reported in the summary which rolls up to *Schedule B-1, Section A, Square Footage*.

We compared square footage for the Job Coach room and Director of Adult Services room on the Carroll Hills Workshop building's floor plan and the Speech Therapy room on the Carroll Hills School building's floor plan to the County Board's summaries.

We found no variances exceeding 10 percent.

4. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's square footage summary varied by more than 10 percent when comparing the County Board's summary to the Cost Report for any cell within *Schedule B-1, Section A, Square Footage*.

We compared the County Board's square footage summaries to the square footage reported for each cell in *Schedule B-1*.

We found no variances.

5. We obtained the County Board's methodology for allocating square footage between programs and reviewed the methodology to ensure that square footage for areas shared by more than one type of service is allocated by program based on reported usage of the area in accordance with the Cost Report Guides.

We found no inconsistencies between the County Board's methodology and the Cost Report Guides.

Statistics – Attendance

1. We reviewed the Cost Reports to determine if individuals served or units of service were omitted on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics*, worksheet 4, or worksheets 7A to 7H which result in unassigned program or general expenses-all program costs.

We determined that there were no individuals served or units of service omitted on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics*, worksheet 4, or worksheets 7A to 7H which resulted in unassigned program or general expenses-all program costs.

2. DODD asked us to compare the County Board's final 2009 typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance statistics* to the typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1* for 2010 and 2011 and, if the hours are the same, to do no additional procedures.

We compared the final 2009 typical hours of service to the typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1* for 2010 and 2011. We found the reported typical hours of service changed in 2010 and 2011 and we compared the County Board's supporting documentation for typical hours of service to the typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1* for 2010 and 2011.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

3. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's attendance statistics were not within two percent of the attendance statistics reported.

We compared the County Board's Day Services Attendance Summaries for the number of individuals served and days of attendance with similar information reported for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation and Enclave on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* and determined if the statistics were reported in accordance with the Cost Report Guides. We also footed the County Board's reports on attendance statistics for accuracy.

We found no variances or computational errors exceeding two percent for Facility Based Services and Enclave individuals served. We found variances or computational errors exceeding two percent for Enclave days of attendance. We reported these variances in Appendix A (2010) and B (2011).

4. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's number of individuals served varied by more than 10 percent when comparing to the prior period's final attendance statistics on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics*.

We compared the County Board's final 2009 number of individuals served to the final individuals served for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation and Enclave for 2010 and then we compared the final 2010 individuals served to the final individuals served for 2011 on *Schedule B-1*, and determined if the variances were over 10 percent.

The number of reported individuals served did not change by more than 10 percent from the prior year's *Schedule B-1* to 2010 for Facility Based Services. The number of reported individuals served did change by more than 10 percent from the prior year's *Schedule B-1* to 2010 for Enclave. The number of reported individuals served changed more than 10 percent from the 2010 *Schedule B-1* to 2011 for both Facility Based and Enclave services. As a result, we performed procedure 5 below.

5. DODD requested us to report variances if the individuals served on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* were not within three of the individuals documented on the attendance sheets.

We haphazardly selected 15 individual names from the County Board's Enclave attendance sheets for 2010, and 15 individual names for Facility Based and Enclave for 2011, and compared the individuals by name to the compiled listing of individuals served by program documentation which rolls up to *Schedule B-1*.

We found no differences exceeding three individuals.

6. DODD requested us to report variances to *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* if more than three of the 15 minute community employment units tested were not calculated in accordance with the Cost Report Guides.

We did not perform this procedure as the County Board did not provide Community Employment services.

Acuity Testing

1. DODD requested us to report variances if days of attendance on the Days of Attendance by Acuity supplemental Cost Report worksheet for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 did not agree to the County Board's supporting documentation.

