



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

GEAUGA COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Recommendation: SSA Units.....	3
Recommendation: Lack of Records/Inaccurate Records	6
Recoverable Finding: 2009 Paid Claims	8
Appendix A: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2009.....	13
Appendix B: Income and Expenditure Report Adjustments – 2010.....	14

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 Geauga 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 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.

The County Board stated that only the square footage for the Educational Service Center changed from the square footage reported in the final 2008 cost report. Therefore, we performed limited procedures below in those areas where the square footage has changed since 2008.

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 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).

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 final 2008 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 obtained the County Board's methodology for allocating square footage and compared the methodology with the Cost Report Guides.

The County Board reported the same square footage in the 2009 and 2010 cost reports. Therefore we tested the 2009 methodology, and applied the results to both years' cost reports. We found no inconsistencies between the County Board's methodology and the Cost Report Guide.

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 final 2008 typical hours of service to the typical hours of service reported on *Schedule B-1* for 2009 and 2010.

We found no differences.

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 Day Service Attendance Summary for the number of individuals served, days of attendance, and 15 minute units with similar information reported for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation, Community Employment 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 for 2009. We also footed the County Board's reports on Attendance Statistics for accuracy.

We found variances or computational errors exceeding two percent for 2009 and 2010. We reported these variances in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

We requested documentation supporting individual dates of service for Community Employment services in 2009 and 2010. The County Board could not provide supporting documentation for services provided on individual dates of service for 2009 and could provide documentation for only seven out of the 47 individuals served in 2010. As a result, all of the 15 minute Community Employment units reported in 2009 on *Schedule B-1, Section B; Attendance Statistics* could not be supported under 2 CFR Part 225, Appendix A, Section (C)(1)(j) and corresponding costs reported on *Worksheet 10, Adult Program* lacked supporting documentation to show they benefitted the County Board's program and are unallowable under 2 CFR Part 225, Appendix A, Section (C)(3)(a). For 2010, the lack of documentation resulted in 85 percent of the units were not supported and the corresponding percentage of costs are unallowable.

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

Recommendation: We recommend that the County Board maintain the required documentation for services as required by the Cost Report Guide in section *Schedule B-1, Allocation Statistics* which states in pertinent part, "This schedule requires statistical information specific to the Adult and Children's Programs" 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."

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 compared the County Board's final 2008 number of individuals served to the final individuals served for Day Habilitation/Adult Day Services/Vocational Habilitation for 2009 and the final 2009 individual served to the final individuals served for 2010 on *Schedule B-1, Section B, Attendance Statistics* and determined if the variances were over 10 percent.

The number of reported individuals served changed more than 10 percent from the prior year's Schedule B-1 in 2009 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* 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 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 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 Guide.

We haphazardly selected 15 units from 2010 from the County Board detailed Community Employment units report and determined if the units were calculated in accordance with the Cost Report Guide.

We found differences exceeding three units in 2010. We reported the differences on Appendix B (2010).

The County Board in 2009 was able to provide a list of individuals served for Supported Employment – Community Employment; however, the County Board could not provide support for the reported 15 minute units on the cost report; therefore, we made an adjustment to remove the unsupported units. We reported this adjustment in Appendix A (2009).

Acuity Testing

1. 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 for 2008, 2009 and 2010 did not agree to the County Board's supporting documentation.

We calculated the number of individuals served and days of attendance for each acuity band, for 2008, 2009 and 2010, using the Day Services Attendance Summaries.

We found no differences in individuals served or days of attendance.

2. We also compared two individuals from each acuity level on the County Board's 2008, 2009 and 2010 Days of Service Attendance Summary to the Acuity Assessment Instrument or other documentation for each individual.

We found no acuity variances for any individuals and days of attendance reported on the Days of Attendance and Individuals Served by Acuity supplemental cost report worksheet in any of the years under review.

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 Annual Transportation Summary 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 Quarterly Transportation report for accuracy.

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

2. DODD requested us to report variances of more than 10 percent of the total trips taken for five 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 five individuals for 2009 and five for 2010 from the County Board's daily reporting documentation to *Schedule B-3, Quarterly Summary of Transportation Services*.

We found no differences exceeding 10 percent.

