

# STATE OF MINNESOTA

## Office of the State Auditor



**Rebecca Otto**  
**State Auditor**

---

MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE REPORT  
PREPARED AS A RESULT OF THE AUDIT OF

**SHERBURNE COUNTY**  
**ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014

## **Description of the Office of the State Auditor**

The mission of the Office of the State Auditor is to oversee local government finances for Minnesota taxpayers by helping to ensure financial integrity and accountability in local governmental financial activities.

Through financial, compliance, and special audits, the State Auditor oversees and ensures that local government funds are used for the purposes intended by law and that local governments hold themselves to the highest standards of financial accountability.

The State Auditor performs approximately 160 financial and compliance audits per year and has oversight responsibilities for over 3,300 local units of government throughout the state. The office currently maintains five divisions:

**Audit Practice** - conducts financial and legal compliance audits of local governments;

**Government Information** - collects and analyzes financial information for cities, towns, counties, and special districts;

**Legal/Special Investigations** - provides legal analysis and counsel to the Office and responds to outside inquiries about Minnesota local government law; as well as investigates allegations of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in local government;

**Pension** - monitors investment, financial, and actuarial reporting for approximately 730 public pension funds; and

**Tax Increment Financing** - promotes compliance and accountability in local governments' use of tax increment financing through financial and compliance audits.

The State Auditor serves on the State Executive Council, State Board of Investment, Land Exchange Board, Public Employees Retirement Association Board, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, and the Rural Finance Authority Board.

Office of the State Auditor  
525 Park Street, Suite 500  
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55103  
(651) 296-2551  
state.auditor@osa.state.mn.us  
www.auditor.state.mn.us

This document can be made available in alternative formats upon request. Call 651-296-2551 [voice] or 1-800-627-3529 [relay service] for assistance; or visit the Office of the State Auditor's web site: [www.auditor.state.mn.us](http://www.auditor.state.mn.us).

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

**Year Ended December 31, 2014**



**Management and Compliance Report**

**Audit Practice Division  
Office of the State Auditor  
State of Minnesota**

This page was left blank intentionally.

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs	1
Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	7
Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program; Report on Internal Control Over Compliance; and Report on Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards Required by OMB Circular A-133	10
Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards	14
Notes to the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards	16

This page was left blank intentionally.

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014**

**I. SUMMARY OF AUDITOR'S RESULTS**

**Financial Statements**

Type of auditor's report issued: **Unmodified**

Internal control over financial reporting:

- Material weaknesses identified? **No**
- Significant deficiencies identified? **Yes**

Noncompliance material to the financial statements noted? **No**

**Federal Awards**

Internal control over major programs:

- Material weaknesses identified? **No**
- Significant deficiencies identified? **Yes**

Type of auditor's report issued on compliance for major programs: **Unmodified**

Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with Section 510(a) of OMB Circular A-133? **Yes**

The major programs are:

Highway Planning and Construction	CFDA #20.205
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	CFDA #93.558

The threshold for distinguishing between Types A and B programs was \$300,000.

Sherburne County qualified as a low-risk auditee? **Yes**

## II. FINDINGS RELATED TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AUDITED IN ACCORDANCE WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS*

### INTERNAL CONTROL

#### PREVIOUSLY REPORTED ITEM NOT RESOLVED

Finding 2013-001

#### Network Access Termination

**Criteria:** When employees are terminated, the County's written procedures direct the Information Services (IS) Department to disable all necessary network accounts the same day as the employee's last day in the office if the event is non-mutual. If the event is mutual and proper notice has been given, the accounts are to be removed within one business day of the employee's last day of employment.

**Condition:** Our testing of controls over information technology security identified seven instances where terminated employees' access to the County's network was not removed in a timely manner.

**Context:** The IS Department's Employee Access Termination Tracking procedures were adopted in 2010.

**Effect:** When terminated employees have access to County systems, it increases the risk that malicious damage to the County's data files and systems, fraud, and/or misstatements may occur.

**Cause:** County departments did not provide the Human Resources Department with timely notification of the employment end dates.

**Recommendation:** We recommend the County implement additional procedures that allow for the removal of a terminated employee's network access in a timely manner in accordance with the IS Department's Employee Access Termination Tracking procedures.

