## Department of Health and Human Services

# OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

# TEXAS DID NOT ALWAYS COMPLY WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS AND ITS PUBLIC ASSISTANCE COST ALLOCATION PLAN WHEN IT CLAIMED MEDICAID ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Inquiries about this report may be addressed to the Office of Public Affairs at Public Affairs (a) oig. hhs. gov.



Brian P. Ritchie Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services

> August 2016 A-06-15-00038

## Office of Inspector General

http://oig.hhs.gov

The mission of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), as mandated by Public Law 95-452, as amended, is to protect the integrity of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) programs, as well as the health and welfare of beneficiaries served by those programs. This statutory mission is carried out through a nationwide network of audits, investigations, and inspections conducted by the following operating components:

#### Office of Audit Services

The Office of Audit Services (OAS) provides auditing services for HHS, either by conducting audits with its own audit resources or by overseeing audit work done by others. Audits examine the performance of HHS programs and/or its grantees and contractors in carrying out their respective responsibilities and are intended to provide independent assessments of HHS programs and operations. These assessments help reduce waste, abuse, and mismanagement and promote economy and efficiency throughout HHS.

#### Office of Evaluation and Inspections

The Office of Evaluation and Inspections (OEI) conducts national evaluations to provide HHS, Congress, and the public with timely, useful, and reliable information on significant issues. These evaluations focus on preventing fraud, waste, or abuse and promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of departmental programs. To promote impact, OEI reports also present practical recommendations for improving program operations.

#### Office of Investigations

The Office of Investigations (OI) conducts criminal, civil, and administrative investigations of fraud and misconduct related to HHS programs, operations, and beneficiaries. With investigators working in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, OI utilizes its resources by actively coordinating with the Department of Justice and other Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities. The investigative efforts of OI often lead to criminal convictions, administrative sanctions, and/or civil monetary penalties.

#### Office of Counsel to the Inspector General

The Office of Counsel to the Inspector General (OCIG) provides general legal services to OIG, rendering advice and opinions on HHS programs and operations and providing all legal support for OIG's internal operations. OCIG represents OIG in all civil and administrative fraud and abuse cases involving HHS programs, including False Claims Act, program exclusion, and civil monetary penalty cases. In connection with these cases, OCIG also negotiates and monitors corporate integrity agreements. OCIG renders advisory opinions, issues compliance program guidance, publishes fraud alerts, and provides other guidance to the health care industry concerning the anti-kickback statute and other OIG enforcement authorities.

### **Notices**

#### THIS REPORT IS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

at http://oig.hhs.gov

Section 8M of the Inspector General Act, 5 U.S.C. App., requires that OIG post its publicly available reports on the OIG Web site.

#### OFFICE OF AUDIT SERVICES FINDINGS AND OPINIONS

The designation of financial or management practices as questionable, a recommendation for the disallowance of costs incurred or claimed, and any other conclusions and recommendations in this report represent the findings and opinions of OAS. Authorized officials of the HHS operating divisions will make final determination on these matters.

#### INTRODUCTION

Texas did not always comply with Federal requirements and its Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan when it claimed Medicaid administrative costs.

#### WHY WE DID THIS REVIEW

We performed this audit because of concerns the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) had about Medicaid administrative costs claimed on line 49 of the Quarterly Medicaid Statement of Expenditures for the Medical Assistance Program (CMS-64 report).

#### **OBJECTIVE**

Our objective was to determine whether the Texas Department of Health and Human Service Commission (State agency) complied with Federal requirements and its Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan (PACAP) when it claimed Medicaid administrative costs.

#### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Medicaid Program**

The Medicaid program provides medical assistance to low-income individuals and individuals with disabilities. The Federal and State Governments jointly fund and administer the Medicaid program. At the Federal level, CMS administers the program. Each State administers its Medicaid program in accordance with a CMS-approved State plan. Although the State has considerable flexibility in designing and operating its Medicaid program, it must comply with applicable Federal requirements. The State agency administers the Medicaid program. The State agency oversees four other agencies; <sup>1</sup> together, the five agencies make up the Health and Human Services Enterprise (HHS Enterprise).

Section 1903(a)(7) of the Social Security Act permits States to claim Federal reimbursement for 50 percent of the costs of administrative activities that are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State Medicaid plan (Medicaid administration). States seek reimbursement for Medicaid administrative costs on the CMS-64 report.