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 compared the cost of bus tokens/cabs from the County Board's State Expenses Detailed report to the amount reported in *Schedule B-3* of the Cost Reports. We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2009). We found no differences in 2010.

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, and SSA Unallowable) from the County Board's Quarterly SSA reports with those statistics reported in *Schedule B-4, Quarterly Summary of Units of Service – Service and Support Administration*. We also footed the County Board's Quarterly SSA reports for accuracy. The County Board did not maintain statistics for SSA Unallowable units in 2009 and an estimate was developed for these units based on final 2007 and 2008 SSA units.

We found differences as reported in Appendix A (2009) and 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 both 2009 and 2010 from the TCM Allowable/Un-Allowable Detail 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 both 2008 and 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 errors exceeding 10 percent in 2009; therefore, we expanded our 2009 testing by 20 units and found no errors. The units found in error did not exceed 10 percent of our sample for 2010.

The errors found did not indicate a systematic issue. As a result, we adjusted the errors found in our sample and reported these adjustments on Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

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 haphazardly selected a sample of 40 Unallowable SSA service units for 2010 from the TCM Un-Allowable Detail report 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 did not perform this procedure for 2009 as the County Board did not maintain documentation for the statistics for Unallowable SSA service units for that year. The amounts on the cost report were estimated by calculating the percentage of unallowable units to allowable units in 2007 and 2008 and averaging the two years. This percentage was taken against the 2009 Other Allowable units to arrive at an estimated number of units. We then compared this estimate to the amounts reported on the cost report and made adjustments for the difference. We reported these adjustments in Appendix A (2009).

We found no errors in 2010 units tested.

Recommendation - Lack of Records/Inaccurate Records: We recommend the County Board 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. 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 2009 Cost Report relating the Schedule B-4 unallowable units was not readily available.

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 2009 to 2010 *Schedule B-4* for unallowable units. This was due to the County Board not tracking those units in 2009 and developing estimates instead,

6. 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 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 test as the County Board did not track non-individual specific activities.

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 Revenue Ledger Summary Listing for the General Operating Fund, Capital Construction Fund, Donations Fund, and Residential Service 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 Northeast Ohio Network 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 2009 and 2010 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):

- IDEA Title VI and Title VI-Part B revenues in the amount of \$190,749 in 2009 and \$165,209 in 2010;
- IDEA Early Childhood Special Education revenues in the amount of \$22,128 in 2009 and \$36,750 in 2010.
- Title XX revenues in the amount of \$15,774 in 2009 and \$45,358 in 2010;
- Help Me Grow revenues in the amount of \$58,779 in 2009 and \$228,821 in 2010; and
- Miscellaneous Revenue in the amount of \$6,912 in 2009 and \$23,990 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 \$13.03

We determined the County Board was over reimbursed for 1 units of ATB service in which the County Board did not have supporting documentation.

Service Code	Units	Review Results	FFP1 Amount	eFMAP2 Amount	Total Finding
ATB	1	Overbilled	\$13.02	\$1.46	\$14.48
		TOTAL			\$14.48

¹ Federal Financial Participation Amount (FFP)

² Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (eFMAP)

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

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 misclassified Homemaker and Personal Care expenses on *Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs- By Program* worksheet that exceeded two percent, in both 2009 and 2010. We reported differences in Appendix A (2009) and Appendix B (2010).

Non-Payroll Expenditures and Reconciliation to the County Auditor Report

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).

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 Expense Ledger Summary Listing balances for S03 - General Operating Fund, Q40 - Capital Construction Fund, TTC - Donations Fund, and TTM - Residential Support Fund.

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 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 Detailed Expenditure 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 Detailed Expenditure Reports.

We found differences exceeding \$100 in 2009 as reported in Appendix A (2009). We found no differences in 2010.

5. We compared disbursement entries on Schedule A, Summary of Service Costs – By Program and Worksheets 2 through 10 to the Northeast Ohio Network Council of Government (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 Detailed Expenditure 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 Detailed Expenditure 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, 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 (2009) and Appendix B (2010) for misclassified and non-federal reimbursable costs.

7. We scanned the County Board's Detailed Expenditure 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 Fixed Asset Listing.

We found no unrecorded purchases meeting the capitalization criteria.

