

OFFICE OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE  
HEARINGS  
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA

**Audit Report**

For the Biennium Ended  
June 30, 2013

ROBERT R. PETERSON  
STATE AUDITOR

Office of the State Auditor  
Division of State Audit

**LEGISLATIVE AUDIT AND FISCAL REVIEW  
COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

***Representative Gary Kreidt – Chairman  
Senator Ralph Kilzer – Vice Chairman***

Representatives

*Wesley R. Belter  
Jeff Delzer  
Ron Guggisberg  
Patrick Hatlestad  
Jerry Kelsh  
Scot Kelsh  
Keith Kempenich  
Andrew G. Maragos  
Bob Martinson  
Corey Mock  
Chet Pollert  
Dan Ruby  
Jim Schmidt  
Robert J. Skarphol  
Wayne Trottier*

Senators

*Judy Lee  
David O'Connell  
Terry M. Wanzek*

# *Contents*

---

<i>Transmittal Letter</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Responses to LAFRC Audit Questions</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>LAFRC Audit Communications</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Management’s Discussion and Analysis</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Financial Summary</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Financial Statements</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Statement of Revenues and Expenditures</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Statement of Appropriations</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Internal Control</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Compliance With Legislative Intent</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Operations</i>	<i>11</i>

STATE AUDITOR  
ROBERT R. PETERSON



PHONE  
(701) 328 - 2241  
FAX  
(701) 328 - 1406

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA  
**OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR**  
STATE CAPITOL  
600 E. BOULEVARD AVENUE - DEPT. 117  
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58505

## *Transmittal Letter*

---

February 6, 2014

The Honorable Jack Dalrymple, Governor  
Members of the North Dakota Legislative Assembly  
Mr. Wade Mann, Director, Office of Administrative Hearings

We are pleased to submit this audit of the Office of Administrative Hearings for the biennium ended June 30, 2013. This audit resulted from the statutory responsibility of the State Auditor to audit or review each state agency once every two years. The same statute gives the State Auditor the responsibility to determine the contents of these audits.

In determining the contents of the audits of state agencies, the primary consideration was to determine how we could best serve the citizens of the state of North Dakota. Naturally we determined financial accountability should play an important part of these audits. Additionally, operational accountability is addressed whenever possible to increase efficiency and effectiveness of state government.

The in-charge auditor for this audit was Kristi Morlock. Paul Welk, CPA was the audit manager. Inquiries or comments relating to this audit may be directed to the audit manager by calling (701) 328-2241. We wish to express our appreciation to Director Mann and his staff for the courtesy, cooperation, and assistance they provided to us during this audit.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bob Peterson".

Robert R. Peterson  
State Auditor

# *Executive Summary*

---

## ***Introduction***

The North Dakota Office of Administrative Hearings is an executive branch agency that provides independent administrative law judges to preside at administrative hearings and related proceedings. The agency is authorized to provide administrative law judges to preside at state agency, local government agency, tribal government, and judicial branch hearings and related proceedings.

The Legislative Audit and Fiscal Review Committee (LAFRC) requests that certain items be addressed by auditors performing audits of state agencies. Those items and the Office of the State Auditor's responses are noted below.

## ***Responses to LAFRC Audit Questions***

*1. What type of opinion was issued on the financial statements?*

Financial statements were not prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles so an opinion is not applicable. The agency's transactions were tested and included in the state's basic financial statements on which an unqualified opinion was issued.

*2. Was there compliance with statutes, laws, rules, and regulations under which the agency was created and is functioning?*

Yes.

*3. Was internal control adequate and functioning effectively?*

Yes.

*4. Were there any indications of lack of efficiency in financial operations and management of the agency?*

No.

*5. Has action been taken on findings and recommendations included in prior audit reports?*

There were no recommendations included in the prior audit report.

*6. Was a management letter issued? If so, provide a summary below, including any recommendations and the management responses.*

No, a management letter was not issued.

## **LAFRC Audit Communications**

7. *Identify any significant changes in accounting policies, any management conflicts of interest, any contingent liabilities, or any significant unusual transactions.*

There were no significant changes in accounting policies, no management conflicts of interest were noted, no contingent liabilities were identified or significant unusual transactions.

8. *Identify any significant accounting estimates, the process used by management to formulate the accounting estimates, and the basis for the auditor's conclusions regarding the reasonableness of those estimates.*

The Office of Administrative Hearings financial statements do not include any significant accounting estimates.

