



November 2, 2011

TO: Donald M. Berwick, M.D.
Administrator
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

FROM: /Gloria L. Jarmon/
Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services

SUBJECT: Review of Medicaid Administrative Costs Claimed by New Jersey for State Fiscal Year 2007 (A-02-07-01050)

Attached, for your information, is an advance copy of our final report on Medicaid administrative costs claimed by New Jersey for State fiscal year 2007. We will issue this report to the New Jersey Department of Human Services within 5 business days.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please do not hesitate to call me, or your staff may contact Brian P. Ritchie, Assistant Inspector General for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Audits, at (410) 786-7104 or through email at Brian.Ritchie@oig.hhs.gov or James P. Edert, Regional Inspector General for Audit Services, Region II, at (212) 264-4620 or through email at James.Edert@oig.hhs.gov. Please refer to report number A-02-07-01050.

Attachment



Office of Audit Services
Jacob Javits Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3900
New York, NY 10278

November 4, 2011

Report Number: A-02-07-01050

Jennifer Velez, Esq.
Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Human Services
222 South Warren Street
P.O. Box 700
Trenton, NJ 08625-0700

Dear Ms. Velez:

Enclosed is the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of Inspector General (OIG), final report entitled *Review of Medicaid Administrative Costs Claimed by New Jersey for State Fiscal Year 2007*. We will forward a copy of this report to the HHS action official noted on the following page for review and any action deemed necessary.

The HHS action official will make final determination as to actions taken on all matters reported. We request that you respond to this official within 30 days from the date of this letter. Your response should present any comments or additional information that you believe may have a bearing on the final determination.

Section 8L of the Inspector General Act, 5 U.S.C. App., requires that OIG post its publicly available reports on the OIG Web site. Accordingly, this report will be posted at <http://oig.hhs.gov>.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please do not hesitate to call me, or contact John J. Madigan, Audit Manager, at (518) 437-9390, extension 224, or through email at John.Madigan@oig.hhs.gov. Please refer to report number A-02-07-01050 in all correspondence.

Sincerely,

/James P. Edert/
Regional Inspector General
for Audit Services

Enclosure

Direct Reply to HHS Action Official:

Ms. Jackie Garner
Consortium Administrator
Consortium for Medicaid and Children's Health Operations
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
233 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 600
Chicago, IL 60601

Department of Health and Human Services

**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**REVIEW OF MEDICAID
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
CLAIMED BY NEW JERSEY FOR
STATE FISCAL YEAR 2007**



Daniel R. Levinson
Inspector General

November 2011
A-02-07-01050

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 8L 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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act (the Act), 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, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (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.

In New Jersey, the Department of Human Services (State agency) administers the Medicaid program. The State agency contracts with 56 community-based mental health providers to provide Medicaid-related mental health and related services. Section 1903(a)(7) of the 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 submit expenditures for Medicaid administration activities for reimbursement on Form CMS-64, the Quarterly Medicaid Statement of Expenditures for the Medical Assistance Program (Form CMS-64). New Jersey computes the cost of Medicaid administration activities performed by staff of contracted mental health providers using a process that results in New Jersey's Medicaid Administrative Claim (MAC). To compute the MAC for State fiscal year (FY) 2007, the State agency entered into a contingency fee contract with Maximus, Inc. (Maximus), which developed a four-step methodology that included a random moment timestudy (RMTS) to identify the Medicaid administration activities of staff in contracted mental health providers.

For State FY 2007, the State agency claimed Federal Medicaid reimbursement totaling \$25,957,141 (\$12,978,570 Federal share) for the cost of Medicaid administration activities performed by staff of contracted community mental health services on the Form CMS-64.

OBJECTIVE

Our objective was to determine whether the State agency's MAC for FY 2007 complied with Federal requirements for claiming costs associated with administration of the State Medicaid plan.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The State agency's MAC did not comply with Federal requirements. Specifically, Maximus included unallowable costs in the cost pool used to compute the MAC, resulting in a claim for \$10,047,252 (\$5,023,626 Federal share) in excess Medicaid administrative costs. In addition, Maximus (1) performed an RMTS that deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices and (2) applied Medicaid eligibility rates that were not documented by the State agency. We were unable to quantify the effect of these errors; however, they impacted the accuracy of the Medicaid administrative costs claimed by the State agency and the validity of the RMTS used to

allocate these costs. Therefore, we were unable to express an opinion on the allowability of the remaining \$15,909,889 (\$7,954,944 Federal share) claimed on the State agency's MAC. These errors occurred because the State agency did not establish adequate policies and procedures to ensure that calculation of its MAC complied with Federal requirements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the State agency:

- refund \$5,023,626 to the Federal Government,
- work with CMS to determine what portion of the remaining \$7,954,944 in Medicaid administration costs claimed for FY 2007 was allowable under Federal requirements,
- establish policies and procedures to ensure that future RMTS results used to allocate costs to Medicaid follow acceptable statistical sampling practices, and
- maintain supporting documentation for Medicaid eligibility rates used in computing the MAC.

STATE AGENCY COMMENTS AND OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL RESPONSE

In written comments on our draft report, the State agency did not agree with our findings and recommendations related to its inclusion of unallowable administrative costs in its Medicaid administrative cost pool and that its RMTS deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices. The State agency agreed with our recommendation to maintain supporting documentation for Medicaid eligibility rates and described steps that it has taken to address our finding.

After reviewing the State agency comments, we maintain that our findings and recommendations are valid. The State agency's comments appear in their entirety as Appendix B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
Medicaid Program.....	1
Medicaid Administration Costs	1
New Jersey’s Community Mental Health Services Medicaid Administrative Claim.....	1
OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	2
Objective.....	2
Scope.....	2
Methodology.....	3
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
UNALLOWABLE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS INCLUDED IN MEDICAID ADMINISTRATION COST POOL	4
Federal Requirements	4
Unallowable Overhead Costs.....	4
Unallowable Salaries and Wages.....	5
RANDOM MOMENT TIMESTUDY DEVIATED FROM ACCEPTABLE STATISTICAL SAMPLING PRACTICES	5
Federal Requirements	5
Random Moment Timestudy Observations Improperly Coded.....	5
Random Moment Timestudy Did Not Cover Period to Which It Was Applied.....	6
Random Moment Timestudy Did Not Reduce the Potential for Bias	6
MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RATES NOT DOCUMENTED	6
RECOMMENDATIONS	7
STATE AGENCY COMMENTS AND OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL RESPONSE	7
Unallowable Administrative Costs Included in Medicaid Administrative Cost Pool.....	7
Random Moment Timestudy Deviated From Acceptable Statistical Sampling Practices	9
Medicaid Eligibility Rates Not Documented.....	10

APPENDIXES

**A: COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDERS THAT DID NOT
PROVIDE SERVICES COVERED BY MEDICAID**

B: STATE AGENCY COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Medicaid Program

Pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act (the Act), 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, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (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.