8. We haphazardly selected 20 disbursements from 2009 and 2010 from the County Board's Detailed Expense Summary 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 found no differences exceeding two percent of total service contracts and other expenses on any Worksheet or any disbursements over \$100 which are non-federal reimbursable under 2 CFR 225 Appendix B.

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 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 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 reported differences for depreciation taken in the year of acquisition for 2009 in Appendix A (2009). We found no differences in 2010.

5. We haphazardly selected three County Board's fixed assets which meet the County Board's capitalization policy and purchased in either 2009 or 2010 to determine if their useful life 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 period of useful life to determine compliance with the Cost Report Guides and AHA Asset Guide.

We found no differences.

6. DODD asked us to haphazardly select the lesser of five percent or 20 disposed assets from 2009 and 2010 from the County Board's list of disposed assets and determine 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 2009 (and 2010, if applicable) 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 Guide 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 2009 or 2010. In addition, we reviewed the Detailed Revenue Ledger for 2009 and 2010, and we noted nothing indicating the sale of assets.

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 these funds.

We totaled salaries and benefits from worksheets 2 through 10 from the 2009 and 2010 Cost Reports and compared the yearly totals to the County Auditor's expenditure reports. The variance was less than two percent.

2. DODD asked us to compare the County Board disbursements on the Detailed Expenditure 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 Payroll Only By SAC/Employee (Summary) Reports for 2009 and 2010.

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

3. We selected 40 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 there were no misclassification errors found in Procedure 3 above.

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

July 25, 2013

cc: Don Rice, Superintendent, Geauga County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Steve Tucker, Business Manager, Geauga County Board of Developmental Disabilities
Nanette Warholic, Board President, Geauga County Board of Developmental Disabilities

