



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NOBLE COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Recommendation: Supporting Documentation for SSA Units	5
Recoverable Findings: Paid Claims - 2009.....	7
Recommendation: Tracking Payroll Allocations.....	11
Appendix A: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2009.....	13
Appendix B: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2010.....	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 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 Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities (County Board) prepared its *Income and Expenditure Report* for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2010 (Cost Reports) in accordance with DODD's Guide to Preparing Income and Expenditure Reports for 2009 and 2010 (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 attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. 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 and 2010 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 2008 square footage totals are the same and no significant changes in the floor plan have occurred, to perform no additional procedures.

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board informed us that it leased all of its space and did not own any buildings during 2008, 2009 or 2010, and square footage for leased space is not reported according to the Cost Report Guide.

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* of the Cost Reports.

We did not perform this procedure as there were no changes in square footage allocated between programs from the square footage reported in the final 2008 cost report through 2009 and 2010 (see Procedure 1 above).

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* of the Cost Reports.

We did not perform this procedure as there were no significant changes in square footage allocated between programs from the square footage reported in the final 2008 cost report through 2009 and 2010 (see Procedure 1 above).

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* worksheet.

We compared the County Board's square footage summary to the square footage reported for each cell in *Schedule B-1, Section A, Square Footage* of the Cost Reports.

We found variances exceeding 10 percent and we reported these variances in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

5. DODD asked us to obtain 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 did not perform this procedure as the County Board had no reportable square footage.

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 2008 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 2009 and 2010 and, if the hours are the same, to do no additional procedures.

We compared the County Board's supporting documentation for the hours of service to the typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* of the Cost Reports to determine if the statistics were reported according to the Cost Report Guides.

The County Board informed us that it did not provide Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation, Enclave or Community Employment programs during 2009 or 2010 yet they reported hours in the cost report for such services. We adjusted the hours of service for 2009 and 2010 accordingly, and reported the differences in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

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

We compared the County Board's State Expenses Detailed reports and supporting monthly invoice documentation to the County Board cost report for the number of individuals served and days of attendance reported for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* of the Cost Reports and determined if the statistics were reported in accordance with the Cost Report Guides. We found no variance for 2009.

In 2010, the County Board did not provide any services other than contracting for Day Habilitation service for one non-waiver individual over a span of fourteen days, and they did not report the statistics for this service (the number of individuals served and the days of attendance) on the cost report resulting in a variance greater than two percent. We reported this variance in Appendix B (2010).

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

We did not perform this step because the County Board did not provide Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation services.

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

We haphazardly selected 15 individual names from the County Board's attendance sheets for 2009 and 15 for 2010, and compared the individuals by name to the compiled listing of individuals served by program documentation which rolls up to *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* of the Cost Reports

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board did not provide Day Habilitation services.

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 Guide.

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

7. DODD requested us to report variances if days of attendance and individuals served on the Days of Attendance and Individuals Served by Acuity supplemental cost report worksheet did not agree to the County Board's supporting documentation for 2008, 2009 and 2010.

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board did not provide Day Habilitation or Enclave services.

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

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board did not provide Day Habilitation or Enclave services.

Statistics – Transportation

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

We compared the number of one-way trips from the County Board's Transportation By Age Group report for 2009 and the Non-Medical Transportation Per-Trip report for 2010 with those statistics as reported in *Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Statistics* of the Cost Reports. We also footed the County Board's reports for accuracy.

We found no differences or computational errors in 2009. We found differences in 2010 as reported in Appendix B (2010).

2. DODD requested us to report variances of more than 10 percent of the total trips taken for two individuals for both 2009 and 2010, 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 two individuals for 2009 from the County Board's daily reporting documentation to *Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services*. We did not perform this procedure for 2010 because a 100 percent test of 2010 trips was performed in procedure 1 above.

We found no differences in 2009.

3. DODD requested us to report variances if the 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 Statistics*.

We did not perform this procedure as the County Board did not report the cost of bus tokens, cabs on *Schedule B-3* of the Cost report for 2009 or 2010. However, we did review the County Board's detailed expenditure report for any of these costs not identified by the County Board (see procedures and results in the Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Audit Report Section).