Section 1903(a)(7) of the 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 submit expenditures for Medicaid administration for reimbursement on Form CMS-64, the Quarterly Medicaid Statement of Expenditures for the Medical Assistance Program (Form CMS-64).

Medicaid Administration Costs

To determine the portion of time and activities related to the administration of the Medicaid State plan, States must develop an allocation methodology that is approved by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Division of Cost Allocation. Federal regulations require that cost allocation plans conform to the accounting principles and standards in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87, *Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments* (2 CFR pt. 225), and other pertinent regulations and instructions (45 CFR § 95.507 (a)(2)).

According to the OMB Circular A-87, random moment sampling is an acceptable method for allocating salaries and wages to Federal awards. Random moment sampling, which uses a random moment timestudy (RMTS), must reflect all of the time and activities (whether allocable or allowable under Medicaid) performed by participating employees. Pursuant to OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A, C.3a and C.2a, program costs must be reasonable and necessary and allocated in accordance with the benefits received by the program.

New Jersey's Community Mental Health Services Medicaid Administrative Claim

In New Jersey, the Department of Human Services (State agency) administers the Medicaid program. The State agency contracts with 56 community-based mental health providers to provide Medicaid-related mental health and related services.¹ Mental health center staff also perform certain activities in support of the State's administration of the Medicaid State plan.

¹ The mental health providers are managed by nonprofit organizations and county governments. The mental health providers' services include psychiatric treatment, community residences (e.g., group homes), case management, and job placement.

For State fiscal year (FY) 2007, the State agency claimed Federal Medicaid reimbursement on the Form CMS-64 totaling \$25,957,141 (\$12,978,570 Federal share) for Medicaid administration activities performed by mental health providers. The costs were computed using a process that resulted in the State's Medicaid Administrative Claim (MAC). To compute the MAC for State FY 2007, the State agency entered into a contingency fee contract with Maximus, Inc. (Maximus), which developed a four-step methodology to identify the cost of Medicaid administration activities performed by staff of contracted mental health providers:²

1. Maximus first calculated the MAC cost pool, which included the salaries and other operating costs contained in annual operating budgets for the mental health providers.
2. To determine the percentage of time and related costs spent by mental health center staff on Medicaid administration, Maximus performed an RMTS of the activities of the employees of sampled mental health providers.³
3. To determine the Medicaid-related percentage of the employees' administration efforts, Maximus applied the applicable Medicaid eligibility rates —the mental health providers' number of Medicaid patients divided by total patients.
4. Finally, Maximus applied the estimated percentage of the employees' efforts applicable to Medicaid administration to the MAC cost pool.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Objective

Our objective was to determine whether the State agency's MAC for FY 2007 complied with Federal requirements for claiming costs associated with administration of the State Medicaid plan.

Scope

We reviewed the \$25,957,141 (\$12,978,570 Federal share) that the State agency claimed on its Forms CMS-64 for FY 2007 related to administrative costs applicable to the mental health providers.

Our objective did not require an understanding or assessment of the State agency's internal control structure. We limited our review to internal controls related to the State agency's and Maximus' calculation of the MAC.

² The contingency fee contract was valued at 4.75 percent of new Federal funds generated by Maximus' efforts. The State agency did not claim the contingency fee for Federal reimbursement.

³ On the selected date and time, Maximus contacted a sample of employees and recorded an activity code for each reported activity. Maximus calculated the percentage of responses related to various activities.

We performed our fieldwork at the State agency's offices in Trenton, New Jersey, and at 38 of the 56 mental health providers throughout New Jersey whose costs were used to calculate the MAC.

Methodology

To accomplish our objective, we:

- reviewed applicable Federal laws, regulations, and guidance;
- reviewed the State agency's contingency fee contract with Maximus;
- held discussions with the State agency, Maximus, HHS Division of Cost Allocation, and CMS officials to gain an understanding of the process for calculating the MAC;
- reconciled the quarterly administrative costs claims developed by Maximus to the costs submitted by the State agency on the Forms CMS-64;
- reviewed the budgeted costs included in the administrative cost pool for the 56 mental health providers;
- selected a simple random sample of 100 of the total 1,312 RMTS observations, taken between April 1, 2005, and March 31, 2006, that Maximus used to allocate employee time and costs to the Medicaid program;
- for each of the sampled observations, visited the corresponding mental health center to determine if the associated employee(s)' effort(s) were properly identified and reviewed documentation supporting the center's Medicaid eligibility rates;⁴and
- reviewed documentation to support the statewide Medicaid eligibility rates.

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 objective.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The State agency's MAC did not comply with Federal requirements for claiming costs associated with administration of the State Medicaid plan. Specifically, Maximus included unallowable salaries and operating costs in the cost pool used to compute the MAC, resulting in a claim for

⁴ The 100 RMTS observations in our statistical sample were associated with individuals employed at the 38 facilities we visited.

\$10,047,252 (\$5,023,626 Federal share) in excess Medicaid administration costs. In addition, Maximus (1) performed an RMTS that deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices and (2) applied Medicaid eligibility rates that were not documented by the State agency. We were unable to quantify the effect of these errors; however, they impacted the accuracy of the Medicaid administration costs claimed by the State agency and the validity of the RMTS used to allocate these costs. Therefore, we were unable to express an opinion on the allowability of the remaining \$15,909,889 (\$7,954,944 Federal share) claimed on the State agency's MAC. These errors occurred because the State agency did not establish adequate policies and procedures to ensure that its MAC complied with Federal requirements.

UNALLOWABLE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS INCLUDED IN MEDICAID ADMINISTRATION COST POOL

Federal Requirements

OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A § (C)(3)(a) (2 CFR 225 Appendix A. § C.3.a), states that “[a] cost is allocable to a particular cost objective if the goods or services involved are chargeable or assignable to such cost objective in accordance with relative benefits received.” Under OMB Circular A-87, costs are allocable to particular cost objectives, such as public assistance programs, only up to the amount of the relative benefits received by such objectives and only allocable costs are allowable. To be allowable under a Federal award, costs must be necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the award. Further, costs must be allocable and chargeable in accordance with the relative benefits received.