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule A				
23. Homemaker/Personal Care (L) Community Residential	\$ 133,767	\$ (133,767)	\$ -	To reclassify homemaker/personal care expenses
Schedule B-1, Section A				
1. Building Services (B) Adult	\$ 656	\$ 642	\$ 1,298	to adjust square footage
2. Dietary Services (C) Child	\$ -	\$ 720	\$ 720	to adjust square footage
4. Nursing Services (B) Adult	\$ 240	\$ 50	\$ 290	to adjust square footage
4. Nursing Services (C) Child	\$ 280	\$ 121	\$ 401	to adjust square footage
7. Occupational Therapy (C) Child	\$ 420	\$ 419	\$ 839	to adjust square footage
8. Physical Therapy (C) Child	\$ 420	\$ 420	\$ 840	to adjust square footage
11. 0-2 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 3,548	\$ 3,574	\$ 7,122	to adjust square footage
12. 3-5 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 6,384	\$ 1,492	\$ 7,876	to adjust square footage
13. 6-21 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 3,016	\$ 3,283	\$ 6,299	to adjust square footage
14. Facility Based Services (B) Adult	\$ 28,131	\$ (5,162)	\$ 22,969	to adjust square footage
18. County Board Operated ICF/MR (D) General	\$ 17,508	\$ 13,688	\$ 31,196	to adjust square footage
19. Community Residential (D) General	\$ 48	\$ (48)	\$ -	to adjust square footage
20. Family Support Services (D) General	\$ 48	\$ (48)	\$ -	to adjust square footage
21. Service And Support Admin (D) General	\$ 2,382	\$ 511	\$ 2,893	to adjust square footage
22. Program Supervision (B) Adult	\$ 150	\$ 732	\$ 882	to adjust square footage
22. Program Supervision (C) Child	\$ 750	\$ 522	\$ 1,272	to adjust square footage
23. Administration (D) General	\$ 2,000	\$ (350)	\$ 1,650	to adjust square footage
24. Transportation (D) General	\$ 1,515	\$ 2,851	\$ 4,366	to adjust square footage
25. Non-Reimbursable (C) Child	\$ 800	\$ (111)	\$ 689	to adjust square footage
25. Non-Reimbursable (D) General	\$ 100	\$ (100)	\$ -	to adjust square footage
Schedule B-1, Section B				
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (C) Supported Emp. -Community Employment	\$ 45	\$ (45)	\$ -	To remove unsupported individuals served
4. 15 Minute Units (C) Supported Emp. -Community Employment	\$ 2,386	\$ (2,386)	\$ -	To remove unsupported units
Schedule B-3				
1. Children 0-2 (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 254	\$ 304	\$ 558	To adjust trips
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 8,506	\$ 1,294	\$ 9,800	To adjust trips
7. Supported Emp. -Comm Emp. (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 1,346	\$ (746)	\$ 600	To adjust trips
7. Supported Emp. -Comm Emp. (H) Cost of Bus, Tokens, Cabs- Fourth Quarter	\$ 16	\$ 843	\$ 859	To add transportation costs
9. County Board Opp. ICF/MR (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 414	\$ 365	\$ 779	To adjust trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 4,650	\$ 10,090	\$ 14,748	To correct SSA units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 1,225	\$ (228)	\$ 997	To reclassify units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (E) COG Activity	\$ -	\$ (8)	\$ (8)	To reclassify units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (B) 2nd Quarter	\$ 1,758	\$ (477)	\$ 1,281	To remove SSA units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (C) 3rd Quarter	\$ 1,478	\$ (1,478)	\$ -	To remove SSA units
5. SSA Unallowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 1,738	\$ (1,738)	\$ -	To remove SSA units
Worksheet 1				
2. Land Improvements (D) Unasgn Children Programs	\$ 13,031	\$ (2,411)	\$ 10,620	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 3,841	\$ (2,411)	\$ 1,430	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (K) Co. Board Operated ICF/MR	\$ 4,341	\$ (2,484)	\$ 1,857	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (M) Family Support Services	\$ 518	\$ (518)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
