



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VINTON COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Independent Auditors' Report.....	1
Recommendation – Transportation Documentation	5
Paid Claims - Recoverable Findings – 2010.....	9
Paid Claims - Recoverable Findings – 2011.....	9
Appendix A: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2010.....	15
Appendix B: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2011.....	17

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 I-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 Vinton 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 and discussed square footage changes with the County Board. We noted significant changes have occurred and performed the procedures below.

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 and compared the square footage to the County Board's floor plan and 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 each room on the building's floor plan to the County Board's summary for each year.

We found variances exceeding 10 percent and we reported these variances in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011).

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 summary to the square footage reported for each cell in *Schedule B-1*.

We found no variances exceeding 10 percent.

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 Guide except; however, based on other procedures performed in the Payroll Testing section, square footage was omitted on *Schedule B-1* for Enclave and Transportation. We obtained the County Board's input on allocating square footage to these programs.

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

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*, 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. There was no change for typical hours of service for facility based services. In 2009, the County Board did not report typical hours of service for Enclave. The County Board provided supporting documentation for the Enclave typical hours of service and we compared the supporting documentation to *Schedule B-1*.

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 Attendance by Acuity report for Adult Day Services and Attendance report for Enclave in 2010 and Day Services Attendance Summary By Consumer Location and Month for both Adult Day Services and Enclave in 2011 for the number of individuals served, 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 variances or computational errors exceeding two percent in 2010 for Enclave as the County Board provided Enclave services but reported these as Adult Day and Vocation Habilitation Services and we reported these variances in Appendix A (2010). In addition, we found the Enclave services were billed with wrong procedure code and identified recoverable finding for this error (see Paid Claims Testing section). In 2011, we found no variances or computational errors exceeding two percent.

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 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 Enclave individuals served changed by more than 10 percent from the prior year's *Schedule B-1* in 2010 and the number of reported individuals served for Adult Day Services and Enclave changed more than 10 percent from 2010 to 2011 and 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 did not perform this test for 2010 Enclave individuals as we adjusted 100 percent of the individuals from the Enclave attendance reports (see procedure 3). For 2011, we haphazardly selected 15 for individuals for both Adult Day and Enclave 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.

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 in 2010 or 2011.

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 attendance by acuity 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.

We found no variances in 2008, 2009 or 2011. For 2010, we found 256 Enclave days of attendance that should be added to acuity level A.

2. We also compared two individuals from each acuity level on the County Board's 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 attendance acuity reports to the Acuity Assessment Instrument for each individual for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

We found 19 Adult Day services days of attendance for one individual should be reclassified from acuity level B to A for 2008.

We found no acuity variances for 2009, 2010 and 2011.

We submitted revised 2010 supplemental spreadsheets reflecting the differences 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 Print Transportation by Age Group report in 2010 and Receivable Billing Reimbursable Summary by Funding Source and Service report in 2011 with those statistics as reported in *Schedule B-3*. We also footed the County Board's Transportation reports for accuracy.

We found no differences or computational errors. However, we noted that transportation statistics for Enclave for both years were not documented on *Schedule B-3*. We estimated the number of Enclave trips using the Enclave attendance report in 2010 and Day Services Attendance Summary By Consumer, Location, Acuity and Month report in 2011 and multiplying Enclave days of attendance by two for an estimated total of 512 trips in 2010 and 542 trips in 2011.

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

Recommendation:

We recommend the County Board maintain the required documentation for services as required by the Cost Report Guides in section Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services which states in pertinent part, "This worksheet requires statistical information for children and adult programs. Transportation records indicating trips to and from the county dd board programs must be maintained by each county dd board for each person transported" and the Audit and Records Retention Requirements section, which states, "Expenditure and Income Reports are subject to audit by DODD, ODJFS and CMS at their discretion. Records, documentation, and supplemental worksheets used to prepare the report must be kept on file for a period of seven years from the date of receipt of payment from all sources, or for six years following completion and adjudication of any state or federal initiated audit, whichever period of time is longer."

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 adult individuals for one month each in 2010 and one month each in 2011 from the County Board's daily reporting documentation to *Schedule B-3*.

We found no differences exceeding 10 percent.

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 did not perform this procedure as the County Board did not report the cost of bus tokens, cabs on *Schedule B-3* for 2010 or 2011. However, we scanned the County Board's State Expenses Without Payroll or Benefits (Detailed) Reports for any of these costs not identified by the County Board. We found no unreported costs of bus tokens, cabs.