On December 20, 1994, CMS issued a State Medicaid Director Letter reiterating its “long-standing policy” on Federal financial participation for costs “found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State [Medicaid] plan.” The letter stated that allowable administrative costs must be “directly related to the administration of the Medicaid program” and “may not include the overhead costs of operating a provider facility.”

The letter also stated that allowable administrative costs do not include gaining access to or coordinating non-Medicaid services even if such services are health-related. Also, allowable administrative costs do not include gaining access to or coordinating social, educational, vocational, legal or other non-Medicaid services. Allowable administrative costs may not include the operating costs of an agency whose purpose is other than the administration of the Medicaid program.

Unallowable Overhead Costs

Maximus improperly included overhead costs of the mental health providers in the MAC cost pool. The costs consisted of operating costs (e.g., indirect salaries and wages,⁵ rent, utilities, and depreciation) that were not directly related to the administration of the Medicaid program and

⁵ The unallowable salaries and wages were related to the mental health providers' general and administrative employees who were not included in the RMTS roster. Maximus also included unallowable salaries and wages for general and administrative staff who did participate in the RMTS, but we were unable to determine the monetary effect of this.

were operating costs of an agency whose purpose is other than administration of the Medicaid program. As a result, the State agency claimed excess Medicaid administration costs totaling \$7,116,272 (\$3,558,136 Federal share).

Unallowable Salaries and Wages

Maximus improperly included unallowable salaries and wages in the MAC cost pool related to employees at 17 mental health providers that did not provide services that directly benefited the Medicaid program. CMS's 1994 State Medicaid Director Letter states that an allowable Medicaid administration cost must be "directly related to Medicaid State Plan or waiver services." Specifically, the mental health providers provided mental health-related social, family, legal, and housing services that were not covered by Medicaid. As a result, the State agency claimed excess Medicaid administration costs totaling \$2,930,980 (\$1,465,490 Federal share).⁶

Appendix A details the non-Medicaid services provided at the 17 mental health providers.

RANDOM MOMENT TIMESTUDY DEVIATED FROM ACCEPTABLE STATISTICAL SAMPLING PRACTICES

Federal Requirements

OMB Circular A-87, Attachment B, § (8)(h)(6) (2 CFR 225 Appendix B. § 8.h.6), states that random moment sampling may be used to allocate salaries and wages to a Federal award. Further, "... systems which use sampling methods ... must meet acceptable statistical sampling standards including: (i) The sampling universe must include all of the employees whose salaries and wages are to be allocated based on sample results ...; (ii) The entire time period involved must be covered by the sample; and (iii) The results must be statistically valid and applied to the period being sampled."

HHS's *A Guide for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments: Cost Principles and Procedures for Developing Cost Allocation Plans and Indirect Cost Rates for Agreements With the Federal Government* (Reference No. ASMB C-10, pt. 3.4, § 3-23) states that the results of an acceptable statistical sampling method covering one period of time cannot be applied to a different period.

Random Moment Timestudy Observations Improperly Coded

Because some observations were improperly coded, the RMTS results were not statistically valid. Of the 100 RMTS observations performed by Maximus that we sampled, 10 were improperly coded. Specifically, the activity code that Maximus recorded for the sample observations did not match the activity that the health center employee was performing during the observation. For example, one employee who was terminated as of September 10, 2005, was reported as being on vacation on September 13, 2005—the date of the observation. Another

⁶ Maximus also improperly included unallowable salaries and wages in the MAC cost pool related to employees at the remaining 39 mental health providers. However, we were unable to determine the monetary effect of this action.

employee was reported as being “on duty” on February 27, 2006; however, the employee’s timesheet and payroll register indicated that the employee did not work that day.

Random Moment Timestudy Did Not Cover Period to Which It Was Applied

The State agency applied the results of the RMTS to a period that was not covered by the timestudy. Maximus performed the RMTS for the period April 1, 2005, through March 31, 2006, but the State agency applied the RMTS results to administrative costs for the period July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007.

Random Moment Timestudy Did Not Reduce the Potential for Bias

The RMTS deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practice because it did not reduce the potential for bias by ensuring that (1) only eligible mental health center employees were selected for participation, (2) study participants did not have access to potentially biasing information, and (3) selected employees were not notified in advance. Specifically, Maximus’ RMTS methodology contained the following deviations from acceptable statistical sampling practices:

- The mental health providers included ineligible employees (e.g., secretaries and accountants) on employee work schedules that they provided to the State agency and were subsequently forwarded to Maximus. Of the 100 RMTS observations performed by Maximus that we sampled, 18 were for individuals whose work was not directly related to the Medicaid program. Inclusion of these employees created a bias that contributed to a higher general administration response rate than if the administrative positions were not included.
- Instructional materials that the State agency provided to the mental health providers contained a potentially biasing statement that compliance with the RMTS would help generate additional funds for New Jersey and the mental health providers.
- Before Maximus conducted the RMTS, the State agency gave the mental health providers the names and contact times of employees who would be surveyed, thus potentially influencing the employees’ assigned duties at the time they were polled.

MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RATES NOT DOCUMENTED

Pursuant to OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A, (C)(1)(j) (2 CFR 225 Appendix A § C.1.j) allowable costs must be adequately documented.

The State agency did not maintain documents to support the eligibility rates used to determine the percentage of certain employee efforts applicable to the Medicaid program. In computing the MAC, the State agency gave each health center the option to develop its own Medicaid eligibility rate—the center’s number of Medicaid patients divided by total patients—or to use a statewide rate. Mental health providers used both options during our audit period; however, the mental health providers and the State agency did not maintain documentation to support the Medicaid eligibility rates that were reported by the providers and used to compute the MAC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the State agency:

- refund \$5,023,626 to the Federal Government,
- work with CMS to determine what portion of the remaining \$7,954,944 in Medicaid administration costs claimed for FY 2007 was allowable under Federal requirements,
- establish policies and procedures to ensure that future RMTS results used to allocate costs to Medicaid follow acceptable statistical sampling practices, and
- maintain supporting documentation for Medicaid eligibility rates used in computing the MAC.

STATE AGENCY COMMENTS AND OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL RESPONSE

In written comments on our draft report, the State agency did not concur with our findings and recommendations related to its inclusion of unallowable administrative costs in its Medicaid administrative cost pool and that its RMTS deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices. The State agency agreed with our recommendation to maintain supporting documentation for Medicaid eligibility rates and described steps that it has taken to address our finding. State agency's comments appear in their entirety as Appendix B.

