



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 568-2240

Department Name: Auditor-Controller  
Department No.: 061  
For Agenda Of: 02/15/2011  
Placement: Administrative  
Estimated Tme:  
Continued Item: No  
If Yes, date from:  
Vote Required: Majority

---

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Department Robert W. Geis, CPA (x2100)  
Director(s)  
Contact Info: Jennifer Christensen (x2134)  
Heather Harkless (x2456)

**SUBJECT:** Single Audit Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010

---

**County Counsel Concurrence**

As to form: N/A

**Auditor-Controller Concurrence**

As to form: N/A

**Other Concurrence:** N/A

As to form: N/A

**Recommended Actions:**

To receive and file the County of Santa Barbara's Single Audit Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010.

**Summary Text:**

Under the *Single Audit Act*, entities that have expenditures of federal awards in excess of \$500K per year are required to have annual audits (commonly referred to as *Single Audits*). The audits are conducted by independent outside auditors in accordance with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133. During fiscal year 09-10 the County expended approximately \$111M in federal funds excluding fee for service Medicaid and other vendor type transactions. The County's Single Audit was performed by Brown Armstrong Accountancy Corporation of Bakersfield, California (Brown Armstrong).

The County continues to be designated with a high-risk status which subjects the County to further scrutiny from outside organizations and higher audit costs.

**Background:**

The *Single Audit Act* (officially the *Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996*) is intended to promote sound financial management, including effective internal control, with respect to federal awards administered by state and local governments and not-for-profit organizations. The Single Audit contains both compliance and financial components. The audit standards require the auditee (the County) to:

1. Maintain internal control for federal programs,
2. Comply with the laws, regulations, and provisions of contracts or grant agreements,
3. Prepare appropriate financial statements, including the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA),
4. Ensure that the required Single Audits are properly performed and submitted when due, and
5. Follow up and take corrective actions on audit findings.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provides funds to stimulate the economy and create and retain jobs. These funds are subject to intense scrutiny and must be administered under strict accountability and transparency guidelines. During the fiscal year 09-10, total Recovery Act expenditures included in the County’s Single Audit amounted to approximately \$9.7M. The Single Audit is specifically identified in the OMB guidance as an audit tool integral to promoting accountability over Recovery Act funds. The importance of the Single Audit process has become magnified by the Recovery Act’s emphasis on accountability.

Although interrelated, the Single Audit differs from the County’s annual financial audit in that the Single Audit focuses on compliance with federal regulations and internal controls over federal programs, while the financial audit focuses on the fair and materially accurate presentation of the County’s financial statements. The County’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the year ended June 30, 2010, was previously received and filed by your Board on September 21, 2010.

The Single Audit requires the independent auditor to evaluate the County’s status as high-risk or low-risk. A high-risk auditee is a recipient which has a high risk of not complying with Federal laws and regulations, while a low-risk auditee is the exact opposite. The County is currently considered a high-risk auditee.

A high-risk auditee status results in increased County audit costs due to extended audit procedures that must be performed. Furthermore, increased scrutiny from outside organizations also results from this status. To be considered a low-risk auditee certain criteria must be met for the previous two fiscal years. The table below depicts the criteria and items that were met/not met by the County in fiscal years 08-09 and 09-10.

Criteria	Met by the County?	
	09-10	08-09
<i>Single Audits performed on an annual basis</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Auditor’s opinions were unqualified</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>No material weaknesses (internal control deficiencies)</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>No noncompliance with a material effect on the program</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>No known or likely questioned costs exceeding five percent of the program Federal award expended</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>

An **unqualified opinion** is the same as a clean opinion, while a **qualified opinion** signifies that the auditor found material instances of noncompliance within a major program.