We compared the County Board's Day Services Attendance Summary reports for the days of attendance for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/ Vocational Habilitation and Enclave with the Days of Attendance by Acuity supplemental Cost Report worksheet for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

- For 2008, we found 60 Facility Based days of attendance should be added to acuity level A;
 - For 2009, we found no acuity variances for days of attendance reported;
 - For 2010, we found 79 Enclave days of attendance that should be removed from acuity level A-1 and 63 Enclave days of attendance that should be added to acuity level A; and
 - For 2011, we found 17 Enclave days of attendance that should be added to acuity level A-1 and 28 Enclave days of attendance that should be removed from acuity level A.
2. We also compared two individuals from each acuity level on the County Board's 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 Day Services Attendance Summary to the Acuity Assessment Instrument or other documentation for each individual for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
 - For 2008, we found 21 Facility Based days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level A to B and 224 Facility Based days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level A-1 to A.
 - For 2009, we found 235 Facility Based days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level A-1 to A and 22 Enclave days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level A-1 to A;
 - For 2010, we found no acuity variances for days of attendance reported;
 - For 2011, we found two Facility Based days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level A-1 to A and 26 Enclave days of attendance for two individuals should be reclassified from acuity level A-1 to A.

We found two individuals in 2008, 2009, and 2010 and one individual in 2008 where the acuity assessment instrument or equivalent document could not be located by the County Board or was performed on a date after the year of acuity that was tested.

We reported these differences on the Days of Attendance by Acuity supplemental Cost Report worksheets for 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 and submitted them to DODD.

Statistics – Transportation

1. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's transportation units were not within two percent of total units reported on each line of *Schedule B-3 Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services*.

We compared the number of one-way trips from the County Board's Transportation Trips by Age Group and Transportation Detail reports with those statistics as reported in *Schedule B-3*. We also footed the County Board's transportation reports for accuracy.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

2. DODD requested us to report variances of more than 10 percent of the total trips taken for five individuals for both 2010 and 2011, between the County Board's internal documentation versus the amount reported on *Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services*.

We traced the number of trips for five adults and one child for March 2010 and September 2011 from the County Board's daily reporting documentation to *Schedule B-3*.

We found differences exceeding 10 percent in 2010. As a result of the differences found in 2010, we selected five additional individuals for testing. When we combined all individuals tested in 2010, we found no differences exceeding 10 percent. We found no differences in 2011.

3. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's cost of bus tokens/cabs was not within two percent of the total amount reported on *Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services*.

We compared the cost of bus tokens/cabs from the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports to the amount reported in *Schedule B-3*.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

Statistics – Service and Support Administration (SSA)

1. DODD requested us to report variances if the County Board's SSA units were not within two percent of total units reported on each line of *Schedule B-4, Quarterly Summary of Units of Service – Service and Support Administration*.

We compared the number of SSA units Targeted Case Management (TCM), Other SSA Allowable, and SSA Unallowable from the County Board's Quarterly Receivable Billing Reimbursable Summaries with those statistics reported in *Schedule B-4*. We also footed the County Board's quarterly summaries for accuracy.

We found no differences or computational errors.

2. DODD requested us to report variances if the Other SSA Allowable units tested had an error rate exceeding 10 percent.

We haphazardly selected samples of 63 Other SSA Allowable units for 2010 and 61 Other SSA Allowable units for 2011 from the Quarterly Receivable Billing Reimbursable Summaries and determined if the case note documentation described activities listed in Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(D), and also included the elements required by Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(F).

The units found to be in error did not exceed 10 percent of our sample for 2010. In 2011, the units found to be in error exceeded 10 percent and we reported these differences in Appendix B.

3. DODD requested us to report variances if the SSA Unallowable units tested had an error rate exceeding 10 percent.

We haphazardly selected a sample of 76 Unallowable SSA service units for 2010 and 61 Unallowable SSA service units for 2011 from the Quarterly Receivable Billing Reimbursable Summaries and determined if the case note documentation described activities listed in Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(D), and also included the elements required by Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(F).

The units found to be in error did not exceed 10 percent of our sample for 2010.

From the sample population of 572 Other SSA Unallowable units for 2011, we selected our sample of 61 units and found 38 percent of those units were TCM and Other SSA Allowable units and we projected and then reclassified 200 units as TCM units and 15 units as Other SSA Allowable Units.

We reported the differences in Appendix B (2011).

4. DODD requested us to report decreases exceeding five percent in total SSA units by line on *Schedule B-4* when compared to the prior year's final Cost Report.