Unallowable Administrative Costs Included in Medicaid Administrative Cost Pool

Applicability of Federal Criteria

State Agency Comments

The State agency stated that the OMB Circular A-87 requirement that costs must be “necessary and reasonable” applies to its development of its MAC. However, the State agency argued that “A-87 is only applicable to these provider costs in that the costs paid by the State for the administrative functions performed by the provider agencies must be reasonable, since they are contracted provider payments—not costs of the state agency staff directly performing these activities.”

Office of Inspector General Response

The Federal cost principles set forth in OMB Circular A-87 are all applicable to costs incurred by the State under its Federal award. To be allowable to Medicaid under OMB Circular A-87, costs must be both necessary and reasonable and also allocable to Medicaid in accordance with the benefits received by Medicaid. The State may not develop a Medicaid payment rate based on costs that are not allowable to Medicaid. CMS's policy guidance on Medicaid administrative claiming is consistent with OMB Circular A-87. The December 20, 1994, State Medicaid

Director Letter provides that allowable Medicaid administration costs must be included in a cost allocation plan approved by CMS. Under 45 CFR § 95.507, cost allocation plans must conform to OMB Circular A-87 cost principles. In addition, CMS's guidance to school-based programs applies OMB Circular A-87 guidance, particularly with respect to use of an RMTS. Accordingly, we believe the OMB Circular A-87 cost allocation principles apply to the costs used to develop the State agency's MAC payment rate.

Unallowable Overhead Costs

State Agency Comments

The State agency stated that, because contractors perform activities that would otherwise be performed directly by the State agency, the overhead cost of operating contractor facilities may be included in calculating the rate paid for Medicaid administration. The State agency said that it modeled its development of the MAC rates on the approach in the CMS *School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide*. The State agency also stated that, "[b]ecause regulations do not contain a prohibition on the inclusion of 'overhead costs of operating a provider facility' as being part of allowable and claiming administrative costs ... overhead costs were properly included in the claim."

Office of Inspector General Response

CMS's longstanding policy on administrative claiming, set forth in its 1994 State Medicaid Director letter, prohibits including costs that are not directly related to Medicaid and, specifically, the overhead cost of operating a provider agency. Further, the CMS *School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide* was issued specifically for school settings and may not be applicable to the activities of contracted mental health providers.⁷

In developing its RMTS roster, the State agency instructed mental health providers to include all employees who performed MAC-reimbursable activities. The indirect salaries included in our finding were related to employees that the State agency excluded from its roster of RMTS participants. Salaries of individuals who did not perform Medicaid activities (i.e., employees who were not on the RMTS roster) were not directly related to Medicaid. Further, OMB Circular A-87 requires that the sampling universe for the RMTS include all employees whose salaries and wages are to be allocated based on sample results. Nevertheless, the State agency included nonroster salaries in the MAC cost pool. Accordingly, overhead costs associated with operating a provider agency and the salaries of employees who did not perform Medicaid activities and were not included on the RMTS roster should not have been included in the MAC cost pool.

⁷ The *School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide* was developed to help schools and school districts prepare appropriate claims for administrative costs under the Medicaid program and to ensure that the Medicaid program pays for only appropriate school-based administrative activities (*Claiming Guide* at 1). Schools have a unique role in assuring that services to children that are required by Medicaid are provided and that eligible children are enrolled in Medicaid.

Unallowable Salaries and Wages

State Agency Comments

The State agency stated that the salaries and wages related to the 17 contracted mental health providers were properly included in the MAC cost pool because some of the mental health providers' employees performed activities that related to the administration of Medicaid. Citing the December 20, 1994, State Medicaid Director Letter, the State agency argued that operating costs (including salaries) may be included in MAC cost pool if the State agency can identify the fraction of effort devoted exclusively to a Medicaid-claimable activity. The State agency further stated that its RMTS study identified this fraction of claimable activity.

Office of Inspector General Response

We reviewed the documentation for the random moments sampled from the 17 mental health providers' employees. These employees reported a total of 69 Medicaid-reimbursable moments out of a total of 3,168 moments sampled. Of the 69 moments, we found only 2 activities that were documented as Medicaid-related. Consequently, our questioned costs cannot be shown to be reasonable costs to Medicaid. Further, using the statewide RMTS results to allocate a portion of the salary costs of these 17 mental health providers to Medicaid, on the basis of so few activities that can be documented as Medicaid-reimbursable, is contrary to both the OMB Circular A-87's "necessary and reasonable" standard and CMS's guidance under § 1903 (a) of the Act that costs allowable to Medicaid administration must be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan. Therefore, the salary costs of these employees should not be included in the cost pool apportioned to Medicaid on the basis of the statewide RMTS.

We continue to recommend that the State agency refund \$5,023,626 to the Federal Government and that the State agency work with CMS to determine what portion of the remaining \$7,954,944 in Medicaid administrative costs claimed for FY 2007 was allowable under Federal requirements.

Random Moment Timestudy Deviated From Acceptable Statistical Sampling Practices

State Agency Comments

The State agency agreed that 10 of the RMTS observations included in our sample of 100 observations were improperly coded. However, the State agency indicated that the RMTS is "a valid methodology designed to accurately determine the portion of total provider agency time and effort expended on allowable and reimbursable Medicaid administrative activities." The State agency also indicated that "there is no regulation or citation that precluded the results of the study from being employed to calculate the State's contract payments in a subsequent period." The State agency also objected to our finding that the State agency did not reduce the potential for bias. Nevertheless, the State agency indicated that it obtained a new contractor to develop the State agency's MAC and that the new contractor had refined and changed its procedures related to the RMTS to address some of our concerns.

Office of Inspector General Response

OMB Circular A-87 specifies certain “acceptable statistical sampling standards” for random moment sampling that we found were not satisfied by the State when it conducted its RMTS. For example, the State agency used RMTS results to allocate salaries of employees who were not in the sampling universe and applied RMTS results to time periods not covered by the sample. We also found that the State agency did not adequately reduce the potential for bias in conducting its RMTS. After reviewing the State agency comments, we maintain our findings and related recommendation.

Medicaid Eligibility Rates Not Documented

State Agency Comments

The State agency indicated that the statewide Medicaid eligibility rate was supported by records that did not exactly match the rate used for 2007. According to the State agency, the underlying database is dynamic and corrections are made on an ongoing basis. As a result, the records queried at the time of our audit yielded a slightly different result. In addition, the State agency concurred that it did not require mental health providers to submit supporting documentation for their Medicaid eligibility rates. The State agency stated that it relied on mental health providers to maintain this documentation. The State agency indicated that it has adjusted its procedures to ensure these providers maintain documentation to support their Medicaid eligibility rate.