3. Buildings/Improve (D) Unasgn Children Programs	\$ 61,252	\$ (4,792)	\$ 56,460	To correct depreciation
3. Buildings/Improve (L) Community Residential	\$ 3,767	\$ (3,767)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
5. Movable Equipment (D) Unasgn Children Programs	\$ 3,237	\$ (1,817)	\$ 1,420	To correct depreciation
8. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 6,032	\$ (5,448)	\$ 584	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 2				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 147,662	\$ (22,878)	\$ 124,784	To Adjust NFR Billing Fees
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 2,165	\$ 2,165	To Adjust NFR Costs
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 75,077	\$ (2,165)	\$ 72,912	To Adjust NFR Costs
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 75,750	\$ (182)	\$ 75,568	To Adjust COG entries
10. Unallowable Fees (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	To reclassify 1.5% Administrative Fee
	\$ -	\$ 22,878	\$ 22,878	To Adjust NFR Billing Fees
	\$ -	\$ 144,870	\$ 144,870	To Adjust Auditor and Treasurer Fees
Worksheet 2A				
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 28,461	\$ (2,768)	\$ 25,693	To correct data entry error
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 13,419	\$ (477)	\$ 12,942	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 5				
1. Salaries (A) Ages 0-2	\$ 411,720	\$ 185,662	\$ 597,382	To reclassify HMG salaries
2. Employee Benefits (A) Ages (0-2)	\$ 146,271	\$ 68,486	\$ 214,757	To reclassify HMG benefits
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential	\$ 274,428	\$ 133,767	\$ 408,195	To reclassify homemaker/personal care expenses
4. Other Expenses (A) Ages (0-2)	\$ 24,180	\$ 31,882	\$ 56,062	To reclassify HMG benefits
4. Other Expenses (D) Unasgn Children Program	\$ 570	\$ 4,792	\$ 5,362	To reclassify land improvement expense
Worksheet 8				
3. Service Contracts (G) Community Employment	\$ -	\$ 308	\$ 308	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ 293	\$ 293	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ 287	\$ 287	To reclassify transportation expenses
3. Service Contracts (H) Unasgn Adult Program	\$ 3,917	\$ (293)	\$ 3,624	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ (287)	\$ (287)	To reclassify transportation expenses
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 23,457	\$ (308)	\$ 23,149	To reclassify transportation expenses
Worksheet 10				
1. Salaries (G) Community Employment	\$ 79,242	\$ (79,242)	\$ -	To adjust community employment costs
2. Employee Benefits (G) Community Employment	\$ 34,989	\$ (34,989)	\$ -	To adjust community employment costs
3. Service Contracts (G) Community Employment	\$ 294	\$ (294)	\$ -	To adjust community employment costs
4. Other Expenses (G) Community Employment	\$ 8,000	\$ (8,000)	\$ -	To adjust community employment costs
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 122,525	\$ 122,525	To adjust community employment costs
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet Expense:				
Real Estate Fees	\$ -	\$ (144,870)	\$ (144,870)	To adjust Real Estate Fees
Plus: Help Me Grow	\$ 286,031	\$ (286,031)	\$ -	To reclassify HMG related expenses
Memo: 1 1/2% ODMRDD *Administrative & Oversight Fee* (Not In Total)	\$ 60,000	\$ (60,000)	\$ -	To reclassify 1.5% Administrative Fee
Less: Capital Costs	\$ (325,143)	\$ 1,817	\$ (323,326)	To correct depreciation
	\$ -	\$ 12,616	\$ 12,616	To correct depreciation
	\$ -	\$ 3,767	\$ 3,767	To correct depreciation