We compared the final 2009 SSA units to the final 2010 SSA units and compared the final 2010 SSA units to the final 2011 SSA units.

The final 2010 TCM and Unallowable units and final 2011 Unallowable units decreased by more than five percent from the prior year's *Schedule B-4* and we obtained the County Board's explanation that the problem may have been a staff training issue and/or lack of SSAs documenting case notes adequately. During 2010, SSA staff were re-trained on documentation procedures and made aware of an expected minimum productivity standard.

5. DODD requested us to determine if the County Board maintained case note documentation for non-individual specific activities (general time units) as described in *Worksheet 9, Service and Support Administration Costs* of the Cost Report Guides. If the County Board did record general time units and they accounted for over 10 percent of total SSA units on the final *Schedule B-4* plus any general time units recorded, DODD requested us to determine if they were properly classified and report any variances with an error rate exceeding 10 percent and indicated a systemic issue.

We did not perform this procedure as the County Board did not track general time units.

Revenue Cost Reporting and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report

1. We compared the receipt totals from the 12/31/2010 and 12/31/2011 county auditor's Transaction History Report for the Carroll County Board of DD (S010), Hot Lunch (P010), 2004 Special Levy (S015), Family Support Services (T060), Title VI Grant (T065), ARRA Special Education Part B (T160), ARRA Early Childhood Special Education (T161), and Ohio Clean Diesel School Bus (T162) funds to the County Auditor's Report totals from the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheets*.

We found no differences.

2. DODD asked us to determine whether total County Board receipts reported in the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheets* reconciled within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly report of total receipts for these funds.

Total County Board receipts were within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly receipt totals reported for these funds.

3. DODD asked us to compare the account description and amount for each revenue reconciling item on the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet* to the County Board's revenue detail reports and other supporting documentation such as county tax settlement sheets.

We did not perform this procedure since the total County Board receipts were within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly receipt totals in procedure 2 above.

4. We compared revenue entries on *Schedule C Income Report* to the Mid East Ohio Regional Council (MEORC or the COG) prepared County Board Summary Workbooks.

We found no differences.

5. We reviewed the County Board's State Account Code Detailed Reports for 01/01/2010 to 12/31/2010 and 01/01/2011 to 12/31/2011 and *Schedule C, Income Report* to determine whether revenues are maintained separately to offset corresponding expense via the use of specific expenditure costs centers and identified any potential revenue offsets/applicable credits.

We identified the following sources of potential revenue credits for which the County Board did not offset costs on the Cost Reports in accordance with 2 CFR 225, Appendix A (C)(3)(c) and (4)(a):

- School Lunch Program revenues in the amount of \$10,765.94 in 2010 and \$9,443.24 in 2011;
- Title XX revenues in the amount of \$20,574 in 2010 and \$29,198 in 2011;
- Miscellaneous refunds, reimbursements and other income in the amount of \$11,98.36 in 2010 and \$12,919.14 in 2011;
- Local school district reimbursements in the amount of \$227,795.32 in 2010 and \$225,904.06 in 2011;
- IDEA Part B revenues in the amount of \$42,108.35 in 2010 and \$23,380.67 in 2011; and
- IDEA Early Childhood Special Education revenues in the amount of \$6,830.51 in 2010 and \$6,231.50 in 2011.

Paid Claims Testing

1. We selected 100 paid claims among all service codes from 2010 and 2011 from the Medicaid Billing System (MBS) data and determined if the claims met the following service documentation requirements of Ohio Admin. Code §§ 5123:2-9-05, 5123-2-9-18 (H)(1)-(2), and 5101:3-48-01(F):

- Date of service;
- Place of service;
- Name of the recipient;
- Name of the provider;
- Signature of the person delivering the service or initials of the person delivering the service if the signature and corresponding initials are on file with the provider;
- Type of service;
- Number of units of the delivered service or continuous amount of uninterrupted time during which the service was provided; and
- Arrival and departure times of the provider of service's site visit to the recipient's location or of the recipient's visit to the provider of service's location.¹

We found instances of non-compliance related to Targeted Case Management (TCM) services in both 2010 and 2011. However, for 2010 we found that the reimbursed TCM units per the MBS Summary by Service Code report exceeded total units provided (see procedure 2 below).