Office of Inspector General Response

The State agency acknowledged that records used to support the statewide Medicaid eligibility rate were not consistent with the rate actually used and that, although mental health providers should have maintained documentation of the rates they used, such documentation was not available to the auditors. The State agency indicated it has subsequently changed some of its procedures related to provider recordkeeping. Nevertheless, we continue to recommend that it maintain supporting documentation for Medicaid eligibility rates used in computing the MAC.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDERS THAT DID NOT PROVIDE SERVICES COVERED BY MEDICAID

HEALTH CENTER

NON-MEDICAID SERVICES PROVIDED

Advance Housing, Inc.	Housing services
Alternatives, Inc.	Housing services
Health Services, County of Bergen	Legal services
Bridgeway Rehabilitation Services, Inc.	Housing services
Career Opportunity Development, Inc.	Housing services
Central Jersey Legal Services	Legal services
Dept. of Social Services, City of Asbury Park	Legal services
Collaborative Support Programs of NJ, Inc.	Legal and housing services
Community Health Law Project	Legal services
Easter Seals, Inc.	Housing and family services
Legal Services of Northwest Jersey	Legal services
Mental Health Association in New Jersey, Inc.	Legal, employment, family, and other services
Mental Health Association of Monmouth County	Housing and family services
Mental Health Association of Southwestern New Jersey	Employment and family services
Mental Health Association in Passaic County	Legal, family, and other services
Resources for Human Development	Housing services
United Family and Children's Society	Legal services

Note: Advance Housing; Easter Seals NJ, Inc.; Bridgeway Rehabilitation Services; Career Opportunity Development; and Alternatives, Inc., had additional fully reimbursed Medicaid and/or Division of Development Disability programs that were properly excluded from the Medicaid Administrative Claim cost pool.

APPENDIX B: STATE AGENCY COMMENTS



CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH SERVICES
PO Box 712
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0712

JENNIFER VELEZ
Commissioner

VALERIE HARR
Director

June 10, 2011

James P. Edert
Regional Inspector General for Audit Services
Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Inspector General
Office of Audit Services Region II
Jacob K. Javits Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza – Room 3900
New York, NY 10278

Report Number: A-02-07-01050

Dear Mr. Edert:

This is in response to your letter dated April 14, 2011 concerning the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) draft report entitled "Review of Medicaid Administrative Costs Claimed by New Jersey for State Fiscal Year 2007" Your letter provides the opportunity to comment on this draft report.

The objective of this review was to determine whether the New Jersey Department of Human Services' Division Medical Assistance and Health Services' (DMAHS) Medicaid Administrative Claiming (MAC) for fiscal year 2007 complied with Federal requirements for claiming costs associated with administration of the State Medicaid plan. Specifically, the State contracts with 56 community-based mental health centers to provide Medicaid-related mental health and related services. Title XIX 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. The review focused on the MAC claiming for these mental health centers.

The draft audit report concluded that New Jersey's MAC claiming did not comply with Federal requirements. Specifically, Maximus, DMAHS's contractor who developed the claiming methodology, included unallowable costs in the cost pool used to compute the MAC, resulting in a claim for \$10,047,252 (\$5,023,626 Federal Share) in excess Medicaid administrative costs. In addition, Maximus (1) performed a random moment time study (RMTS) that deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices and (2) applied Medicaid eligibility rates that were not documented by DMAHS. The auditors

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 2

were unable to quantify the effect of these errors; however, they impacted the accuracy of the Medicaid administration costs claimed by DMAHS and the validity of the RMTS used to allocate these costs. The draft audit report stated that the auditors were unable to express an opinion on the allowability of the remaining \$15,909,888 (\$7,954,944 Federal share) claimed on New Jersey's MAC. The draft audit report stated that these errors occurred because DMAHS did not establish adequate policies and procedures to ensure that calculation of its MAC complied with Federal requirements.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this response to the draft OIG audit report. Following are the auditors' recommendations and DMAHS's responses:

Recommendation 1:

The OIG recommends that New Jersey should refund \$5,023,626 to the Federal Government:

The State does not concur with this recommendation. Several of the issues addressed later in this letter derive in part from the auditors' assertion that the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 applies to the detailed method the State used to calculate the payment which contracted community providers are paid to provide Medicaid Administrative Services. In other words, the auditors argue that the cost allocation methods used in the provider rate development process must map to those outlined in A-87, which establishes cost principles for State, Local, or Indian Tribal governments. The auditors contend that because the costs were claimed by a state agency, A-87 must apply to the calculation of those costs, and thus to the rate development.

Applicability of A-87:

The State believes that this position is flawed because it fails to distinguish between the costs for which the State is seeking reimbursement and the costs to which Section 8.h.(6) of Attachment B of A-87 applies. The State's administrative claim consists of a contractually required payment to be made by the State to provider agencies that represents a reasonable estimation of the costs to be incurred by such agencies in performing allowable Medicaid administrative activities. It is not a claim for the costs of activities performed by State agency personnel. Since Section 8.h.(6) relates solely to compensation for personal services of State agency personnel, it is totally unrelated to the contractually required payment that the State is claiming. Thus, while we agree that the general principles contained in Attachment A of A-87 apply to the claiming of the payments themselves in that the costs must be reasonable we disagree that Attachment B, Section 8 applies to the specific method used to calculate provider rates.

OMB Circular A-87, which contains the cost principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal governments for the administration of federal awards, states that, "Governmental units

Mr. James P. Edert
 June 10, 2011
 Page 3

are responsible for the efficient and effective administration of federal awards." Under these provisions, costs must be reasonable and necessary for the operation of the governmental unit or the performance of the federal award. OMB Circular A-87 goes on to state "Reasonable Costs - A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost..." and "In determining reasonableness of a given cost, consideration shall be given to:

- A. Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the governmental unit or the performance of the Federal award.
- B. The restraints or requirements imposed by such factors as: sound business practices; arms length bargaining; Federal, State and other laws and regulations; and, terms and conditions of the Federal award.
- C. Market prices for comparable goods or services.
- D. Whether the individuals concerned acted with prudence in the circumstances considering their responsibilities to the governmental unit, its employees, the public at large, and the Federal Government."

