



INSPECTOR GENERAL'S SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Appalachian Regional Commission
October 1, 2012–March 31, 2013



On Cover *(clockwise from top left):*

Coal Heritage Byway, Wise County, Virginia. Photo by Randy Rose, Courtesy of National Scenic Byways Online (www.byways.org)

Maury River, Glasgow, Virginia. Photo by Michael L. Smith/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Blue Ridge Parkway, Virginia. Photo by David West, Courtesy of National Scenic Byways Online (www.byways.org)

Shenandoah National Park. Photo courtesy of National Park Service



May 24, 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FEDERAL CO-CHAIR

Subject: Semiannual Report to Congress

In accordance with the requirements of the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, Public Law 100-504, the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Public Law 110-409, and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Public Law 111-203. I am pleased to submit the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress.

This Semiannual Report to Congress summarizes the activities of our office for the 6-month period ending March 31, 2013. During this fiscal period, we issued fifteen reports, followed-up on open recommendations and monitored contractor performance.

Also during this period, the Inspector General continued to serve as a member of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity & Efficiency (CIGIE), its Audit Committee and participate in National and Intergovernmental Audit Forums. The Inspector General continues to chair a smaller OIG group in order to address issues directly impacting these offices and made presentations to two groups representing ARC grantees.

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, provides that this report be forwarded to appropriate Congressional committees within 30 days and that you provide whatever additional comments you consider appropriate.

I appreciate the Commission's cooperation with the Office of Inspector General in the conduct of our operations.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Hubert Spinks".

Inspector General

Enclosure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	ii
I. Introduction	1
II Background	1
Appalachian Regional Commission	1
Office of Inspector General	5
III. OIG Activity	6
Audits, Inspections, Evaluations & Reviews	6
Investigations	8
Other	8
IV. Reporting Fraud, Waste, and Abuse	9
V. Legislative & Regulatory Review	9
VI. Dodd-Frank Legislation	10
Appendices	
A. Schedule of Reports Issued October 1, 2012 thru March 31, 2013	
B. Schedule of Audits, Inspections, Evaluation and Review Reports of Questioned or Unsupported Cost	
C. Schedule of Audit, Inspection, Evaluation and Review Reports with Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use and Summary of Management Decision	
D. Schedule of Audit, Inspection, Evaluation and Review Reports with Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use and Summary of Management Decision	
E. Definition of Terms Used	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ARC grant operations represent the most significant part of ARC's programs. For this reporting period our activities included the issuance of fifteen reports, follow-up on significant recommendations in prior reports, and monitoring contractor performance of grant reviews. This included eleven grant audits issued during the reporting period, three reports dealing with grant management, and the 2012 Financial Statement Audit.

Grant management reviews emphasized ARC follow-up on older open Child Agency and ARC Administered grants and applicable policies and procedures. Continued ARC actions, including follow-up on basic agency grants identified in prior reports as needing follow-up resulted in approximately 2.5 million dollars in actual or intended recoveries during the past six months that can be put to better use.

Our follow-up review of older open grants administered by Child Agencies identified the need for continued emphasis on timely follow-up on grants with limited activity. Sixty three grants (open for over 24 months) were identified without any disbursement activity since grant approval with the longest being 121 months. ARC funds of \$24,370,122 were approved for these grants, including \$7,989,643 for grants with no ARC disbursements at least four years after approval.

Our review of ARC administered grants identified substantial progress with respect to inactive older grants. The ARC grant management system identified only 17 grants totaling \$1,992,374 for which no disbursements were noted during the 18 months since approval.

Other issues relating to timely follow-up of open grants status included identifying grants with expired end dates, closing of grants with zero balances, and increased use of controls available to initiate action on inactive grants, including increased use of ARC guidelines that allow for action on projects not started within 18 months of approvals.

Individual grant reviews and ARC management of the grant process disclosed that grants were generally implemented in accordance with applicable regulations and project objectives. These reviews included recommendations with respect to supporting documentation for matching funds, timely submission of progress and final reports, and identification of performance outcomes. The FY 2012 Financial audit received an unqualified opinion for the fifth conservative year.

Decisions and/or OMB guidance with respect to implementing certain sections of Dodd-Frank Legislation have not been issued. The primary issues are the designation of full Commissions/ Boards as Agency Heads at designated Federal Entities (DFEs), such as ARC, who's Commission, consists of primarily Non-Federal Officials and the status of Federal OIG staff, including the IG.