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, Home Choice, and SSA Unallowable) from the County Board's quarterly SSA units reports for 2010 and quarterly Receivable Billing Reimbursable Summary By Funding Source and Service report for 2011 with those statistics reported in *Schedule B-4*. We also footed the County Board's quarterly SSA reports for accuracy.

We found no differences or computational errors in 2010. In 2011, we found differences exceeding two percent as reported in Appendix B.

As part of our planning for this engagement, we found that the County Board was reimbursed for Home Choice units. The County Board provided supporting case note documentation for the Home Choice units and we traced these units to the Vinton Unit Report (Billable) and confirmed that some of the Home Choice units were misclassified as TCM units. We traced these misclassified units to the Medicaid Billing System (MBS) data and found that the misclassified units were reimbursed as TCM services. The remaining Home Choice units were omitted from *Schedule B-4*.

We reported these differences in Appendix A (2010) and Appendix B (2011). We also identified a recoverable finding in 2010 and 2011 for the Home Choice units reimbursed as TCM units which is included in the Paid Claims Testing section of this report.

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

We haphazardly selected two samples of 60 Other SSA Allowable units for both 2010 and 2011 from the Unit Entry by Date Span reports for 2010 and Receivable Billing Reimbursable Detail reports for 2011 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 and 2011.

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 60 Unallowable SSA service units for both 2010 and 2011 from the Detailed Units Marked Non Billable reports for 2010 and Receivable Billing Reimbursable Detail reports for 2011 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 of our sample and we reported these differences in Appendix B.

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 SSA Unallowable units decreased by more than five percent from the prior year and we determined that this was due to separate tracking of general time and unallowable service time. The final 2011 SSA Unallowable units decreased by more than five percent from the prior year and we obtained the County Board's explanation that the Service and Support Administrators decreased the provision of direct services to increase productivity. Additionally, the final 2011 Home Choice units decreased by more than five percent from the prior year and we obtained the County Board's explanation that it was due to fewer individuals being enrolled in the program.

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 haphazardly selected a sample of 60 General Time Units for both 2010 and 2011 from the Non-Billable, General Time reports for 2010 and Receivable Billing Reimbursable Detail reports for 2011 and determined if the case note documentation described activities listed in Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(D) or in *Worksheet 9, Service and Support Administration Costs*, Section 1(b) of the Cost Report Guides.

From the sample population of 179 general time units for 2010, we selected our sample of 60 units and found 15 percent of those units were for allowable activities. We projected and then reported 27 units as Other SSA Allowable units.

We reported the differences in Appendix A (2010). The units found to be in error did not exceed 10 percent of our sample for 2011.

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 Budget Report for the MRF (B50), F-MAP (B51), and Residential (T23) funds to the county auditor's report totals reported on 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 State Account Code Detail Revenue Reports and other supporting documentation.

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 Southern Ohio Council of Governments (SOCOG) prepared County Board Summary Workbooks.

We found no differences.

5. We reviewed the County Board's State Account Code Detailed Revenue Reports 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):

- Miscellaneous refunds in the amount of \$1,237 in 2010 and \$318 in 2011;
- Miscellaneous reimbursements in the amount of \$4,616 in 2011; and
- Title XX revenues in the amount of \$9,137 in 2010 and \$11,037 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 identified non-compliance in both 2010 and 2011. In 2010 the errors for Non-Medical Transportation - Per Trip (ATB/FTB) exceeded 10 percent of the ATB and FTB units in the sample, and as a result, we selected an additional 20 paid services for these two service codes where the units billed were greater than two. All 20 services had errors related to paid units exceeding units documented. Based on the identified errors, we identified recoverable finding for all instances of ATB and FTB services with greater than 2 units.

In addition, during testing of SSA services we identified Home Choice units that were billed and paid as TCM services and identified recoverable findings for these units. (See Statistics – Service and Support Administration section).

We also identified Enclave services that were billed as Adult Day Support and Vocational Habilitation (combination). We obtained a report showing daily Enclave units by individual and compared the data to the MBS data. For all matches found, we calculated a finding for those instances in which the amount reimbursed exceeded the amount that would have been paid if the Enclave services were billed and the remaining hours (out of the six typical facility based hours) were paid as Adult Day Support and Vocational Habilitation. See procedure 3 in the Statistics – Attendance section.

¹ For non-medical transportation service codes, 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 \$1,191.19

We determined the County Board was over reimbursed for Non-Medical Transportation - Per Trip (ATB and FTB); Targeted Case Management (TCM); Adult Day Support and Vocational Habilitation Combination - Daily (AXD and FXD); and Adult Day Support and Vocational Habilitation Combination - 15 minute units (AXF and FXF).