Statistics – Service and Support Administration (SSA)

1. DODD requested us to report variances if the 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 TCM units report with those statistics reported in *Schedule B-4, Quarterly Summary of Units of Service – Service and Support Administration* for 2009. We also footed the County Board's Quarterly TCM units report for accuracy.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2009).

The County Board provided the Claims Listing Report, Keyed Records Only report for 2010 which included only January, 2010 TCM that were billed to Medicaid. The County Board stated they did provide TCM, Other SSA Allowable and Unallowable units throughout 2010 but the case notes, except those billed to Medicaid, were generally in short hand and had not been transcribed, coded or

compiled. The County Board declined to perform these functions in order to provide an accurate count of SSA units for cost report purposes. The County Board instead agreed to report 1 Unallowable unit which resulted in all SSA expenses allocated as non-federal reimbursable.

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

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

We haphazardly selected a sample of 40 Other SSA Allowable units for 2009 from the Unit Entry by Date Span reports and determined if the case note documentation described activities listed in Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(D), and also included the documentation required by Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(F). We also determined if the units for Other Allowable SSA services for 2009 were provided to individuals that were not Medicaid eligible at the time of service delivery per the Medicaid Information Technology System (MITS).

We found no errors in 2009. We did not perform this procedure in 2010 because the County Board reported no Other SSA Allowable units as described in procedure 1 above.

The County Board stated case notes for 2010 SSA services were generally prepared in short hand and were not transcribed, coded or compiled.

Recommendation: Audit and Records Retention Requirements contained in the Cost Report Guidelines specify that "Expenditure and Income Reports are subject to audit by ODMRDD, 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 (7) years from the date of receipt of payment from all sources, or for six (6) years following completion and adjudication of any state or federal initiated audit, whichever period of time is longer." Documentation to support the County Board's 2010 SSA Units was not readily available in an auditable manner. In the future, the County Board should ensure that information used to compile the Cost Reports is complete and accurately describes all services provided. In addition, it should ensure that all documentation used to prepare the Cost Report is maintained for the period of time specified.

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

We selected 100 percent of reported Unallowable SSA units (14) for 2009 from the Unit Entry by Date Span reports and determined if the case note documentation described activities listed in Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(D), and also included the documentation required by Ohio Admin. Code § 5101:3-48-01(F).

We found no errors in 2009. We did not perform this procedure in 2010 because the County Board reported 1 unallowable unit as described in procedure 1 above.

4. 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 does record general time units and they account for over 10% of total SSA units on the final audited 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 40 General Time Units for 2009 from the Detailed Units Marked Non Billable report 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.

We found no errors in 2009. We did not perform this procedure in 2010 because the County Board did not record general time units.

5. 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 2008 SSA units to the final 2009 SSA units and compared the final 2009 SSA units to the final 2010 SSA units.

The final units decreased by more than five percent from the prior year's *Schedule B-4* and we obtained the County Board's explanation that it was due to staffing issues. We reported no variances in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

Revenue Cost Reporting and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report

1. We compared the receipt totals from the 12/31/2009 and 12/31/2010 County Auditor's Receipts Ledger for the General Fund and Supported Living Fund 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 from were within 1/4 percent of the County Auditor yearly receipt totals reported for these funds.

3. DODD asked that we 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 Reports and other supporting documentation unless Procedure 2 above reconciled within the 1/4 percent threshold.

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

4. We compared revenue entries on *Schedule C Income Report* to the Mideast Ohio Regional Council of Government (COG) prepared County Board Summary Workbook.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

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

- Reimbursement for Inclusion Facilitators from local school districts in the amount of \$23,510 in 2009 and \$19,889 in 2010;
- Refund for vehicle insurance in the amount of \$3,081 for 2009; and
- Miscellaneous refunds in the amount of \$490 in 2010.

Paid Claims Testing

1. We selected 50 paid claims among all service codes from 2009 and 2010 from the Medicaid Billing System (MBS) data and determined if the claims met the following service documentation requirements of Ohio Admin. Code Sections 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 (for homemaker/personal care, type must include if routine, on-site/on-call, or level one emergency);
- 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

Recoverable Finding - 2009

Finding \$178.37

We determined the County Board was reimbursed for 5 units of Targeted Case Management (TCM) service in which the County Board could not provide adequate documentation. We also determined the County Board was reimbursed for 18 units of TCM service more than their compiled reports supported.