#### Client's Response:

*Over the past few years Sherburne County Technology Department (IT) has removed access to terminated employee accounts in a timely fashion. In some isolated cases, there has been a delay in receiving account information as they travel from the departments to Human Resources and then onto the Information Technology Department. In order to streamline this process, late in 2014, Sherburne County IT reworked the off-boarding process by creating a single user-friendly, paperless entry page, which removed the multiple paper forms and duplicate work which were required of our Departments.*



*In January of 2015, Sherburne County IT put the paperless off-boarding process into place. Presentations and training were provided to Department Heads and Supervisors. Sherburne County continues to review and improve upon our processes. We expect the paperless system will enable us to make further improvements and come into compliance with swift deactivation of employee access from the organization.*

### **III. FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS FOR FEDERAL AWARD PROGRAMS**

#### **PREVIOUSLY REPORTED ITEM NOT RESOLVED**

Finding 2013-002

#### **Eligibility**

**Program:** U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Grant (CFDA #93.558)

**Pass Through Agency:** Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)

**Criteria:** OMB Circular A-133 § .300(b) states that the auditee shall maintain internal control over federal programs that provides reasonable assurance that the auditee is managing federal awards in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of contracts or grant agreements that could have a material effect on each of its programs.

**Condition:** During our previous audit we noted ten instances where required documentation was not available to support that the program participant was eligible for benefits, nor was there evidence to support that all information was entered into MAXIS correctly. We found significant improvement during the current audit but still noted the following exceptions in our sample of 40 cases tested:

- Two cases had insufficient verification of the participant's income. It is unknown if this information would have caused the participant to be ineligible.
- One case should have had a ten percent sanction to the participant for the month of December 2014. This was not entered into MAXIS until January 2015.

We also noted there are no periodic supervisory reviews performed over the Family Home visiting case files.

**Questioned Costs:** Not applicable. The County administers the program, but benefits to participants in this program are paid by the State of Minnesota.

**Context:** The State of Minnesota contracts with the County's Health and Human Services Department to perform the "intake function" (meeting with the social services participant to determine income and categorical eligibility), while the state maintains the computer system (MAXIS) supporting the eligibility determination process and actually pays the benefits to the participants.

**Effect:** Missing information, or erroneous information entered into MAXIS increases the risk that participants will receive benefits when they are not eligible.

**Cause:** Program personnel entering case information into MAXIS did not ensure all required information was obtained and entered into MAXIS correctly. Supervisory case reviews over the Family Home Visiting case files is no longer being performed due to staffing constraints when the Public Health and Human Services staff was downsized.

**Recommendation:** We recommend the County implement additional procedures to provide reasonable assurance that all necessary documentation to support eligibility determinations is properly obtained and entered into MAXIS. We further recommend the County reinstate supervisory case reviews of the Family Home Visiting case files. In addition, consideration should be given to providing additional training to program personnel.

Corrective Action Plan:

Name of Contact Person Responsible for Corrective Action:

*Cathy Stubbs - Income Maintenance Program Supervisor*

Corrective Actions Planned:

1. Two cases had insufficient verification of the participant's income. It is unknown if this information would have caused the participant to be ineligible.

Client's Response:

*In one of these two cases, the income verification was missed by case worker and Jobs & Training. Re-training of staff is scheduled during the monthly training meeting in June. Training will include budgeting income and ensuring proper documentation to support gaps in employment.*

*The second case is still questionable. Per CM 0010.81.01 MANDATORY VERIFICATIONS – CASH ASSISTANCE VERIFY THE FOLLOWING AT INITIAL APPLICATION Stop work, if necessary to verify income in the month of application (April 2014).*

*In this case, worker did not verify stop work as income from April was in the case record when approval was completed on May 12, 2014.*

*A best practice (recommendation) to verify ending employment for the month of no income (in this case May 2014) but not required in the application month if income is verified in case record.*

2. One case should have had a ten percent sanction to the participant for the month of December 2014. This was not entered into MAXIS until January 2015.

Client's Response:

*In this case, the sanction was missed in the month of December.*

*The Guidebook to Sanctions will be reviewed at the June 2015 unit meeting.*

*In February 2015, Income Maintenance Family unit implemented an added process on how status updates on sanction notifications from Jobs & Training is sent to the County. As a safety net on sanction notifications, Jobs & Training staff e-mails the case worker and the lead worker in order to ensure timely updates to MAXIS on sanctions.*

3. There are no periodic supervisory reviews performed over the Family Home Visiting case files.

Client's Response:

*In checking with surrounding counties, supervisory reviews are not in place or required per Federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Grant Guidelines through MDH. Sherburne County does, however, review cases during the Public Health Nurse Case Conference Meetings. These meetings are held monthly. In addition, the Sherburne County Health & Human Service Public Health Division completes the TANF Grant Eligibility Determination Form which is kept in the client file.*

Anticipated Completion Date:

*June 2015*

#### IV. OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

##### OTHER ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION

###### GASB Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) is the independent organization that establishes standards of accounting and financial reporting for state and local governments. Effective for your calendar year 2015 financial statements, the GASB changed those standards as they apply to employers that provide pension benefits.