The Single Audit opinions by major Federal program audited for the last two years are as follows:

<b>Federal Program</b>	<b>09-10</b>	<b>08-09</b>
<i>Food Stamps</i>	Qualified	Qualified
<i>Medicaid</i>	Qualified	Qualified
<i>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>	Qualified	Qualified
<i>Child Support</i>	Qualified	Unqualified
<i>Foster Care</i>	Qualified	Qualified
<i>Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT)</i>	Unqualified	Qualified
<i>Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)</i>	Unqualified	Non-major Program
<i>Adoption Assistance</i>	Qualified	Non-major Program
<i>Workforce Investment Act (WIA)</i>	Unqualified	Non-major Program
<i>Community Development Block Grants/Entitlement (CDBG)</i>	Unqualified	Non-major Program
<i>Highway Planning &amp; Construction</i>	Unqualified	Non-major Program

Material instances of noncompliance included in the report for the major Federal programs, fiscal year 09-10, are listed below. Findings below are primarily based on a sample size of 60 for each program. Findings predominately related to deficiencies in performing required procedures.

***Foster Care Title IV-E – Social Services***

- Unallowable costs of \$47,089 resulting from four cases where participants were not eligible for Federal aid.

***Medicaid - Social Services***

- Four case files whereby the County did not use the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) report to verify income and property documentation.
- Four case files whereby the eligibility information provided by the client did not match the information entered into the system.
- Four case files whereby the County failed to timely process the client’s reapplication form to redetermine eligibility.
- Ten IHSS case files whereby the County failed to perform a client reassessment of needs within the 12 month renewal period.

***Food Stamps - Social Services***

- Three case files whereby the County inaccurately entered the participant's income into the CalWin System.

***TANF- Social Services***

- Eight case files whereby the County inaccurately recorded the participants' benefit amounts from supporting documentation.
- Eight case files whereby the County did not use the IEVS to verify income and property documentation.

***Foster Care Title IV-E – Probation***

- Thirteen case files whereby the County failed to re-determine reasonable candidacy every six months.
- Four case files whereby the case plans were missing one of the required signatures.

***Adoption Assistance – Social Services***

- Fifteen case files whereby the County failed to agree the benefit payment on form AAP-2 to the amount in the CalWin System.
- Seven case files whereby the County failed to perform a 2 year assessment for eligibility in a timely manner.
- Eight case files whereby the County failed to update the CalWin System with information from form AAP-2 in a timely manner.
- Three case files whereby the forms AAP-2 and/or AD4320 were missing the required signatures.
- Two case files whereby the County failed to terminate benefits after the child became 18 years of age.

***Child Support – Child Support Services***

- Ten case files whereby the County failed to serve process and/or establish an order for support obligation within 90 days of locating the non-custodial parent.

Material instances of noncompliance are reported to the Federal awarding agency. It is the responsibility of the Federal awarding agency to issue a management decision on audit findings within six months after receipt of the audit report and ensure that the recipient takes appropriate and timely corrective action.

In order to become a low-risk auditee, management must ensure that proper controls are put into place to eliminate the findings that continue to affect the grant recipient departments. Until such time as adequate controls are implemented by the grantee departments, the County is unable to achieve its performance measure of receiving an unqualified opinion. County departments have prepared corrective action plans to ensure that material instances of noncompliance don't continue into future years. These corrective action plans, if implemented, appear to contain reasonable solutions to prevention of future findings.

Also included as part of the Single Audit reporting package is the Agreed Upon Conditions Report. This report includes findings that the auditors determined were not significant enough to include in the Single Audit Report, but needed to be communicated to management.

**Performance Measure:**

Receive an unqualified opinion on the Federal Single Audit Report.

**Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:**

Budgeted: Yes

**Fiscal Analysis:**

For FY 09-10, the total audit contract is \$148,400 of which \$56,840 is attributed to the Single Audit. The Internal Audit Division of the Auditor-Controller's Office also contributed approximately \$67,000 toward the audit.

**Staffing Impacts:**

None

**Special Instructions:**

None

**Attachments:**

County of Santa Barbara Single Audit Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010.  
Agreed Upon Conditions Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010.

**Authored by:**

Heather Harkless, Internal Audit Division, Office of the Auditor-Controller. Phone (805) 568-2456.

**CC:** Chandra Wallar, County Executive Officer  
Kathy Gallagher, Director, Department of Social Services  
Carrie Topliffe, Director, Child Support Services  
Ann Detrick, Director, Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services  
Scott McGolpin, Director, Public Works  
Patricia Stewart, Chief Probation Officer, Probation  
Dr. Takashi Wada, Director, Public Health  
David Matson, Director, Housing and Community Development