#### **Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan**

The State agency administers federally financed public assistance programs as identified in subpart E of 45 CFR part 95. Federal cost principles require that the State agency submit a PACAP and have it approved.<sup>2</sup> The paying agency will allocate the costs of the service being

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Department of Aging and Disability Services, Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Family Protective Services, and Department of State Health Services.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, Cost Principles for State, Local, and Tribal Government, was relocated to 2 CFR part 225. During our audit period, OMB consolidated and streamlined its guidance, which is now located at 2 CFR part 200.

paid in accordance with the methodologies specified in its PACAP. The State agency's PACAP describes the allocation of indirect costs that have been grouped into cost pools, which accumulate costs that benefit more than one program. The State agency's PACAP includes 61 separate cost pools.

#### State Agency's Miscellaneous Regional Full-Time-Equivalent Cost Pool

In Federal fiscal year (FY) 2014, the State agency claimed \$790,787,745 (\$395,393,873 Federal share) in Medicaid administrative costs on line 49, "Other Care Services" (line 49), of its CMS-64 reports. Line 49 comprises numerous types of expenditures. We reviewed only those expenditures that the State agency reported on line 49 as the Miscellaneous Regional FTE [full-time-equivalent] Cost Pool (miscellaneous regional cost pool). The State agency uses the miscellaneous regional cost pool to allocate regional HHS Enterprise support costs to agencies receiving regional support. The State agency allocates these costs based on an FTE count of all regional staff for which the HHS Enterprise provides support, excluding staff in State Supported Living Centers and State hospitals.

In FY 2014, the State agency claimed Medicaid administrative costs of \$31,512,174 (\$15,756,191 Federal share) for office space and related facility costs included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool. The costs were for the 5 HHS Enterprise agencies to occupy 870 separate facilities that provided space for 24,837 FTE employees across Texas. The State agency accumulates facility costs and then allocates the cost to each HHS Enterprise agency based on its portion of the total FTEs in the cost pool. These costs are then charged to Medicaid and other State agency programs. Most of these miscellaneous regional cost pool costs were associated with State agency employees who determine eligibility for the Medicaid program. Employees who determine eligibility account for half of the State agency's FTEs in the miscellaneous regional cost pool.

#### HOW WE CONDUCTED THIS REVIEW

We reviewed \$31,512,174 (\$15,756,191 Federal share) of miscellaneous regional cost pool costs that the State agency claimed on line 49 of the CMS-64 report in FY 2014. These costs included mainly office space and related facility costs. We reconciled the amounts reported on line 49 of the CMS-64 report for each quarter with the State agency's summary reports and accounting system records. We applied data analytical tools to compare payroll, facility, and accounting information for errors. We also reviewed 13 sample vouchers totaling \$2,962,224 (\$344,122 Federal share) in related facility costs included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool.

We did not review the overall internal control structure of the State agency or the Medicaid program. Rather, we reviewed only those internal controls related to our objective.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

#### **FINDINGS**

The State agency did not always comply with Federal requirements and its PACAP when it claimed Medicaid administrative costs. Of the \$15,756,191 Federal share of Medicaid administrative costs we reviewed, the State agency claimed \$15,700,712 that was allowable under Federal requirements and its PACAP. In addition we found that all of the 13 sample vouchers, totaling \$2,962,224 (\$344,122 Federal share), in related facility costs we reviewed were allowable. However, the State agency did not comply with Federal requirements and its PACAP for the remaining \$55,479 in Medicaid administrative costs. Specifically, the State agency improperly charged Medicaid \$55,479 for colocated warehouse costs included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool. This occurred because the State agency failed to follow the PACAP as written.

# WAREHOUSE COSTS IMPROPERLY INCLUDED IN THE MISCELLANEOUS REGIONAL COST POOL AND CHARGED TO MEDICAID

Federal Regulations require the State agency to describe the specific procedures used to identify, measure, and allocate administrative costs in the PACAP, and the procedures should "contain sufficient information in such detail to permit" CMS to "make an informed judgment on the correctness and fairness of the State's procedures for identifying, measuring, and allocating administrative costs to each of the programs operated by the State agency" (45 CFR § 95.507(b)(4)(a)(4)).

A State must claim Federal financial participation for costs associated with a program only in accordance with its approved cost allocation plan (45 CFR § 95.517(a)). The Federal Government will disallow costs not claimed in accordance with the cost allocation plan (45 CFR § 95.519).

The State agency did not follow the approved cost allocation plan when reporting miscellaneous regional cost pool costs. The State agency improperly charged Medicaid \$55,479 for five colocated warehouses that were included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool. To identify colocated warehouses, we reviewed payroll data to isolate which warehouses were occupied by more than one agency. Colocated warehouse space should not be included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool but rather in the warehouse space cost pool, which has a separate methodology for allocating costs under the PACAP. The miscellaneous regional cost pool allocates costs based on FTE's, and the warehouse space cost pool allocates costs based on the square footage of leased colocated warehouse space used by each agency.