Service Code	Units	Review Results	FFP1 Amount	eFMAP2 Amount	Total Finding
TCM	5	no documentation provided	\$31.63	\$5.19	\$36.82
TCM	18	reimbursement in excess of compiled reports	\$122.04	\$19.51	\$141.55
		TOTAL			\$178.37

¹ Federal Financial Participation Amount (FFP)

² Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (eFMAP)

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).

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 reported a recoverable finding in 2009 for units reimbursed in excess of units reported by the Board on compiled County Board reports. See procedure 1 above. We did not perform this procedure for 2010 TCM units since the County Board reported 1 TCM unit in 2010 and the effect of this will be resolved during DODD's settlement with the County Board. See procedure 1 under Statistics - Service and Support Administration (SSA) above.

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

We compared the amounts reported on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program*, Lines (20) to Line (25) for Community Residential to the amount reimbursed for these services in 2009 and 2010 on the MBS Summary by Service Code report.

We found no differences.

Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report

1. We compared the disbursement totals from the 12/31/2009 and 12/31/2010 County Auditor's report listed on the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheets* to the County Auditor's appropriations ledger balances for the General Fund, Supported Living Fund and OBRA Fund.

We found no differences in 2009. We found differences as reported in Appendix B (2010).

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 yearly disbursement totals reported for these funds.

3. DODD asked that we compare the account description and amount for each reconciling item on the *Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet* to the County Board's State Expense Detailed Reports and other supporting documentation unless Procedure 2 above reconciled within the 1/4 percent threshold.

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

4. 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 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 no differences in 2009. We found differences in 2010 as reported in Appendix B (2010).

5. We compared disbursement entries on Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program and Worksheets 2 through 10 to the COG prepared County Board Summary Workbook.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

6. DODD asked us to determine whether total County Board disbursements on the State Expenses Detailed reports were properly classified, on Worksheets 2 through 10, within two percent of total service contracts and other expenses for each individual Worksheet and that no 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-Gen Expense all Programs on Worksheets 2, 3 and 8; Column N-Service and Support Admin Costs on Worksheet 9; and Columns E-Facility Based Services, F-Enclave, and G-Community Employment [an 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 (2009) and Appendix B (2010) for misclassified and non-federal reimbursable costs.

7. We scanned the County Board's State Expenses Detailed reports for items purchased during 2009 and 2010 that met the County Board's capitalization criteria and traced them to inclusion on the County Board's Depreciation Schedule.

We found no unrecorded purchases meeting the capitalization criteria.

8. We haphazardly selected 20 disbursements from 2009 and 2010 from the County Board's State Expenses Detailed report that were classified as service contract and other expenses on Worksheets 2-10 (not selected for scanning under Step 5 above). 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 from these procedures 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). to ensure assets are either capitalized or expensed in accordance with established guidelines.

We found no inconsistencies between the County Board's capitalization procedures and the guidelines listed above.

2. We compared the County Board's final 2008 Depreciation Schedule to the County Board's 2009 and 2010 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 Schedule.

We found differences exceeding \$100 as reported in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

4. We scanned the County Board's Depreciation Schedule for 2009 and 2010 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. DODD asked us to select the lesser of 10% or ten (10) items purchased in each year of review period that meet the County Board's capitalization policy and purchased in 2009 and 2010 to determine if their useful life agreed to the estimated useful lives prescribed in the 2008 American Hospital Association (AHA) Asset Guide. DODD also asked us to recompute the first year's depreciation for these assets, based on their cost, acquisition date and period of useful life to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guides and AHA Asset Guide.

We did not perform this procedure because the County Board stated they did not purchase any capital assets in 2009 or 2010. We scanned the County Board's 2009 and 2010 State Expense Detailed report under Procedure 7 of the **Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report** section and did not identify any unrecorded capital assets.

6. We haphazardly selected 1 disposed asset from 2009 and 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 sale of the asset to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guide and CMS Publication 15-1, Chapter 1.

We found no differences in 2009. We found differences as reported in Appendix B (2010).