¹ For non-medical transportation we reviewed similar service documentation requirements to ensure compliance with Ohio Admin. Code § 5123:2-9-18 (H)(1)-(2) excluding H(1)(d),(f),(j) and H(2)(d),(f).

Recoverable Finding - 2010 Finding \$3,249.09

Service Code	Units	Review Results	Finding
TCM	443	Total reimbursed units exceeded final reported units	\$3,249.09

Recoverable Finding - 2011 Finding \$337.16

Service Code	Units	Review Results	Finding
TCM	48	Supporting documentation did not match units reimbursed	\$337.16

2. DODD requested us to report variances if units reimbursed by Medicaid were more than the units reported in the Cost Reports.

We compared the number of reimbursed TCM units and Community Employment units from the MBS Summary by Service Code report, to the final units on *Schedule B-4, Quarterly Summary of Units of Service – Service and Support Administration, Line (1)(F), TCM Units* and to *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics, Line (4)(C), Supported Employment – Community Employment*, 15 minute units, respectively.

We found the reimbursed TCM units exceeded actual TCM units delivered in 2010 and issued a finding for the variance (see Recoverable Finding – 2010 above). We found no instance where the Medicaid reimbursed units were greater than final TCM units in 2011. The County Board was not reimbursed for Supported Employment - Community Employment units in 2010 or 2011.

3. DODD requested us to report whether any reimbursements exceeded disbursements on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs- By Program* by two percent.

We compared the amounts reported on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program*, Lines (20), Environmental Accessibility Adaptations to Line (25), Other Waiver Services to the amount reimbursed for these services in 2010 and 2011 on the MBS Summary by Service Code report.

We found no differences as the County Board did not report costs on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program*, for Lines (20) to Line (25). We also reviewed the MBS Summary by Service Code report and found the County Board did not get reimbursed for these services in 2010 and 2011.

Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report

1. We compared the disbursement totals from the 12/31/2010 and 12/31/2011 county auditor's report listed on the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheets* to the county auditor's Transaction History Report balances for the Permanent Improvement (N000), Carroll County Board of DD (S010), Hot Lunch (P010), 2004 Special Levy (S015), Family Support Services (T060), Title VI Grant (T065), ARRA Special Education Part B (T160), ARRA Early Childhood Special Education (T161), and Ohio Clean Diesel School Bus (T162) funds.

We found no differences.

2. DODD asked us to determine whether total County Board disbursements reported in the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheets* reconciled within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly report of total disbursements for these funds.

Total county board disbursements were within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly disbursement totals reported for these funds.

3. DODD asked us to compare the account description and amount for each reconciling item on the *County Auditor Reconciliation Worksheets* to the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports and other supporting documentation such as county tax settlement sheets.

We did not perform this procedure since total County Board disbursements were within 1/4 percent of the county auditor's yearly disbursement totals in procedure 2 above.

4. DODD asked us to compare the County Board's detailed disbursements to the amounts reported on worksheets 2 through 10, and report variances exceeding \$100 for service contracts and other expenses on any worksheet.

We compared all service contract and other expenses entries on worksheets 2 through 10 to the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010). We found no differences exceeding \$100 on any worksheet in 2011.

5. We compared disbursement entries on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program* and worksheets 2 through 10 to the MEORC prepared County Board Summary Workbooks.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

6. DODD asked us to determine whether the County Board's detailed disbursements were properly classified within two percent of total service contracts and other expenses for all worksheets and if any worksheet included disbursements over \$100 which are non-federal reimbursable under 2 CFR 225 Appendix B.

We scanned the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports for service contracts and other expenses in the following columns and worksheets: Column X-General Expense-All Programs on worksheets 2 through 8; Column N-Service and Support Administration Costs on worksheet 9; and Columns E-Facility Based Services, F-Enclave, and G-Community Employment and H-unassigned on worksheet 10 and reviewed documentation to identify disbursements not classified as prescribed by the Cost Report Guides or costs which are non-federal reimbursable under 2 CFR 225 Appendix B.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011) for misclassified and non-federal reimbursable costs.