GASB Statement 68 significantly changes pension accounting and financial reporting for governmental employers that prepare financial statements on the accrual basis by separating pension accounting methodology from pension funding methodology. Statement 68 requires employers to include a portion of the Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA) total employers' unfunded liability, called the "net pension liability" on the face of the County's government-wide statement of financial position. The County's financial position will be immediately impacted by its unfunded share of the pension liability.

Statement 68 changes the amount employers report as pension expense and defers some allocations of expenses to future years—deferred outflows or inflows of resources. It requires pension costs to be calculated by an actuary; whereas, in the past pension costs were equal to the amount of employer contributions sent to PERA during the year. Additional footnote disclosures and required supplementary information schedules are also required by Statement 68.

The net pension liability that will be reported in Sherburne County's financial statements is an accounting estimate of the proportionate share of PERA's unfunded liability at a specific point in time. That number will change from year to year and is based on assumptions about the probability of the occurrence of events far into the future. Those assumptions include how long people will live, how long they will continue to work, projected salary increases, and how well pension trust investments will do. PERA has been proactive in taking steps toward implementation and will be providing most of the information needed by employers to report the net pension liability and deferred outflows/inflows of resources.



REBECCA OTTO  
STATE AUDITOR

# STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR

SUITE 500  
525 PARK STREET  
SAINT PAUL, MN 55103-2139

(651) 296-2551 (Voice)  
(651) 296-4755 (Fax)  
state.auditor@state.mn.us (E-mail)  
1-800-627-3529 (Relay Service)

## **REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS***

### Independent Auditor's Report

Board of County Commissioners  
Sherburne County

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of Sherburne County, Minnesota, as of and for the year ended December 31, 2014, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the County's basic financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated June 2, 2015.

### **Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered Sherburne County's internal control over financial reporting to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's internal control over financial reporting.

A deficiency in internal control over financial reporting exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the County's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. Given these limitations, during our audit, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified. We did identify a deficiency in internal control over financial reporting, described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as item 2013-001, that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

## **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether Sherburne County's financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

## **Minnesota Legal Compliance**

The *Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Political Subdivisions*, promulgated by the State Auditor pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 6.65, contains seven categories of compliance to be tested in connection with the audit of the County's financial statements: contracting and bidding, deposits and investments, conflicts of interest, public indebtedness, claims and disbursements, miscellaneous provisions, and tax increment financing. Our audit considered all of the listed categories.

In connection with our audit, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that Sherburne County failed to comply with the provisions of the *Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Political Subdivisions*. However, our audit was not directed primarily toward obtaining knowledge of such noncompliance. Accordingly, had we performed additional procedures, other matters may have come to our attention regarding the County's noncompliance with the above referenced provisions.

## **Other Matters**

Also included in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs is an other item for consideration. We believe this information to be of benefit to the County, and we are reporting it for that purpose.

## **Sherburne County's Response to Findings**

Sherburne County's response to the internal control finding identified in our audit has been included in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. The County's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

### **Purpose of This Report**

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting, compliance, and the provisions of the *Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Political Subdivisions* and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the County's internal control over financial reporting and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

*/s/Rebecca Otto*

REBECCA OTTO  
STATE AUDITOR

*/s/Greg Hierlinger*

GREG HIERLINGER, CPA  
DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

June 2, 2015

This page was left blank intentionally.





REBECCA OTTO  
STATE AUDITOR

# STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR

SUITE 500  
525 PARK STREET  
SAINT PAUL, MN 55103-2139

(651) 296-2551 (Voice)  
(651) 296-4755 (Fax)  
state.auditor@state.mn.us (E-mail)  
1-800-627-3529 (Relay Service)

## **REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM; REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE; AND REPORT ON SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS REQUIRED BY OMB CIRCULAR A-133**

### Independent Auditor's Report

Board of County Commissioners  
Sherburne County

#### **Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program**

We have audited Sherburne County's compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that could have a direct and material effect on each of the County's major federal programs for the year ended December 31, 2014. Sherburne County's major federal programs are identified in the Summary of Auditor's Results section of the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.

#### ***Management's Responsibility***

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to each of its federal programs.

#### ***Auditor's Responsibility***

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for each of Sherburne County's major federal programs based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about Sherburne County's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for each major federal program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the County's compliance with those requirements.

### ***Opinion on Each Major Federal Program***

In our opinion, Sherburne County complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended December 31, 2014.

### ***Other Matters***

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed an instance of noncompliance, which is required to be reported in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and which is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as item 2013-002. Our opinion on each major federal program is not modified with respect to this matter.