Payroll Testing

1. DODD asked us to determine whether total County Board salaries and benefits in the 2009 and 2010 cost reports were within two percent of the county auditor's report totals for the operating fund.

We totaled salaries and benefits from Worksheets 2-10 from the 2009 and 2010 Cost Reports and compared the yearly totals to the County Auditor's Appropriations Ledger. The variance was less than two percent.

2. DODD asked us to compare the County Board disbursements on the State Expenses 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 Reports.

We found no differences in 2009. We found differences as reported in Appendix B (2010).

3. We selected 3 employees and compared the County Board's organizational chart and job descriptions 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 found no differences.

4. DODD asked us to scan the County Board's State Expenses Detailed Reports for 2009 and 2010 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.

Recommendation: To ensure proper allocation of costs between programs, we recommend the County Board either track actual time spent for each program or update job descriptions accordingly.

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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "D" and "Y".

Dave Yost
Auditor of State

June 12, 2013

cc: Stephen Williams, Superintendent, Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Lori Balvin, Business Manager, Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Bryan Chandler, Board President, Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities

Appendix A
Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2009 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	\$ -	\$ 4,856	\$ 4,856	To agree to audited COG amounts
Schedule B-1, Section A				
11. 0-2 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 87	\$ (87)	\$ -	To correct square footage
21. Service And Support Admin (D) General	\$ 171	\$ (171)	\$ -	To correct square footage
23. Administration (D) General	\$ 242	\$ (241)	\$ 1	To correct square footage
Schedule B-1, Section B				
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (A) Facility Based Services	\$ 2	\$ (2)	\$ -	To remove facility based statistics
3. Typical Hours Of Service (A) Facility Based Services	\$ 6	\$ (6)	\$ -	To remove facility based statistics
Schedule B-3				
5. Facility Based Services (F) Cost of Bus, Tokens, Cabs- Third Quarter	\$ -	\$ 221	\$ 221	To report cost of per mile trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 179	\$ 106	\$ 285	To agree to compiled amount
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 16	\$ 26	\$ 42	To agree to compiled amount
5. SSA Unallowable Units (A) 1st Quarter	\$ 61	\$ (61)	\$ -	To agree to compiled amount
5. SSA Unallowable Units (B) 2nd Quarter	\$ 113	\$ (113)	\$ -	To agree to compiled amount
5. SSA Unallowable Units (C) 3rd Quarter	\$ 80	\$ (80)	\$ -	To agree to compiled amount
5. SSA Unallowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 211	\$ (197)	\$ 14	To agree to compiled amount
Schedule C				
I. County				
(B) Interest- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 2,931	\$ 2,931	To agree to audited COG amounts
II. Department of MR/DD				
(A) Supported Living- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 37,567	\$ 37,567	To agree to audited COG amounts
(B) Family Support Services- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 4,271	\$ 4,271	To agree to audited COG amounts
(C) SSA Subsidy- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 9,794	\$ 9,794	To agree to audited COG amounts
(D) Operating Subsidy- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 12,823	\$ 12,823	To agree to audited COG amounts
(G) Waiver Administration- Subsidy- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 460	\$ 460	To agree to audited COG amounts