9. *Identify any significant audit adjustments.*

Significant audit adjustments were not necessary.

10. *Identify any disagreements with management, whether or not resolved to the auditor's satisfaction relating to a financial accounting, reporting, or auditing matter that could be significant to the financial statements.*

None.

11. *Identify any serious difficulties encountered in performing the audit.*

None.

12. *Identify any major issues discussed with management prior to retention.*

This is not applicable for audits conducted by the Office of the State Auditor.

13. *Identify any management consultations with other accountants about auditing and accounting matters.*

None.

14. *Identify any high-risk information technology systems critical to operations based on the auditor's overall assessment of the importance of the system to the agency and its mission, or whether any exceptions identified in the six audit report questions to be addressed by the auditors are directly related to the operations of an information technology system.*

ConnectND Finance, Human Resource Management System (HRMS), and the Billing System (the system used by the Office of Administrative Hearings to track their accounts receivable) are high-risk information technology systems critical to the Office of Administrative Hearings.

# ***Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology***

---

## ***Audit Objectives***

The objectives of this audit of the Office of Administrative Hearings for the biennium ended June 30, 2013 were to provide reliable, audited financial statements and to answer the following questions:

1. What are the highest risk areas of the Office of Administrative Hearings' operations and is internal control adequate in these areas?
2. What are the significant and high-risk areas of legislative intent applicable to the Office of Administrative Hearings and are they in compliance with these laws?
3. Are there areas of the Office of Administrative Hearings' operations where we can help to improve efficiency or effectiveness?

## ***Audit Scope***

This audit of the Office of Administrative Hearings is for the biennium ended June 30, 2013. 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 the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The Office of Administrative Hearings has operations in the following locations. Each location was included in the audit scope:

- The main office is located in Bismarck.
- A field office is located in West Fargo.

## ***Audit Methodology***

To meet the objectives outlined above, we:

- Prepared financial statements from the legal balances on the state's accounting system tested as part of this audit and the audit of the state's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and reviewed management's discussion and analysis of the financial statements.
- Performed detailed analytical procedures including computer-assisted auditing techniques. These procedures were used to identify high-risk transactions and potential problem areas for additional testing.
- Tested internal control and compliance with laws and regulations which included selecting representative samples to determine if controls were operating effectively and to determine if laws were being followed consistently. Non-statistical sampling was used and the results were projected to the population. Where applicable, populations were stratified to ensure that particular groups within a population were adequately

- represented in the sample, and to improve efficiency by gaining greater control on the composition of the sample.
- Interviewed appropriate agency personnel.
  - Queried the ConnectND (PeopleSoft) system. Significant evidence was obtained from ConnectND.
  - Observed Office of Administrative Hearings' processes and procedures.

In aggregate there were no significant limitations or uncertainties related to our overall assessment of the sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence.



## ***Management's Discussion and Analysis***

---

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared to present the Office of Administrative Hearings' revenues and expenditures on the legal (budget) basis. The accompanying financial statements are not intended to be presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

The following management discussion and analysis was prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings' management. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted primarily of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of this supplementary information to ensure it does not conflict with the knowledge we gained as part of our audit.

For the biennium ended June 30, 2013, operations of the Office of Administrative Hearings were entirely supported by appropriations of special funds. These funds are obtained by the Office of Administrative Hearings through billings of all user agencies for services rendered by administrative law judges in the conduct of administrative hearings.

### ***Financial Summary***

The Office of Administrative Hearings' total revenue was \$942,664 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2013, as compared to \$1,078,490 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. The Office of Administrative Hearings received no general fund appropriation for the 2011-2013 biennium.

Total expenditures for the Office of Administrative Hearings were \$1,002,223 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2013, as compared to \$1,069,497 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. Expenditures and revenue remained fairly constant for the period under audit. An administrative law judge was appointed for the Public Service Commission from July 1, 2012, through December 31, 2012. Correspondingly, revenues and salaries and benefits expenditures decreased during the absence. All other expenditures remained fairly constant. Payments for professional services accounted for approximately 47 percent of total expenditures during the fiscal years reviewed. Such services relate primarily to contracts with temporary administrative law judges to conduct Workforce Safety and Insurance hearings.