	Reported Amount	Correction	Corrected Amount	Explanation of Correction
Schedule A				
23. Homemaker/Personal Care (L) Community Residential	\$ 126,486	\$ (126,486)	\$ -	To match audited COG data
Schedule B-1, Section A				
1. Building Services (B) Adult	\$ 656	\$ 642	\$ 1,298	To adjust square footage
2. Dietary Services (C) Child	\$ -	\$ 720	\$ 720	To adjust square footage
4. Nursing Services (B) Adult	\$ 240	\$ 50	\$ 290	To adjust square footage
4. Nursing Services (C) Child	\$ 280	\$ 121	\$ 401	To adjust square footage
7. Occupational Therapy (C) Child	\$ 420	\$ 419	\$ 839	To adjust square footage
8. Physical Therapy (C) Child	\$ 420	\$ 420	\$ 840	To adjust square footage
11. 0-2 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 3,548	\$ 3,574	\$ 7,122	To adjust square footage
12. 3-5 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 6,384	\$ 1,492	\$ 7,876	To adjust square footage
13. 6-21 Age Children (C) Child	\$ 3,016	\$ 3,283	\$ 6,299	To adjust square footage
14. Facility Based Services (B) Adult	\$ 28,131	\$ (5,162)	\$ 22,969	To adjust square footage
18. County Board Operated ICF/MR (D) General	\$ 17,508	\$ 13,688	\$ 31,196	To adjust square footage
19. Community Residential (D) General	\$ 48	\$ (48)	\$ -	To adjust square footage
20. Family Support Services (D) General	\$ 48	\$ (48)	\$ -	To adjust square footage
21. Service And Support Admin (D) General	\$ 2,382	\$ 511	\$ 2,893	To adjust square footage
22. Program Supervision (B) Adult	\$ 150	\$ 732	\$ 882	To adjust square footage
22. Program Supervision (C) Child	\$ 750	\$ 522	\$ 1,272	To adjust square footage
23. Administration (D) General	\$ 2,000	\$ (350)	\$ 1,650	To adjust square footage
24. Transportation (D) General	\$ 1,515	\$ 2,851	\$ 4,366	To adjust square footage
25. Non-Reimbursable (C) Child	\$ 800	\$ (111)	\$ 689	To adjust square footage
25. Non-Reimbursable (D) General	\$ 100	\$ (100)	\$ -	To adjust square footage
Schedule B-1, Section B				
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (A) Facility Based Services	\$ 158	\$ 6	\$ 164	To adjust individuals served
1. Total Individuals Served By Program (C) Supported Emp. -Community Employer	\$ 48	\$ (41)	\$ 7	To remove unsupported individuals serve
4. 15 Minute Units (C) Supported Emp. -Community Employment	\$ 2,414	\$ (2,118)	\$ 296	To remove unsupported units
	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 300	To correct miscalculated units
Schedule B-3				
5. Facility Based Services (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 8,955	\$ (4,085)	\$ 4,870	To correct trips
7. Supported Emp. -Comm Emp. (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ 1,228	\$ (185)	\$ 1,043	To correct trips
9. County Board Opp. ICF/MR (G) One Way Trips- Fourth Quarter	\$ -	\$ 1,760	\$ 1,760	To correct trips
Schedule B-4				
1. TCM Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 4,147	\$ 5,131	\$ 9,278	To correct SSA units
	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 9,282	To reclassify units
2. Other SSA Allowable Units (D) 4th Quarter	\$ 1,709	\$ (1,453)	\$ 256	To correct SSA units
	\$ -	\$ (4)	\$ 252	To reclassify units
Worksheet 1				
2. Land Improvements (D) Unasn Children Programs	\$ 15,742	\$ 109	\$ 15,851	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (E) Facility Based Services	\$ 1,430	\$ 109	\$ 1,539	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (K) Co. Board Operated ICF/MR	\$ 10,810	\$ 112	\$ 10,922	To correct depreciation
2. Land Improvements (M) Family Support Services	\$ -	\$ 58	\$ 58	To correct depreciation
3. Buildings/Improve (L) Community Residential	\$ 3,767	\$ (3,767)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
4. Fixtures (U) Transportation	\$ 430	\$ (430)	\$ -	To correct depreciation
8. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 6,451	\$ (5,829)	\$ 622	To match audited COG data
8. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ -	\$ 35	\$ 35	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 2				
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 82,925	\$ (2,120)	\$ 80,805	To Adjust NFR Costs
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 2,120	\$ 2,120	To Adjust NFR Costs
	\$ -	\$ 1,719	\$ 3,839	To Adjust NFR Costs
4. Other Expenses (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 70,154	\$ (1,719)	\$ 68,435	To Adjust NFR Costs
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 100,830	\$ (69,278)	\$ 31,552	To match audited COG data
5. COG Expense (N) Service & Support Admin	\$ -	\$ 1,799	\$ 1,799	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 2A				
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 12,973	\$ (12,973)	\$ -	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 5				
1. Salaries (A) Ages 0-2	\$ 409,450	\$ 243,856	\$ 653,306	To reclassify HMG salaries
2. Employee Benefits (A) Ages (0-2)	\$ 160,407	\$ 26,179	\$ 186,586	To reclassify HMG benefits
3. Service Contracts (L) Community Residential	\$ 5,751	\$ 126,486	\$ 132,237	These expenses were moved from Schedule A
4. Other Expenses (A) Ages (0-2)	\$ 20,498	\$ 41,499	\$ 61,997	To reclassify HMG related expenses
5. COG Expenses (L) Community Residential	\$ 207,137	\$ 6,424	\$ 213,561	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 8				
2. Employee Benefits (H) Unasn Adult Program	\$ 182,523	\$ (186)	\$ 182,337	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ (249)	\$ 182,088	To reclassify transportation expenses
3. Service Contracts (G) Community Employment	\$ -	\$ 249	\$ 249	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ 186	\$ 435	To reclassify transportation expenses
	\$ -	\$ 196	\$ 631	To reclassify transportation expenses
3. Service Contracts (X) Gen Expense All Prgm.	\$ 32,945	\$ (196)	\$ 32,749	To reclassify transportation expenses
Worksheet 9				
5. COG Expenses (N) Service & Support Admin. Costs	\$ -	\$ 12,179	\$ 12,179	To match audited COG data
Worksheet 10				
1. Salaries (G) Community Employment	\$ 78,072	\$ (66,361)	\$ 11,711	To adjust community employment costs
2. Employee Benefits (G) Community Employment	\$ 38,415	\$ (32,653)	\$ 5,762	To adjust community employment costs
3. Service Contracts (G) Community Employment	\$ 319	\$ (271)	\$ 48	To adjust community employment costs
4. Other Expenses (G) Community Employment	\$ 7,754	\$ (6,591)	\$ 1,163	To adjust community employment costs
4. Other Expenses (O) Non-Federal Reimbursable	\$ -	\$ 105,877	\$ 105,877	To adjust community employment costs
Reconciliation to County Auditor Worksheet				
Expense:				
Plus: HELP ME GROW (HMG) Program Expenditures	\$ 311,534	\$ (311,534)	\$ -	To reclassify HMG related expenses
Less: Capital Costs	\$ (346,864)	\$ (387)	\$ (347,251)	To correct depreciation
	\$ -	\$ 430	\$ 430	To correct depreciation
	\$ -	\$ 3,767	\$ (3,337)	To correct depreciation



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

GEAUGA COUNTY BOARD OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

GEAUGA 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
SEPTEMBER 24, 2013**