V. Other Revenues				
(H) Refunds- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ 4,088	\$ 4,088	To agree to audited COG amounts
(I) Other (Detail On Separate Sheet)- COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
23. Misc, refunds	\$ -	\$ 395	\$ 395	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 1				
5. Movable Equipment (V) Admin	\$ -	\$ 913	\$ 913	To correct depreciation
5. Movable Equipment (X) Gen Expense All Prgm	\$ 913	\$ (913)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
8. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 73	\$ 73	To agree to audited COG amounts
8. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ -	\$ 44	\$ 44	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 2				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm	\$ 5,091	\$ 1,200	\$ 6,291	To reclassify indirect expenses
		\$ 2,635	\$ 8,926	To reclassify indirect expenses
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 191	\$ 191	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense:
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 25,938	\$ 8,830	\$ 34,768	To reclassify operating lease for office space
		\$ (191)	\$ 34,577	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expense:
		\$ (50)	\$ 34,527	To reclassify building services expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 3,697	\$ 3,697	To agree to audited COG amounts
5. COG Expense (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ -	\$ 2,216	\$ 2,216	To agree to audited COG amounts
10. Unallowable Fees (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 319	\$ 319	To reclassify contingent billing fees
		\$ 3,879	\$ 7,198	To reclassify DODD admin fees
		\$ 12,169	\$ 19,367	To report real estate fees
Worksheet 2A				
4. Other Expenses (A) Ages 0-2	\$ 47	\$ (47)	\$ -	To reclassify eraly intervention expenses
Worksheet 3				
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 1,863	\$ 50	\$ 1,913	To reclassify building services expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 76	\$ 76	To agree to audited COG amounts
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ -	\$ 46	\$ 46	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 5				
4. Other Expenses (A) Ages (0-2)	\$ 1,958	\$ 47	\$ 2,005	To reclassify eraly intervention expenses
4. Other Expenses (M) Family Support Services	\$ 5,138	\$ 228	\$ 5,366	To reclassify speech expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 12,567	\$ 12,567	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 7-C				
4. Other Expenses (C) Ages 6-21	\$ -	\$ 228	\$ 228	To reclassify speech expenses
Worksheet 7-D				
3. Service Contracts (D) Unasn Children Program	\$ -	\$ 1,263	\$ 1,263	To reclassify psychology expenses
Worksheet 9				
3. Service Contracts (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 28,440	\$ (319)	\$ 28,121	To reclassify contingent billing fees
		\$ (8,523)	\$ 19,598	To reclassify fees paid to COG
		\$ (1,263)	\$ 18,335	To reclassify psychology expenses
		\$ (2,635)	\$ 15,700	To reclassify indirect expenses
4. Other Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 71,780	\$ (11,742)	\$ 60,038	To reclassify TCM match payments
		\$ (9,840)	\$ 50,198	To reclassify Waiver match payments
		\$ (3,879)	\$ 46,319	To reclassify DODD admin fees
		\$ (2,254)	\$ 44,065	To reclassify reimbursement for Title XX program
		\$ (41,728)	\$ 2,337	To reclassify fees paid to COG
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ -	\$ 7,531	\$ 7,531	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 10				
3. Service Contracts (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 1,200	\$ (1,200)	\$ -	To reclassify indirect expenses
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet Expense:				
Plus: Real Estate Fees	\$ -	\$ (12,169)	\$ (12,169)	To reconcile off real estate fees