7. We scanned the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports for items purchased during 2010 and 2011 that met the County Board's capitalization criteria and traced them to inclusion on the County Board's Depreciation Schedules.

We reported differences for purchases that were not properly capitalized as reported in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011). We reported differences for 2010 purchases to record their first year's depreciation in Appendix B (2011). However, we did not determine if 2011 purchases were properly capitalized in 2012.

8. We haphazardly selected 20 disbursements from 2010 and 2011 from the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports that were classified as service contract and other expenses on worksheets 2 through 10. We determined if supporting documentation was maintained as required by 2 CFR 225 (OMB Circular A-87, Appendix A, (C)(1)(j)) and the disbursement was properly classified according to the Cost Report Guides.

We reported differences in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011) for misclassified and non-federal reimbursable costs.

Property, Depreciation, and Asset Verification Testing

1. We compared the County Board's procedures regarding capitalization of fixed assets with the Cost Report Guides for preparing *Worksheet 1, Capital Costs* and 2 CFR 225 (OMB Circular A-87, Appendix B, 15(a)(2)).

We noted the following inconsistencies between the County Board's capitalization policy and the guidelines above: per review of Carroll County's 2010 and 2011 Financial Condition reports, the County has a capital asset threshold of \$1,000 while the County Board utilizes a \$5,000 threshold. As a result, during procedure 7 in Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report section, we scanned for purchases over \$1,000 and reported adjustments accordingly.

2. We compared the County Board's final 2009 Depreciation Schedule to the County Board's 2010 and 2011 Depreciation Schedules for changes in the depreciation amounts for assets purchased prior to the periods under review which were not in compliance with the Cost Report Guides.

We found no differences.

3. DODD asked us to compare the depreciation costs reported in the County Board's depreciation schedule to the amounts reported on *Worksheet 1, Capital Costs*, and to report variances exceeding \$100.

We compared all depreciation entries reported on *Worksheet 1, Capital Costs* to the County Board's Depreciation Schedules.

We found no differences exceeding \$100.

4. We scanned the County Board's Depreciation Schedule for 2010 and 2011 for depreciation taken on the same asset more than once, assets that have been fully depreciated in prior years, or depreciation taken on assets during the period of acquisition which were not in compliance with the Cost Report Guides.

We found no differences.

5. We haphazardly selected two of the County Board's fixed assets purchased in either 2010 or 2011 to determine if the useful lives agreed to the estimated useful lives prescribed in the 2008 American Hospital Association (AHA) Asset Guide. We also recomputed the first year's depreciation for these assets, based on their cost, acquisition date and useful life to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guides and AHA Asset Guide.

We found no differences.

6. We haphazardly selected one disposed asset in 2010 from the County Board's list of disposed assets and determined if the asset was removed from the County Board's fixed asset ledger. We also recalculated depreciation and any gain or loss applicable to 2010 for the disposed items based on its undepreciated basis and any proceeds received from the disposal of the asset to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guide and CMS Publication 15-1, Chapter 1.

We found no differences.

Payroll Testing

1. DODD asked us to determine whether total County Board salaries and benefits in the 2010 and 2011 Cost Reports were within two percent of the county auditor's report totals for the Permanent Improvement (N000), Hot Lunch (P010), Carroll County Board of DD (S010), 2004 Special Levy (S015), Family Support Services (T060), Title VI Grant (T065), ARRA Special Education Part B (T160), ARRA Early Childhood Special Education (T161), OH Clean Diesel School Bus (T162) and Medicaid Reserve (U060) funds.

We totaled salaries and benefits from worksheets 2 through 10 from the 2010 and 2011 Cost Reports and compared the yearly totals to the county auditor's Transaction History Reports. The variance was less than two percent.

2. DODD asked us to compare the County Board disbursements on the State Expenses Detailed Reports to the amounts reported on worksheets 2 through 10, and to report variances exceeding \$100 for salaries or employee benefit expenses.

We compared all salary and employee benefit entries on worksheets 2 through 10 to the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports.

We found no differences exceeding \$100 on any worksheet.