Service Code	Units	Review Results	Finding
FTB	19	Services were double billed or units billed exceeded units recorded in supporting documentation	\$286.60
TCM	30	For 2 units, the SSA entered separate notes for the same time and 28 Home Choice units billed as TCM services	\$217.04
ATB	38	Services were double billed or units billed exceeded units recorded in supporting documentation	\$525.07
AXD	53	Billed Enclave service with incorrect service code	\$37.69
AXF	46	Billed Enclave service with incorrect service code	\$1.60
FXD	125	Billed Enclave service with incorrect service code	\$118.48
FXF	116	Billed Enclave service with incorrect service code	\$4.71
TOTAL			\$1,191.19

Recoverable Finding - 2011 Finding \$227.88

We determined the County Board was over reimbursed for Adult Day Support and Vocational Habilitation Combination - 15 minute units (AXF and FXF); Non-Medical Transportation - Per Trip (FTB); and Targeted Case Management (TCM).

Service Code	Units	Review Results	Finding
AXF	26	Units billed exceeded units recorded in supporting documentation	\$26.35
FTB	2	Units billed exceeded units recorded in supporting documentation	\$25.85
FXF	15	Units billed exceeded units recorded in supporting documentation	\$17.23
TCM	16	Home Choice services billed as TCM services	\$158.45
TOTAL			\$227.88

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 reports 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 no instance where the Medicaid reimbursed units were greater than final TCM and Supported Employment - Community Employment units.

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 reports.

We found no differences as the County Board did not report costs on *Schedule A*, for Lines (20) to Line (25). We also reviewed the MBS Summary by Service Code reports and found the County Board was not 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 Budget Report balances for the MRF (B50), F-MAP (B51) and Residential (T23) 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 Without Payroll or Benefits (Detailed) Reports and other supporting documentation.

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 Without Payroll or Benefits (Detailed) Reports.

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

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

We found no differences.

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 Without Payroll or Benefits (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 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 Without Payroll or Benefits (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 fixed asset listings.

We found no unrecorded purchases meeting the capitalization criteria.

8. We haphazardly selected 20 disbursements from 2010 and 2011 from the County Board's State Expenses Without Payroll or Benefits (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 found no inconsistencies between the County Board's capitalization procedures and the guidelines listed above.

2. We compared the County Board's final 2009 Fixed Assets schedule to the County Board's 2010 and 2011 Fixed Assets reports 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 Fixed Assets schedules 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 Fixed Assets reports.

We found no differences exceeding \$100 in 2010. In 2011, we found differences as reported in Appendix B.

4. We scanned the County Board's Fixed Assets report 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 selected the one fixed asset purchased in 2010 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 this asset, based on its cost, acquisition date and useful life to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guides and AHA Asset Guide.

We found no differences. We did not perform this procedure in 2011 as the County Board did not purchase any items which met its capitalization policy during this year.

6. DODD asked us to haphazardly select the lesser of five percent or 20 disposed assets from 2010 and 2011 from the County Board's list of disposed assets and determined if the asset was removed from the County Board's fixed asset ledger. DODD also asked us to recalculate 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 or sale of the asset to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guides and CMS Publication 15-1, Chapter 1.

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board stated that no capital assets were disposed of in 2010 or 2011. We scanned the County Board's State Account Code Detailed Revenue Reports and noted revenue from two disposed vans; however, we reviewed the past four Fixed Assets schedules and find no evidence that these two vans were ever reported as fixed assets.

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 MRF (B50), F-MAP (B51) and Residential (T23) 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 Budget Reports.

The variance was less than two percent.

2. DODD asked us to compare the County Board disbursements on the Totals Pay Distribution 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 Totals Pay Distribution reports.

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

3. We selected five employees and compared the County Board's organizational chart and Totals Pay Distribution reports 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, because misclassification errors exceeded 10 percent of the sample size, we performed procedure 4 below. In 2011, we found no differences.

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 found one additional misclassification and reported difference in Appendix A (2010). We did not perform this procedure in 2011 as the misclassification errors in procedure 3 above did not exceed 10 percent of the sample size; however, the 2010 misclassification also affected 2011 and we reported variance on Appendix B (2011).