The State argues that A-87 is only applicable to these provider costs in that the cost paid by the State for the administrative functions performed by the provider agencies must be reasonable, since they are contracted provider payments – not costs of the state agency staff directly performing these activities. The State has established what it contends is a reasonable method for establishing a rate paid to the providers for the purchase of Medicaid administrative services. Providers are paid pursuant to their contract at this rate, and once the payments are made, the State claims these payments. The payment must be claimed consistent with the principles contained in Attachment A of A-87, and the rate must be "reasonable", however the specific method for calculating the rate is not defined by A-87.

As a parallel example, in a foster care setting, the state Title IV-E agency pays foster homes (providers) for the room, board, and supervision of the child via a monthly foster home payment (rate), which can be claimed to the Title IV-E program. States do not develop these rates by applying the same A-87 cost allocation principles that they would apply to developing claims for their own state agency staff costs. Rather, a reasonable method is used for establishing rates for various levels of care, this rate is paid to the provider, and payment made is the agency costs, assuming the child is Title IV-E eligible.

Unallowable Administrative Costs Included In Medicaid Administrative Cost Pool:

Unallowable Overhead Costs:

The auditors' draft audit report contends that overhead costs of the mental health centers were improperly included in the MAC cost pool. The costs consisted of

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 4

operating costs that were not directly related to the administration of the Medicaid program and were operating costs of an agency whose purpose is other than administration of the Medicaid program. As a result, DMAHS claimed excess Medicaid administration costs of \$3,558,136.

The State disagrees with the auditors' assertion that overhead costs were *improperly* included in the claim. We believe that such costs are properly includable as a component of the rates paid. The auditors cite a December 20, 1994 CMS State Medicaid Director Letter regarding administrative case management. The report includes a bullet from page 5 of the December letter indicating that an allowable administrative cost... "may not include the overhead costs of operating a provider facility such as the supervision and training of providers."

In developing the rates paid to the non-profit behavioral health service providers for administrative activities, the State modeled its approach on the School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide (School MAC Guide) issued by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). This is the only resource we have found which speaks directly to a method for calculating Medicaid Administration in a non-state agency setting. Schools play a similar role to Division of Mental Health Services (DMHS) community based agencies in terms of Medicaid administration. Schools perform Medicaid Administration on behalf of a state under an interagency agreement between the local education agency and the State. DMHS providers perform Medicaid Administration on behalf of the State of New Jersey pursuant to a contract between DMHS and the provider. In both cases the entity is serving individuals who have a likelihood of being Medicaid eligible, and in both cases the purpose of the entity is not exclusively provision of Medicaid services or Medicaid Administration. Both school staff and community mental health providers play an important role on behalf of the state in ensuring and promoting that the vulnerable populations get access to needed Medicaid services. Given all of these similarities, and the fact this is published guidance from the federal cognizant agency (CMS), New Jersey concluded that it was reasonable to model a rate development process on this guide.

The School MAC Guide served as the basis for New Jersey's approach to developing compensation rates. These rates are paid to entities to perform activities that are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State Medicaid program that would otherwise have been performed directly by the State itself.

As such the State contends that the overhead costs included in our claim are allowable and are the same as those claimed in school-based settings nationwide, as well as in community settings in other states such as Indiana. As an example, the Departmental Appeals Board (DAB) made a decision related to Medicaid Administration in Texas DAB 2187 (2008). In addressing a particular

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 5

questioned cost under dispute, the decision described that Texas included costs above and beyond those of the direct service staff salaries and benefits were as Medicaid administrative costs – and neither CMS nor the DAB questioned the appropriateness of including such costs, nor were they included via application of an indirect cost rate. Texas claimed costs included “direct support staff” of time study participants, “materials, supplies, travel, and other operating costs “for staff in the time study and their support staff. While the auditors question the inclusion of such costs in our rate development in New Jersey, these costs were not questioned by CMS or the DAB in Texas. Rather, CMS and the Board were focused on one particular item included within these “operating costs” which they determined to be educational in nature, not a general operating cost. Only this specific “educational” cost was disallowed.

The State further disputes the auditors’ assertion because the State questions the applicability and enforceability of the statement contained in the bullet on page 5 of the December 20, 1994 CMS State Medicaid Director Letter. On page 7 of the letter, the Health Care Financing Administration (the prior name for CMS) indicated that “(W)e plan to issue an expanded list of policy interpretations to guide States’ decision making regarding allowable costs for Medicaid administrative match for ACM [administrative case management] and other functions performed by state or local governments in a SMM [State Medicaid Manual] issuance. We also intend to incorporate these interpretations in regulations.” By this statement, HCFA tacitly admitted that, in order for the policies contained in the letter to be given force, its contents must be included in either an official document, such as the SMM, or codified as official policy in the Code of Federal Regulations. To our knowledge, neither of these actions was ever taken. Because the regulations do not contain a prohibition on the inclusion of “overhead costs of operating a provider facility” as being a part of allowable and claimable administrative costs, as is the case with respect to 75% FFP for the costs of Skilled Professional Medical Personnel, we maintain that overhead costs were properly included in the claim.

Unallowable Salaries and Wages:

The auditors contend that unallowable salaries and wages were improperly included in the MAC cost pool related to employees at 17 mental health centers that did not provide services that directly benefited the Medicaid program. As a result, DMAHS claimed excess Medicaid administration costs of \$1,465,490.

The auditors’ position is that because for some of these providers, their primary mission is providing “related social, family, legal, or housing” services, they could not be performing activities which directly benefit the Medicaid program. As authority for its position, they cite a bullet on page 6 of the December 20, 1994 CMS State Medicaid Director Letter indicating that allowable administrative

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 6

costs... "may not include the operating costs of an agency whose purpose is other than the administration of the Medicaid program, such as the operation of a probation department." The State strongly disagrees that this prohibition is applicable with respect to the 17 provider agencies referenced in the OIG draft report.

Unlike a probation department that performs functions totally distinct from that of Medicaid type providers, DMHS providers serve clients with mental illness which is a vulnerable population for whom the provision of regular care is particularly critical. A crucial role that all providers play – even those such as the 17 providers referenced in the OIG draft report, that they themselves are not providing direct Medicaid services – is assuring that these clients obtain and maintain regular access to Medicaid covered behavioral health and medical care. Thus, similar to schools in the School-Based MAC program, whose primary purpose is to provide services that are not Medicaid eligible or directly related to the Medicaid State Plan, staff within these 17 mental health providers do perform activities which directly relate to the administration of the Medicaid program and should therefore be allowable under the MAC claim. The State contends that the nature of the activity rather than the nature of the entity is what should govern the claimability.