# *Financial Statements*

---

## *Statement of Revenues and Expenditures*

	<u>June 30, 2013</u>	<u>June 30, 2012</u>
<b><u>Revenues:</u></b>		
Charges for Services	\$ 941,976	\$1,078,452
Miscellaneous Revenue	688	38
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<u>\$ 942,664</u>	<u>\$1,078,490</u>
<b><u>Expenditures:</u></b>		
Professional Services	\$ 470,238	\$ 506,147
Salaries and Benefits	436,040	477,769
Rent of Building Space	33,503	33,503
Information Technology	38,347	26,021
Travel	7,476	11,028
Other Operating Expenditures	16,619	15,029
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<u>\$1,002,223</u>	<u>\$1,069,497</u>

## Statement of Appropriations

For The Biennium Ended June 30, 2013

<b>Expenditures by Line Item:</b>	<u>Original Appropriation</u>	<u>Adjustments</u>	<u>Final Appropriation</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Unexpended Appropriation</u>
Salaries and Benefits	\$ 978,182		\$ 978,182	\$ 913,809	\$ 64,373
Operating Expenses	849,017	\$ 500,000	1,349,017	1,157,911	191,106
<b>Totals</b>	<u>\$ 1,827,199</u>	<u>\$ 500,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,327,199</u>	<u>\$ 2,071,720</u>	<u>\$ 255,479</u>
<b>Expenditures by Source:</b>					
General Fund	\$ 1,827,199	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,327,199	\$ 2,071,720	\$ 255,479
Other Funds					
<b>Totals</b>	<u>\$ 1,827,199</u>	<u>\$ 500,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,327,199</u>	<u>\$ 2,071,720</u>	<u>\$ 255,479</u>

### Appropriation Adjustments

North Dakota Century Code section 54-57-07(3) states that money in the Administrative Hearings Fund is continually appropriated as necessary for the expenses of the Office of Administrative Hearings, including payments to temporary administrative law judges. The adjustment was made to increase spending authority of the Operating Expenses line for this purpose.

## ***Internal Control***

---

In our audit for the biennium ended June 30, 2013, we identified the following areas of the Office of Administrative Hearings' internal control as being the highest risk:

### ***Internal Controls Subjected to Testing:***

- Controls surrounding the processing of revenues.
- Controls surrounding the processing of expenditures.
- Controls relating to compliance with legislative intent.
- Controls surrounding the ConnectND (PeopleSoft) system.

The criteria used to evaluate internal control is published in the publication *Internal Control – Integrated Framework* from the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO) of the Treadway Commission.

We gained an understanding of internal control surrounding these areas and concluded as to the adequacy of their design. We also tested the operating effectiveness of those controls we considered necessary based on our assessment of audit risk. We concluded internal control was adequate.

Auditors are required to report deficiencies in internal control that are significant within the context of the objectives of the audit. A deficiency in internal control 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: (1) misstatements in financial or performance information; (2) violations of laws and regulations; or (3) impairments of effectiveness or efficiency of operations, on a timely basis. Considering both qualitative and quantitative factors, we did not identify any significant deficiencies in internal control.

## *Compliance With Legislative Intent*

---

In our audit for the biennium ended June 30, 2013, we identified and tested the Office of Administrative Hearings' compliance with legislative intent for the following areas we determined to be significant and of higher risk of noncompliance:

- Adequate blanket bond coverage of employees (NDCC section 26.1-21-08).
- Compliance with fixed asset requirements including record-keeping, surplus property, lease and financing arrangements in budget requests, and lease analysis requirements.
- Compliance with payroll-related laws including statutory salaries for applicable elected and appointed positions, and certification of payroll.

The criteria used to evaluate legislative intent are the laws as published in the *North Dakota Century Code* and the *North Dakota Session Laws*.

*Government Auditing Standards* require auditors to report all instances of fraud and illegal acts unless they are inconsequential within the context of the audit objectives. Further, auditors are required to report significant violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and significant abuse that has occurred or is likely to have occurred.

The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*. Thus, we concluded there was compliance with the legislative intent identified above.

## *Operations*

---

This audit did not identify areas of the Office of Administrative Hearings' operations where we determined it was practical at this time to help to improve efficiency or effectiveness.

You may obtain audit reports on the internet at:

[www.nd.gov/auditor/](http://www.nd.gov/auditor/)

or by contacting the  
Division of State Audit

Office of the State Auditor  
600 East Boulevard Avenue – Department 117  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0060

(701) 328-2241