We did not receive a response from the 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 26, 2014

cc: John Pekar, Superintendent, Vinton County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Beth Seifert, Business Manager, Vinton County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Jerri Ann Trainer, Board President, Vinton County Board of Developmental Disabilities

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

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

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule B-1, Section A				
15. Supported Emp. - Enclave (B) Adult	-	5	5	To reclassify enclave square footage
23. Administration (D) General	916	92	1,008	To agree to compiled report
24. Transportation (D) General	-	8	8	To agree to compiled report
Schedule B-1, Section B				
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (B) Supported Emp. - Enclave	-	17	17	To report individuals served
2. Days Of Attendance (B) Supported Emp. - Enclave	-	256	256	To report days of attendance
3. Typical Hours Of Service (B) Supported Emp. - Enclave	-	1.0	1.0	To report typical hours of service
Schedule B-3				
6. Supported Emp. -Enclave (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	-	512	512	To report enclave one-way trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	2,005	(28)	1,977	To reclassify Home Choice units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	339	27	366	To project allowable units
3. Home Choice Units (D) 4th Quarter	-	28	28	To reclassify Home Choice units
		28	56	To record Home Choice units
Worksheet 2				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	23,949	\$ (3,793)	\$ 20,156	To reclassify adult program expenses
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable \$	-	\$ 356	\$ 356	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable costs
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	16,912	\$ (356)	\$ 16,556	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable costs
10. Unallowable Fees (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable \$	19,659	\$ 14,533	\$ 34,192	To record auditor/treasurer fees
Worksheet 3				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	7,696	\$ (5,495)	\$ 2,201	To reclassify adult program expenses
Worksheet 5				
3. Service Contracts (O) Non-Federal \$	-	\$ 2,356	\$ 2,356	To reclassify MUI expenses
4. Other Expenses (M) Family Support Services \$	9,380	\$ (1,050)	\$ 8,330	To reclassify medical quality assessment expenses
Worksheet 7-B				
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential \$	-	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,050	To reclassify medical quality assessment expenses
Worksheet 8				
1. Salaries (E) Facility Based Services \$	-	\$ 29,831		To reclassify facility based transportation salaries
		\$ (11,162)	\$ 18,669	To reclassify enclave transportation salaries
1. Salaries (F) Enclave \$	-	\$ 11,162	\$ 11,162	To reclassify enclave transportation salaries
1. Salaries (H) Unasgn Adult Program \$	29,831	\$ (29,831)	\$ -	To reclassify facility based transportation salaries
2. Employee Benefits (E) Facility Based Services \$	-	\$ 5,488		To reclassify facility based transportation benefits
		\$ (1,725)	\$ 3,763	To reclassify enclave transportation benefits
2. Employee Benefits (F) Enclave \$	-	\$ 1,725	\$ 1,725	To reclassify enclave transportation benefits
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program \$	5,488	\$ (5,488)	\$ -	To reclassify facility based transportation benefits

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

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Worksheet 10				
1. Salaries (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 153,557	\$ 153,557	To reclassify facility based salaries
1. Salaries (F) Enclave	\$ -	\$ 5,789	\$ 5,789	To reclassify enclave salaries
1. Salaries (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 159,346	\$ (153,557)		To reclassify facility based salaries
		\$ (5,789)	\$ -	To reclassify enclave salaries
2. Employee Benefits (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 48,757	\$ 48,757	To reclassify facility based benefits
2. Employee Benefits (F) Enclave	\$ -	\$ 1,838	\$ 1,838	To reclassify enclave benefits
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 50,595	\$ (48,757)		To reclassify facility based benefits
		\$ (1,838)	\$ -	To reclassify enclave benefits
3. Service Contracts (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 3,793		To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$ 5,495		To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$ 20,397	\$ 29,685	To reclassify facility based expenses
3. Service Contracts (F) Enclave	\$ -	\$ 850	\$ 850	To reclassify enclave expenses
3. Service Contracts (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 21,247	\$ (21,247)	\$ -	To reclassify adult program expenses
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 8,448	\$ 8,448	To reclassify facility based expenses
4. Other Expenses (F) Enclave	\$ -	\$ 352	\$ 352	To reclassify enclave expenses
4. Other Expenses (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 11,156	\$ (2,356)		To reclassify MUI expenses
		\$ (8,800)	\$ -	To reclassify adult program expenses
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet				
Expense:				
Plus: Real Estate Fees	\$ -	\$ (14,533)	\$ (14,533)	To reconcile auditor/treasurer fees