Furthermore 8 of the providers at issue are providing community support services for individuals in supportive housing settings, which is a coverable Medicaid service. The audit characterizes these as housing services. NJ has a SPA request before CMS now, being evaluated for addition of this service to the Medicaid State Plan. The fact that this service was not a covered service at the time of audit is irrelevant as the service is in fact coverable and in fact will be covered in NJ imminently. Again we would argue that the focus must be upon the nature of the administrative activities being performed, not the nature of the entity.

As the above paragraphs indicate, the 17 cited provider agencies do perform necessary and allowable Medicaid administrative tasks. As a consequence, their activities and costs fall under another statement contained in the December 1994 CMS Letter that was not cited in the OIG draft audit report. As a caveat to the prohibition cited in the OIG draft report, and placed immediately after it, the Letter states:

However, to the degree that a governmental agency directs some fraction of its efforts exclusively to Medicaid claimable administrative services, and can accurately identify that fraction, it may claim an appropriate portion of its operating costs to support that function if all other criteria for administrative claiming is satisfied (e.g., direct relationship to the State plan, health-related, etc.)

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 7

As permitted by the above paragraph, the State's methodology, through use of the Random Moment Time Study (RMTS), accurately identified the "fraction" of the efforts expended exclusively to Medicaid claimable administrative activities by staff at the 17 cited provider agencies and included only the appropriate portion of the provider agencies' operating costs related to such Medicaid claimable administrative activities in determining the amount of the contract payment to be made by the State to the agencies. Thus, contrary to the auditors' position, the inclusion of 17 questioned provider agencies in the sample and the designation of a portion of their costs as representing allowable Medicaid administrative expenditures are appropriate and allowable.

Recommendation 2:

The OIG Recommends that DMAHS Work with CMS to Determine What Portion of the Remaining \$7,954,944 in Medicaid Administration Costs Claimed for FY 2007 was Allowable under Federal Requirements:

The State looks forward to working with CMS to resolve the issues cited in the OIG draft audit report and the allowability of these claims. These issues relate to the Random Moment Time Study (RMTS) and the application of Medicaid eligibility rates that were not documented by DMAHS. The following outlines the State's position concerning the auditors' findings:

Random Moment Time Study Deviated From Acceptable Statistical Sampling Practices:

Random Moment Time Study Observations Improperly Coded:

Of the 100 RMTS observations performed that were sampled by the auditors, 10 were improperly coded. The State does not dispute this finding.

Random Moment Time Study Did Not Cover Period to Which It Was Applied:

The auditors question the propriety of the State's claim because the State applied the results of the RMTS to a period that was not covered by the time study. The RMTS was performed for the period April 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006, whereas the results were applied to the administrative costs for the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. In doing so, the OIG cites OMB Circular A-87, Attachment B, Section 8.h.(6)(a)(ii), which states that "the entire time period involved must be covered by the sample, as justification for its action.

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 8

The State disagrees with the auditors' position and believes that it is flawed because it fails to distinguish between the costs for which the State is seeking reimbursement and the costs to which Section 8.h.(6)(a)(ii) of Attachment B of A-87 applies.

The State's administrative claim consists of a contractually required payment to be made by the State to provider agencies that represents a reasonable estimation of the costs to be incurred by such agencies in performing allowable Medicaid administrative activities. As such, it does not represent a claim for the costs of activities performed by State agency personnel. Consequently, Section 8.h.(6)(a)(ii) is simply not applicable in this matter because it pertains solely to the calculation of compensation for personal services of State agency personnel and therefore is totally unrelated to the contractually required payment that the State is claiming. Thus, the auditor is incorrect in citing this section of A-87 as a basis of questioning the State's claim.

In order to determine an appropriate amount of the State's contract payment that meets the "reasonableness" standard contained in Circular A-87, the State is required to employ a valid methodology designed to accurately determine the portion of total provider agency time and effort expended on allowable and reimbursable Medicaid administrative activities. The method chosen to do so is the RMTS. In the current dispute, a RMTS was performed during the period April 1, 2005, through March 31, 2006 and the resulting percentage rate of time spent on allowable provider agency Medicaid administrative activities was employed to determine the amount of the State's total contractual payments to be made to the provider agencies in the subsequent State Fiscal Year which, in this case, was the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. Since, in the State's claiming process, the RMTS serves solely as the mechanism to accurately determine the portion of total provider agency time and effort expended on allowable and reimbursable Medicaid administrative activities, there is no regulation or citation that precludes the results of the study from being employed to calculate the State's contract payments in a subsequent period.

Random Moment Time Study Did Not Reduce the Potential for Bias:

The auditors contend that the RMTS deviated from acceptable statistical sampling practices because it did not reduce the potential for bias by ensuring that (1) only eligible mental health center employees were selected for participation, (2) study participants did not have access to potentially biasing information, and (3) selected employees were not notified in advance. Specifically, the RMTS methodology contained the following deviations from acceptable statistical sampling practices:

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 9

1. The mental health centers included ineligible employees, e.g. secretaries and accountants.
2. Instructional materials provided to the mental health centers contained a potentially biasing statement that compliance with the RMTS would help generate additional funds for the State and the mental health centers.
3. DMHS gave the mental health centers the names and contact times of employees prior to conducting the RMTS thereby potentially influencing the employees' assigned duties at the time they were polled.

The State's position on each of the above is as follows:

1. As discussed previously, in developing the model for the MAC Program the State relied upon the CMS School MAC guide, the only detailed, operational document issued by CMS about claiming Medicaid administration. In discussing the type of staff that should be included in a MAC time study, CMS never excludes the type of administrative titles cited by the auditors. In fact, the guide provides two basic principles for the inclusion of staff:
 - Staff whose salaries are 100% funded by non state/local funds should not be included, as a revenue offset would be required, effectively nullifying the addition of their costs in the cost pool. "For example, if federal funding sources or third party payers other than Medicaid meet 100 percent of the costs of social workers, then there would be no reason to include such workers in the time study and they must be excluded from participation."
 - Only staff that perform Medicaid administrative activities should be included. "For example, medical staff hired by the schools as contractors and reimbursed on a fixed fee basis... and who do not perform any other administrative activities, should not be included in the time study."

CMS advocates in the School MAC guide examining the responsibilities of individual staff to determine if their job responsibilities include Medicaid administrative activities, such as reviewing position descriptions, to determine if a particular staff member is appropriate for inclusion.