3. We selected 27 employees and compared the County Board's organizational chart and staffing/payroll journal to the worksheet in which each employee's salary and benefit costs were allocated to ensure allocation is consistent with the Cost Report Guides.

We reported differences in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

4. DODD asked us to scan the County Board's detailed payroll reports for 2010 and 2011 and compare classification of employees to entries on worksheets 2 through 10 to determine if salary and benefit costs were reported in accordance with the Cost Report Guides if the errors in procedure 3 above exceeded 10 percent.

We did not perform this procedure as the misclassification errors in procedure 3 above did not exceed 10 percent of the sample size.

Medicaid Administrative Claiming (MAC)

1. DODD asked us to contact its Random Moment Time Study (RMTS) Coordinator to report differences if the MAC salary and benefits versus the County Board's payroll records exceeded one percent or more.

We compared the salary and benefits entered on the MAC RMTS Summary reports to the County Board's payroll records.

We found no variance exceeding one percent.

2. We compared the original MAC RMTS Summary Report(s) to Worksheet 6, columns (I) and (O) for both years.

We found no differences.

3. We compared Ancillary Costs on the Roll Up Report for the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM) report to Lines 6-10 of the *MAC Reconciliation Worksheet*.

We reported differences in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

4. We selected 10 RMTS observed moments completed by employees of the County Board from the DODD RMTS Participant Moments Question and Answer report for the fourth quarter of 2010 and seven RMTS observed moments from the third quarter of 2011 in which they documented their time spent on administering Medicaid-funded programs. We determined if supporting documentation of the County Board employees' activity for each observed moment was maintained and the observed moment was properly classified in accordance with DODD's Guide to Medicaid Administrative Claiming (MAC) using the Random Moment Time Studies (RMTS) Methodology for 2010 and 2011.

We found no differences.

We did not receive a response from officials to the exceptions noted above.

We were not engaged to and did not conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the County Board's Cost Reports. 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 use of the managements of the County Board, DODD, the Ohio Department of Medicaid, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 17, 2014

cc: Matt Campbell, Superintendent, Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Ray Heaston, Business Manager, Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Byron Fairclough, Board President, Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities

**Appendix A
Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2010 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments**

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule B-1, Section B				
2. Days Of Attendance (B) Supported Emp. -Enclave	518	(16)	502	To correct days of attendance
3. Typical Hours Of Service (A) Facility Based Services	5.5	0.5	6.0	To correct typical hours of service
Schedule B-3				
2. Pre-School (H) Cost Of Bus, Tokens, Cabs- Fourth Quarter	\$ -	\$ 535	\$ 535	To record parent reimbursements
3. School Age (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	2,178	(586)	1,592	To reclassify one-way trips
3. School Age (H) Cost of Bus, Tokens, Cabs- Fourth Quarter	\$ -	\$ 1,829	\$ 1,829	To record parent reimbursements
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	6,592	586	7,178	To reclassify one-way trips
6. Supported Emp. -Enclave (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	13	(2)	11	To correct one-way trips
Worksheet 1				
8. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 31	\$ (21)	\$ 10	To match audited COG workbook
8. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 226	\$ (150)	\$ 76	To match audited COG workbook
8. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 9	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 2				
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 55,664	\$ (5,112)	\$ 50,552	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 1,078	\$ (437)	\$ 641	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expense (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 7,805	\$ (3,165)	\$ 4,640	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expense (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 5,415	\$ 5,415	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 3				
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 103,362	\$ (4,088)	\$ 98,587	To reclassify capital asset acquisition
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 88,155	\$ (6,260)	\$ 81,895	To reclassify direct facility based services
4. Other Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 12,542	\$ (1,277)	\$ 11,265	To reclassify direct facility based services
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 18,202	\$ (1,192)	\$ 17,010	To reclassify direct facility based services
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 16	\$ 1	\$ 17	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 119	\$ 2	\$ 121	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 14	\$ 14	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 4				
4. Other Expenses (C) School Age	\$ 22,154	\$ (4,430)	\$ 17,724	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
Worksheet 5				
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential	\$ 3,069	\$ (3,069)	\$ -	To remove COG expenses
4. Other Expenses (B) Pre-School	\$ 9,470	\$ (1,412)	\$ 8,058	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (C) School Age	\$ 6,741	\$ (1,038)	\$ 5,703	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 23,721	\$ 2,500	\$ 26,053	To reclassify FCFC contribution
4. Other Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 2,500	\$ (2,500)	\$ -	To reclassify FCFC contribution
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 168	\$ 168	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 3,069	\$ 3,069	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 2,637	\$ 2,637	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 7-B				
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 3,141	\$ 150	\$ 3,291	To record nursing expenses
Worksheet 7-D				
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 1,110	\$ 1,110	To reclassify psych expenses
Worksheet 8				
1. Salaries (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ -	\$ 32,553	\$ 32,553	To reclassify child transportation salaries
1. Salaries (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ -	\$ 32,918	\$ 32,918	To reclassify adult transportation salaries
1. Salaries (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 269,786	\$ (32,553)	\$ 204,315	To reclassify child transportation salaries
2. Employee Benefits (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ -	\$ 5,570	\$ 5,570	To reclassify adult transportation salaries
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ -	\$ 5,632	\$ 5,632	To reclassify child transportation benefits
2. Employee Benefits (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 87,723	\$ (5,570)	\$ 82,153	To reclassify adult transportation benefits
		\$ (5,632)	\$ 76,521	To reclassify child transportation benefits