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

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule B-1, Section A				
15. Supported Emp. -Enclave (B) Adult	-	5	5	To agree to compiled report
23. Administration (D) General	916	92	1,008	To agree to compiled report
24. Transportation (D) General	-	8	8	To agree to compiled report
Schedule B-1, Section B				
3. Typical Hours Of Service (B) Supported Emp. - Enclave	-	1.0	1.0	To report typical hours of service
Schedule B-3				
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	2,919	(542)	2,377	To reclassify enclave trips
6. Supported Emp. -Enclave (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	-	542	542	To reclassify enclave trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (A) 1st Quarter	1,407	745	2,152	To correctly report SSA units
1. TCM Units (B) 2nd Quarter	1,544	1,001	2,545	To correctly report SSA units
1. TCM Units (C) 3rd Quarter	1,331	747	2,078	To correctly report SSA units
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	994	536		To correctly report SSA units
		(13)		To reclassify Home Choice units
		(3)	1,514	To reclassify Home Choice units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	128	10	138	To reclassify Other SSA Allowable units
3. Home Choice Units (D) 4th Quarter	-	13		To reclassify Home Choice units
		5		To record Home Choice units
		3	21	To reclassify Home Choice units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (B) 2nd Quarter	7	(2)	5	To remove units in error
5. SSA Unallowable Units (C) 3rd Quarter	3	(2)	1	To reclassify Other SSA Allowable units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	8	(8)	-	To reclassify Other SSA Allowable units
Worksheet 1				
3. Buildings/Improve (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	-	\$ 23,294	\$ 23,294	To reclassify depreciation expenses
4. Fixtures (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	23,294	\$ (23,294)	\$ -	To reclassify depreciation expenses
Worksheet 2				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	50,013	\$ (1,100)		To reclassify non-federal reimbursable cost
		\$ (6,836)	\$ 42,077	To reclassify adult program expenses
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable \$	-	\$ 545		To reclassify non-federal reimbursable
		\$ 128	\$ 673	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	27,720	\$ (545)		To reclassify non-federal reimbursable costs
		\$ (1,297)		To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$ (128)	\$ 25,750	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable cost
10. Unallowable Fees (O) Non-Federal \$	28,653	\$ 14,900		To record auditor/treasurer fees
		\$ 1,100	\$ 44,653	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable cost
Worksheet 2A				
3. Service Contracts (E) Facility Based Services \$	10,160	\$ (10,160)	\$ -	To reclassify adult program expenses
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services \$	4,445	\$ (4,000)		To reclassify loan payment
		\$ (445)	\$ -	To reclassify adult program expenses
Worksheet 3				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	20,239	\$ (13,341)	\$ 6,898	To reclassify adult program expenses
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm. \$	29,001	\$ (443)	\$ 28,558	To reclassify adult program expenses

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

	Reported Amount		Correction		Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Worksheet 5						
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential	\$ 400	\$	(400)	\$	-	To reclassify medical assessment expenses
3. Service Contracts (O) Non-Federal	\$ -	\$	7,161	\$	18,222	To reclassify MUI expenses
4. Other Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 38,720	\$	(17,036)	\$	20,534	To reclassify MUI expenses To reclassify expenses paid to development center To reclassify medical assessment expenses
Worksheet 7-B						
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$	400	\$	1,550	To reclassify medical assessment expenses To reclassify medical assessment expenses
Worksheet 8						
1. Salaries (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 28,630	\$	(4,711)	\$	23,919	To reclassify enclave transportation salaries
1. Salaries (F) Enclave	\$ -	\$	4,711	\$	4,711	To reclassify enclave transportation salaries
2. Employee Benefits (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 5,223	\$	(888)	\$	4,335	To reclassify enclave transportation benefits
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 42,453	\$	(42,453)	\$	-	To reclassify adult program transportation expenses
4. Other Expenses (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ -	\$	42,453	\$	42,453	To reclassify adult program transportation expenses
Worksheet 10						
3. Service Contracts (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 21,111	\$	6,836	\$	45,906	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	9,753	\$	45,906	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	13,341	\$	45,906	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	1,297	\$	45,906	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	443	\$	45,906	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	(6,875)	\$	45,906	To reclassify MUI expenses
3. Service Contracts (F) Enclave	\$ 880	\$	406	\$	1,000	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	(286)	\$	1,000	To reclassify MUI expenses
4. Other Expenses (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 16,375	\$	427	\$	6,183	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	(10,619)	\$	6,183	To reclassify MUI expenses
4. Other Expenses (F) Enclave	\$ 682	\$	18	\$	258	To reclassify adult program expenses
		\$	(442)	\$	258	To reclassify MUI expenses
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet						
Expense:						
Plus: Real Estate Fees	\$ -	\$	(14,900)	\$	(14,900)	To reconcile auditor/treasurer fees
Plus: Other	\$ -	\$	4,000	\$	21,036	To reclassify loan payment
		\$	17,036	\$	21,036	To reclassify expenses paid to development center



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

VINTON COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

VINTON 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
AUGUST 12, 2014