Because of the large number of community providers participating in the program, the program includes agencies with widely varied organizational structures. In many of the smaller agencies, staff commonly serve multiple functions, and their official title may not be indicative of the types of activities the person actually performs. As a result of this variety, DMHS could not have created a list of "acceptable" *titles* for inclusion in the study. Instead, the State determined that the community providers themselves would be in the best position to determine which staff would

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 10

be appropriate for inclusion in the study. Providers in the MAC program were asked to establish a program liaison that was responsible for preparing and submitting an agency roster of staff for participation in the time study. Staff were to be included on the roster based a number of rules, including the following principles:

Staff are expected to perform Medicaid administrative activities
Staff are paid staff
Staff are not 100% federally funded
Staff are not funded under one of several New Jersey programs which have fully loaded rates (including Medicaid administration)
Staff are not classified as 100% indirect
Agencies were provided an opportunity on a quarterly basis to update their staff rosters. The instructions for these updates, repeated the guidelines for what types of staff should be included in the study.

While some program liaisons may have made errors in the application of these guidelines, the general approach that the State implemented is consistent with the School MAC guide. It is not the title of the individual, but whether or not they are expected to perform MAC activities that is the determining factor of whether or not the person is to be included.

Moreover, our position is further supported by Texas DAB 2187 (2008), in which the DAB found in favor of the state related to the inclusion of non-direct service staff in the time study. OIG argued that "school principals, their secretaries, school superintendents, and certain other categories of school personnel on the ground that these individuals did not perform activities related to Medicaid." Texas demonstrated via time study results that these types of staff did perform Medicaid administrative activities, "CMS disavowed the original basis for the disallowance", and the DAB reversed the disallowance. Additionally, this decision includes discussion of contractor costs, including some contractors that did not provide direct services. Again, the conclusion was that even though these contractors did not provide direct services, they still could be included in the time study.

2. While it is true that time study information forms and liaison instructions indicated that participation in the program could generate additional funds for both the state and the community providers, the State disagrees that these statements are biasing. These materials were created to inform potential participants of the reasons why a time study was being implemented and imposed upon them, a common sense necessity in order to obtain worker cooperation, that they might be contacted, and to emphasize the importance of responding to time study phone pollers.

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 11

Given the busy schedules of the community agency staff, this information was provided to encourage their cooperation, thereby allowing for a more accurate time study result. Contrary to the implication in the auditors' draft report's conclusion, staff were not informed or "coached" as to which response would result in additional funding – but instead, were only requested to provide information on the activity they were performing in sufficient detail in order to allow the phone poller to assign a code to their activity.

Moreover, it is not unusual to inform staff that a function they are performing (responding to the time study) other than the actual direct service, is important for agency funding. As an example, clinicians may be asked to complete special forms, documentation, or coding following an office visit to allow for billing to Medicaid or third party insurance.

3. The School MAC guide says "All staff in the sample universe should be adequately trained before the sampling begins. Training should cover all aspects of the sampling process." The State chose to accomplish this via distribution of a time study training information form to be given to time study participants. In an effort to ensure that all staff that were to participate in the time study each quarter had been furnished with this information form, each community agency's liaison was provided with a "control list" of sampled employees for the quarter. The purpose of this list was not as the auditor's draft report implies, to notify the sampled individuals in advance of the day or time of their moment, but instead to ensure that all individuals had received training materials consistent with the School MAC guide. At no time did the state request the provider liaisons to advise employees when they would be contacted. Given the large number of participants statewide, this approach was used to assure that when an individual was sampled, they would be conscious of the program and be in a position to participate according to the established guidelines.

As the program moved forward, the state moved to providing a control list which included individual names, but not dates or times to avoid any possibility of advance notice; finally the use of a control list was abandoned and liaisons were asked to provide the training materials to every rostered staff member, since all had a chance of being sampled, rather than just to those staff who were selected for the study.

The auditors contend that any party in a community agency knowing who might participate in the study introduces unacceptable bias. The State disagrees with this position. Many states utilize paper time studies or "observer" time studies for allocation of costs in one or more public

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 12

assistance programs. In both of these cases, someone within the agency must know ahead of time who will be sampled when, to ensure that the sampled individual is either provided the paper time study form, or that the observer visits the sampled individual to observe their activities. Although the procedures for the program were changed over time, we still contend that the notification to an agency liaison of the sampled individuals and the sampled moments was acceptable.

Medicaid Eligibility Rates (MER) Not Documented:

The auditors contend that the State did not maintain documents to support the MER used to determine the percentage of employee efforts applicable to the Medicaid program and further that the providers did not maintain such documentation.

The State required providers to develop and submit their MER. For providers that failed to do so the State developed a statewide MER rate that was used in the absence of a provider specific MER rate. The State concurs that we did not specifically require providers to submit the underlying documentation for the development of their MER and instead relied on providers to maintain such documentation.

For 2007 the statewide MER was supported by records maintained by the State that did not exactly match the MER used for 2007. The underlying database is dynamic and corrections are made on an ongoing basis from time-to-time after the period at issue. As a result, querying the records currently in the database for the year at issue yielded a result slightly different than that from the original query. The originally query used for the claim yielded a statewide MER of 31.5% and the current query of the applicable period yielded 30.9%, not a difference that would have a significant impact on the DMAHS claim.

Recommendation 3:

The OIG Recommends that DMAHS Establish Policies and Procedures to Ensure that Future RMTS results Used to Allocate Costs to Medicaid Follow Acceptable Sampling Practices:

While the State believes that the RMTS used during this audit period to allocate costs to Medicaid were acceptable, the State has replaced Maximus and retained Public Consulting Group (PCG) to develop MAC claims for subsequent years. PCG also uses a RMTS to identify the Medicaid administration activities of staff in the contracted mental health centers. Public Consulting Group has refined and changed the RMTS procedures to address some of the concerns expressed by the auditors.

Mr. James P. Edert
June 10, 2011
Page 13


Recommendation 4:

The OIG Recommends that DMAHS Maintain Supporting Documentation for Medicaid Eligibility Rates Used in Computing the MAC:

The State has adjusted its procedures to assure prospectively that providers submit an attestation with their MER data regarding maintenance of underlying documentation. This documentation will be available for a review by an auditor.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me or Richard Hurd at 609-588-2550. I would like to thank the OIG audit team for their professionalism throughout the audit and our review of their findings and recommendations.

Sincerely,



Valerie Harr
Director

c: Jennifer Velez
Richard Hurd