Appendix A (Page 2)
Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2010 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Worksheet 9				
4. Other Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 14,946	\$ (1,030)	\$ 13,916	To reclassify capital asset acquisitions
Worksheet 10				
1. Salaries (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 568,024	\$ 23,310	\$ 591,334	To correct salary reclassifications
1. Salaries (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 121,810	\$ (23,310)	\$ 98,500	To correct salary reclassifications
2. Employee Benefits (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 220,868	\$ 15,339	\$ 236,207	To correct benefit reclassifications
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 58,021	\$ (15,339)	\$ 42,682	To correct benefit reclassifications
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 37,963	\$ (11,380)		To reclassify capital asset acquisitions
		\$ (1,110)		To reclassify psych expenses
		\$ 4,430		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 5,112		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 687		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 6,260		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,277		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,192		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,412		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,038	\$ 46,881	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet				
Expense:				
Plus: Purchases Greater Than \$5,000	\$ 163,161	\$ 4,088		To reclassify capital asset acquisitions
		\$ 1,030		To reclassify capital asset acquisitions
		\$ 11,380	\$ 179,659	To reclassify capital asset acquisitions
Less: COG Community Residential from Schedule A & COG Comm.Res. / Service Contracts from WrkSht 5	\$ (44,895)	\$ 3,069	\$ (41,826)	To remove COG expense
Medicaid Administration Worksheet				
Lines 6-10 Ancillary costs		\$ 2,682	\$ 2,682	To record ancillary costs