The State agency agreed that the PACAP needs to be modified to further clarify which warehouse space is allocated to the warehouse space cost pool and which to the miscellaneous regional cost pool and that the definitions in the PACAP were not sufficiently detailed. The current PACAP does not allow colocated warehouse costs to be included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the State agency:

- refund to the Federal Government \$55,479 for colocated warehouse costs that were improperly charged to Medicaid or work with CMS to determine whether any of the \$55,479 was allowable and
- ensure that the method the State agency uses to allocate the indirect costs is consistent with the approved PACAP.

#### STATE AGENCY COMMENTS

In written comments on our draft report, the State agency agreed with all of our recommendations and described corrective actions that it had taken or planned to take.

The State agency's comments are included in their entirety as Appendix B.

#### APPENDIX A: AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

#### **SCOPE**

We reviewed \$31,512,174 (\$15,756,191 Federal share) of miscellaneous regional costs that the State agency claimed on line 49 of the CMS-64 report in FY 2014. These costs included office space and related costs. We reconciled the amounts reported on line 49 of the CMS-64 report for each quarter with the State agency's summary reports and accounting system records. We applied data analytical tools to compare payroll, facility, and accounting information for errors. We also reviewed 13 sample vouchers totaling \$2,962,224 (\$344,122 Federal share) in related facility costs included in the miscellaneous regional cost pool.

We did not review the overall internal control structure of the State agency or the Medicaid program. Rather, we reviewed only those internal controls related to our objective.

We performed our fieldwork at the State agency's office in Austin, Texas, periodically from May 2015 to January 2016.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

To accomplish our objective, we:

- reviewed relevant Federal laws, regulations, and guidance;
- reviewed the PACAP;
- interviewed State agency officials;
- reconciled the amounts claimed on the CMS-64 report by tracing them to supporting summary reports and the State agency's accounting system;
- performed detailed analytical procedures; and
- discussed our findings with CMS and State agency officials.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

#### APPENDIX B: STATE AGENCY COMMENTS



#### TEXAS HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

CHARLES SMITH EXECUTIVE COMMISSIONER

June 24, 2016

Ms. Patricia Wheeler Regional Inspector General for Audit Services Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General Office of Audit Services Region VI 1100 Commerce, Room 632 Dallas, Texas 75242

Reference Report Number A-06-15-00038

Dear Ms. Wheeler:

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) received a draft audit report entitled "Texas Did Not Always Comply With Federal Requirements and Its Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan When It Claimed Medicaid Administrative Costs" from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General. The cover letter, dated May 25, 2016, requested that HHSC provide written comments, including the status of actions taken or planned in response to report recommendations.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond. Please find the attached HHSC management response which: (a) includes comments related to the content of the findings and recommendations; and (b) details actions HHSC has completed or planned.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information. David M. Griffith, Deputy IG for Audit, HHSC Inspector General, serves as the lead staff on this matter and may be reached by telephone at (512) 491-2806 or by e-mail at David.Griffith@hbsc.state.tx.us.

Sincerely

Charles Smith

Attachment

P. O. Box 13247 • Austin, Texas 78711 • 4900 North Lamar, Austin, Texas 78751 • (512) 424-6500

# Texas Health and Human Services Commission Management Response to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General Report:

#### Texas Did Not Always Comply With Federal Requirements and Its Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan When It Claimed Medicaid Administrative Costs

**DHHS - OIG Recommendation:** We recommend that the State agency refund to the Federal Government \$55,479 for co-located warehouse costs that were improperly charged to Medicaid or work with CMS to determine whether any of the \$55,479 was allowable.

#### **HHSC Management Response:**

#### **Actions Planned:**

HHSC will continue its efforts to determine whether any of the \$55,479 was allowable. Once these efforts are completed. HHSC will coordinate with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to identify a revised overpayment amount and will refund the revised amount to CMS.

Estimated Completion Date: One year from the date of the final audit report

Title of Responsible Person: Associate Commissioner, Business and Regional

Services

**DHHS - OIG Recommendation:** We recommend that the State agency ensure that the method the State agency used to allocate the indirect costs is consistent with the approved PACAP.

#### **HHSC Management Response:**

#### Actions Planned:

HHSC is currently involved in a multi-agency consolidation in which the current Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan (PACAP) will be reviewed and amended, as appropriate. During this process, HHSC will work with a consultant to identify and draft any necessary PACAP modifications. HHSC will ensure that the revisions clarify the current PACAP ambiguities related to the allocation of indirect costs.

Estimated Completion Date: December 1, 2016

Title of Responsible Person: iIHSC Accounting Director