Sherburne County's response to the noncompliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as a Corrective Action Plan. Sherburne County's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

### **Report on Internal Control Over Compliance**

Management of Sherburne County is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the County's internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on each major federal program to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for each major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's internal control over compliance.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, we identified a deficiency in internal control over compliance, as described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as item 2013-002, that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

Sherburne County's response to the internal control over compliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as a Corrective Action Plan. Sherburne County's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

### **Report on Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards Required by OMB Circular A-133**

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of Sherburne County as of and for the year ended December 31, 2014, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the County's basic financial statements. We have issued our report thereon dated June 2, 2015, which contained unmodified opinions on those financial statements. Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the basic financial statements. The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by OMB Circular A-133 and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the SEFA is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

## **Purpose of This Report**

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of OMB Circular A-133. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

*/s/Rebecca Otto*

REBECCA OTTO  
STATE AUDITOR

June 2, 2015

*/s/Greg Hierlinger*

GREG HIERLINGER, CPA  
DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

**SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014**

<b>Federal Grantor Pass-Through Agency Grant Program Title</b>	<b>Federal CFDA Number</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
<b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>		
Direct		
Conservation Reserve Program	10.069	\$ 889
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Health		
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	10.557	371,038
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Human Services		
State Administrative Matching Grants for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	10.561	<u>510,117</u>
<b>Total U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>		<b><u>\$ 882,044</u></b>
<b>U.S. Department of Justice</b>		
Direct		
Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program	16.607	\$ 6,730
Juvenile Mentoring Program	16.726	<u>32,773</u>
<b>Total U.S. Department of Justice</b>		<b><u>\$ 39,503</u></b>
<b>U.S. Department of Transportation</b>		
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Transportation		
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	\$ 1,733,082
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Public Safety		
State and Community Highway Safety	20.600	163
Passed Through City of Elk River		
Minimum Penalties for Repeat Offenders for Driving While Intoxicated	20.608	<u>48,951</u>
<b>Total U.S. Department of Transportation</b>		<b><u>\$ 1,782,196</u></b>
<b>U.S. Department of Education</b>		
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Health		
Special Education - Grants for Infants and Families	84.181	<b><u>\$ 2,288</u></b>

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

**SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014**

(Continued)

<b>Federal Grantor Pass-Through Agency Grant Program Title</b>	<b>Federal CFDA Number</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
<b>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</b>		
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Health		
Public Health Emergency Preparedness	93.069	\$ 68,223
Universal Newborn Hearing Screening	93.251	1,650
Immunization Cooperative Agreements	93.268	1,620
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Investigations and Technical Assistance	93.283	600
Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Information System (EHDI-IS) Surveillance Program	93.314	150
Affordable Care Act (ACA) Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program	93.505	6,980
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	93.558	61,212
(Total Temporary Assistance for Needy Families CFDA 93.558 \$481,129)		
Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant to the States	93.994	45,242
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Human Services		
Promoting Safe and Stable Families	93.556	46,418
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	93.558	419,917
(Total Temporary Assistance for Needy Families CFDA 93.558 \$481,129)		
Child Support Enforcement	93.563	1,230,685
Refugee and Entrant Assistance - State-Administered Program	93.566	2,619
Child Care and Development Block Grant	93.575	31,781
Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program	93.645	9,644
Foster Care Title IV-E	93.658	216,917
Social Services Block Grant	93.667	226,817
Chafee Foster Care Independence Program	93.674	8,418
Children's Health Insurance Program	93.767	354
Medical Assistance Program	93.778	1,619,160
Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services	93.958	6,419
<b>Total U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</b>		<b>\$ 4,004,826</b>
<b>U.S. Department of Homeland Security</b>		
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Natural Resources		
Boating Safety Financial Assistance	97.012	\$ 5,750
Passed Through Minnesota Department of Public Safety		
Emergency Management Performance Grants	97.042	63,104
Homeland Security Grant Program	97.067	36,977
<b>Total U.S. Department of Homeland Security</b>		<b>\$ 105,831</b>
<b>Total Federal Awards</b>		<b>\$ 6,816,688</b>

**SHERBURNE COUNTY  
ELK RIVER, MINNESOTA**

**NOTES TO THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2014**

---

---

1. Reporting Entity

The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards presents the activities of federal award programs expended by Sherburne County. The County's reporting entity is defined in Note 1 to the financial statements.

2. Basis of Presentation

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards includes the federal grant activity of Sherburne County under programs of the federal government for the year ended December 31, 2014. The information in this schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Because the schedule presents only a selected portion of the operations of Sherburne County, it is not intended to and does not present the financial position, changes in net position, or cash flows of Sherburne County.

3. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Expenditures reported on the schedule are reported on the basis of accounting used by the individual funds of Sherburne County. Governmental funds use the modified accrual basis of accounting. Such expenditures are recognized following the cost principles contained in OMB Circular A-87, *Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments*, wherein certain types of expenditures are not allowable or are limited as to reimbursement. Pass-through grant numbers were not assigned by the pass-through agencies.

4. Subrecipients

The County did not pass any federal money to subrecipients during the year ended December 31, 2014.