Appendix B
Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2011 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule A				
19. Room and Board/Cost to Live (L) Community Residential	\$ 57,286	\$ (349)	\$ 56,937	To match audited COG workbook
23. Homemaker/Personal Care (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 2,270	\$ 2,270	To match audited COG workbook
Schedule B-1, Section B				
2. Days Of Attendance (B) Supported Emp. -Enclave	398	(11)	387	To correct days of attendance
3. Typical Hours Of Service (A) Facility Based Services	5.5	0.5	6.0	To correct typical hours of service
Schedule B-3				
3. School Age (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	1,946	(390)	1,556	To reclassify one-way trips
3. School Age (H) Cost of Bus, Tokens, Cabs- Fourth Quarter	\$ -	\$ 2,301	\$ 2,301	To record parent reimbursements
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	3,534	390		To reclassify one-way trips
		(82)	3,842	To remove trips counted for a County Board employee
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	1,452	200	1,652	To project allowable units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	214	(17)		To reclassify unallowable units
		15	212	To project allowable units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (C) 3rd Quarter	172	(21)	151	
5. SSA Unallowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	194	17		To reclassify unallowable units
		(194)	17	To project allowable units
Worksheet 1				
2. Land Improvements (D) Unasgn Children Programs	\$ 11,472	\$ 144	\$ 11,616	To record depreciation
4. Fixtures (D) Unasgn Children Programs	\$ 3,144	\$ 152	\$ 3,296	To record depreciation
5. Movable Equipment (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 1,251	\$ 1,950		To record depreciation
		\$ 215		To record depreciation
		\$ 233		To record depreciation
		\$ 430	\$ 4,079	To record depreciation
5. Movable Equipment (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 855	\$ 46	\$ 901	To record depreciation
8. COG Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 5	To match audited COG workbook
8. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 4	To match audited COG workbook
8. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 95	\$ 22	\$ 117	To match audited COG workbook
8. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ 13	\$ 2	\$ 15	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 2				
2. Employee Benefits (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 84,027	\$ 3,668	\$ 87,695	To reclassify worker's compensation expense
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 54,808	\$ (3,668)		To reclassify worker's compensation expense
		\$ (1,584)		To reclassify worker's compensation legal fees
		\$ (8,515)	\$ 41,041	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
5. COG Expense (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 215	\$ 215	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 145	\$ 145	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expense (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 1,114	\$ 3,483	\$ 4,597	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expense (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ 6,381	\$ 12,812	\$ 19,193	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 3				
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 74,869	\$ (1,030)		To reclassify capital asset acquisition
		\$ (206)	\$ 73,633	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 82,946	\$ (6,042)	\$ 76,904	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 2,494	\$ (1,277)	\$ 1,217	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 3,521	\$ (1,313)	\$ 2,208	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
5. COG Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 5	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 3	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ 26	\$ 75	\$ 101	To match audited COG workbook
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ 3	\$ 10	\$ 13	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 4				
4. Other Expenses (C) School Age	\$ 15,700	\$ (4,306)	\$ 11,394	To reclassify direct facility based expenses

Appendix B (Page 2)
Carroll County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2011 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Worksheet 5				
4. Other Expenses (B) Pre-School	\$ 6,502	\$ 1,584	\$ 8,086	To reclassify worker's compensation legal fees
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 13,924	\$ (303)		To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense
		\$ 2,500		To reclassify FCFC contribution
		\$ (349)	\$ 15,772	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense
4. Other Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 2,500	\$ (2,500)	\$ -	To reclassify FCFC contribution
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 303		To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense
		\$ 349	\$ 652	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 654	\$ 654	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 8				
5. COG Costs (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 197	\$ 197	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 9				
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 19,500	\$ 1,261	\$ 20,761	To match audited COG workbook
Worksheet 10				
1. Salaries (F) Enclave	\$ 27,013	\$ 3,739	\$ 30,752	To reclassify enclave salaries
1. Salaries (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 101,844	\$ (3,739)	\$ 98,105	To reclassify enclave salaries
2. Employee Benefits (F) Enclave	\$ 9,315	\$ 345	\$ 9,660	To reclassify enclave benefits
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 52,433	\$ (345)	\$ 52,088	To reclassify enclave benefits
3. Service Contracts (G) Community Employment	\$ 7,000	\$ (7,000)	\$ -	To reclassify job development contract expenses
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 13,770	\$ 4,306		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 8,515		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 206		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 6,042		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,277		To reclassify direct facility based expenses
		\$ 1,313	\$ 35,429	To reclassify direct facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ 21,042	\$ 7,000	\$ 28,042	To reclassify job development contract expenses
5. COG Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 773	\$ 773	To match audited COG workbook
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet				
Expense:				
Less: Capital Costs	\$ (125,299)	\$ (144)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (152)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (46)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (1,950)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (215)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (233)		To reconcile off depreciation expense
		\$ (430)	\$ (128,469)	To reconcile off depreciation expense
Plus: Purchases Greater Than \$5,000	\$ 9,148	\$ 1,030	\$ 10,178	To reclassify capital asset acquisition
Less: COG Community Residential from Schedule A	\$ (57,621)	\$ (1,921)	\$ (59,542)	To reconcile off COG expenses
Medicaid Administration Worksheet				
Lines 6-10 Ancillary Costs		\$ 5,608	\$ 5,608	To record ancillary costs



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CARROLL COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

CARROLL 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
JULY 29, 2014**