Appendix A
 Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities
 2009 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Plus: Fees Paid To COG, Or Payments And Transfers made To COG	\$ -	\$ 8,523		To reclassify fees paid to COG
		\$ 41,728	\$ 50,251	To reclassify fees paid to COG
Plus: Match Paid To ODMRDD For IO & LVI Waivers	\$ -	\$ 9,840	\$ 9,840	To reclassify Waiver match payments
Plus: Match Paid To ODMRDD For TCM	\$ -	\$ 11,742	\$ 11,742	To reclassify TCM match payments
Plus:	\$ 8,830	\$ (8,830)	\$ -	To reclassify operating lease for office space
Plus: Other	\$ -	\$ 2,254	\$ 2,254	To reclassify reimbursement for Title XX program
Less: Schedule A COG expenses	\$ -	\$ (4,856)	\$ (4,856)	To reconcile off Schedule A COG expenses
Revenue:				
Less: COG Revenue	\$ -	\$ (72,329)	\$ (72,329)	To reconcile off COG revenue

Appendix B
Noble County Board of Developmental Disabilities
2010 Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule B-1, Section A				
11. Early Intervention (C) Child	\$ 87	\$ (87)	\$ -	To correct square footage
21. Service And Support Admin (D) General	\$ 171	\$ (171)	\$ -	To correct square footage
23. Administration (D) General	\$ 242	\$ (241)	\$ 1	To correct square footage
Schedule B-1, Section B				
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (A) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 1	\$ 1	To report individuals served
2. Days Of Attendance (A) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 14	\$ 14	To report days of attendance
Schedule B-3				
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ -	\$ 261	\$ 261	To report one way trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (A) 1st Quarter	\$ 1	\$ (1)	\$ -	To correct SSA units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (A) 1st Quarter	\$ 1	\$ (1)	\$ -	To correct SSA units
Schedule C				
(I) Other (Detail On Separate Sheet)- COG Revenue				
23. Refund	\$ -	\$ 835	\$ 835	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 1				
5. Movable Equipment (U) Transportation	\$ -	\$ (2,959)	\$ (2,959)	To record gain on disposal of van
5. Movable Equipment (V) Admin	\$ -	\$ 45	\$ 45	To correct depreciation
5. Movable Equipment (X) Gen Expense All Prgm	\$ 45	\$ (45)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
8. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 2				
2. Employee Benefits (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 9,822	\$ 1,309	\$ 11,131	To agree to compiled amount
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 24,492	\$ (9,514)	\$ 14,978	To reclassify SSA expenses
		\$ (553)	\$ 4,425	To reclassify contracted facility based services
		\$ (10,000)	\$ 575	To reclassify RSC match payments
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 575	\$ 575	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expens
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 21,740	\$ (575)	\$ 21,165	To reclassify non-federal reimbursable expens
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 3,388	\$ 3,388	To agree to audited COG amounts
10. Unallowable Fees (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 993	\$ 993	To reclassify DODD admin fees
		\$ 200	\$ 18	To reclassify contingent billing fees
		\$ 18	\$ 14,174	To reclassify contingent billing fees
		\$ 12,963	\$ 4	To report real estate fees
Worksheet 3				
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 4	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 5				
2. Employee Benefits (A) Early Intervention	\$ 12,406	\$ 335	\$ 12,741	To agree to compiled amount
2. Employee Benefits (C) School Age	\$ 12,776	\$ (341)	\$ 12,435	To agree to compiled amount
4. Other Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	To reclassify community residential expenses
4. Other Expenses (M) Family Support Services	\$ 5,021	\$ (125)	\$ 4,896	To reclassify speech expenses
5. COG Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 721	\$ 721	To agree to audited COG amounts
Worksheet 7-C				
4. Other Expenses (C) School Age	\$ -	\$ 125	\$ 125	To reclassify speech expenses
Worksheet 7-D				
3. Service Contracts (C) School Age	\$ -	\$ 1,013	\$ 1,013	To reclassify psychology expenses
Worksheet 9				
3. Service Contracts (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 15,105	\$ 9,514	\$ 24,619	To reclassify SSA expenses
		\$ (5,441)	\$ 17,965	To reclassify fees paid to COG
		\$ (200)	\$ 17,965	To reclassify contingent billing fees
		\$ (1,013)	\$ 43,151	To reclassify psychology expenses
4. Other Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ 49,802	\$ (43,151)	\$ 6,651	To reclassify match payments
		\$ (993)	\$ 5,640	To reclassify DODD admin fees
		\$ (18)	\$ 5,640	To reclassify contingent billing fees
Worksheet 10				
3. Service Contracts (E) Facility Based Services	\$ -	\$ 553	\$ 553	To reclassify contracted facility based services
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet Expense:				
Plus: Real Estate Fees	\$ -	\$ (12,963)	\$ (12,963)	To reconcile off real estate fees
Plus: Capital Housing	\$ 20,000	\$ (20,000)	\$ -	To reclassify community residential expenses
Plus: Fees Paid To COG, Or Payments And Transfers made To COG	\$ -	\$ 5,441	\$ 5,441	To reclassify fees paid to COG
Plus: Match Paid To ODMRDD For IO & LVI Waivers	\$ -	\$ 43,151	\$ 43,151	To reclassify match payments
Plus: Benefits posted in payroll	\$ 4,446	\$ (4,446)	\$ -	To agree to compiled amount
Plus: Other	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	To reclassify RSC match payments
Less: Capital Costs	\$ (45)	\$ 2,959	\$ 2,914	To reconcile off depreciation
Less: Schedule A COG expenses	\$ -	\$ (2,892)	\$ (2,892)	To reconcile off Schedule A COG expenses
Total from 12/31 County Auditor's Report	\$ 346,576	\$ (3,061)	\$ 343,515	To agree to County Auditor total
Revenue:				
Less: COG Revenue	\$ (96,910)	\$ (835)	\$ (97,745)	To reconcile off COG revenue

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

NOBLE COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

NOBLE 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 6, 2013**