The IG continues to chair a group of smaller OIGs to address issues that have particular impact on these offices. The IG is also an active member of the Council of Inspectors General and its Audit committee.

**PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SEMIANNUAL REPORT**

The Inspector General Act of 1978 requires the IG to keep the Federal Co-Chair and Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies in the Commission's operations and the necessity for corrective action. In addition, the Act specifies that semiannual reports will be provided to the Federal Co-Chair by April 30 and October 31 and to Congress 30 days later.

The Federal Co-Chair may transmit comments to Congress along with the report but may not change any part of the report. The specific requirements prescribed in the Act, as amended (Public Law 100-504), are listed below.

Reporting Requirements

Section 4(a)(2)	Review of legislation and regulations	Page 9
Section 5(a)(1)	Problems, abuses, and deficiencies	Pages 6-7
Section 5(a)(2)	Recommendations with respect to problems, abuses, and deficiencies	Pages 6-7
Section 5(a)(3)	Prior significant recommendations not yet implemented	**
Section 5(a)(4)	Matters referred to prosecutive authorities	*
Section 5(a)(5) and 6(b)(2)	Summary of instances where information was refused	*
Section 5(a)(6)	Listing of audit reports showing number of reports and dollar value of questioned costs	App A
Section 5(a)(7)	Summary of each particularly significant report	**
Section 5(a)(8)	Statistical table showing number of reports and dollar value of questioned costs	App B
Section 5(a)(8)	Statistical table showing number of reports and dollar value of questioned costs	App C
Section 5(a)(8)	Statistical table showing number of reports and dollar value of questioned costs	App D
Section 5(a)(8)	Statistical table showing number of reports and dollar value of questioned costs	App E

* None.

** See references to Sections 5(a)(1) and 5(a)(2) for discussion of significant reports (including recommendations).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, (Pub. L. No. 100-504) provides for the establishment of an Office of Inspector General (OIG) at Designated Federal Entities (DFEs), including the ARC. The ARC OIG became operational on October 1, 1989, with the appointment of an IG and provision of budgetary authority for contracted audit and/or investigation activities.

II. BACKGROUND

A. APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, (Pub.L. No. 89-4) established the Appalachian Regional Commission. The Act authorizes a Federal/State partnership designed to promote long-term economic development on a coordinated regional basis in the 13 Appalachian States. The Commission represents a unique experiment in partnership among the Federal, State, and local levels of Government and between the public and private sectors. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal representative who is appointed by the President. The Federal representative serves as the Federal Co-Chair with the Governors electing one of their numbers to serve as the States' Co-Chair.

- Through joint planning and development of regional priorities, ARC funds are used to assist and encourage other public and private resources to address Appalachia's unique needs. Program direction and policy are established by the Commission (ARC Code) with the vote of a majority of the State members and the affirmative vote of the Federal Co-Chair. Emphasis has been placed on highways, infrastructure development, business enterprise, energy, human resources, health and education programs.

- To ensure that funds are used effectively and efficiently, and to strengthen local participation, ARC works with the Appalachian states to support a network of multicounty planning and development organizations, or local development districts (LDDs), throughout the Region. The 73 LDDs cover all 420 counties in Appalachia. The LDDs' roles include identification of priority needs of local communities and assisting with participation in ARC progress.

- Administratively, the Commission has a staff of 53 persons that includes 50 Commission employees responsible for program operations, and the office of the Federal Co-Chair that includes the three person OIG staff. The Commissions' staff administrative expenses, including salaries, are jointly funded by Federal and State funds.


- The Commission's appropriation for FY 2013 is \$64.6 million.

Although Congress changed the funding method for the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) in July 2012, ARC continues to support and participate in completion of the ADHS including fulfilling planning and approval responsibilities with respect to approximately two billion dollars of funds remaining available prior to the new legislation.

ARC's non-ADHS funds are distributed to state and local entities in accordance with an allocation formula intended to provide fair and reasonable distribution of available resources. ARC staff has responsibilities for program development, policy analysis and review, grant development, technical assistance to States, and management and monitoring.


In order to avail itself of federal agency expertise and administrative capability in certain areas, ARC often relies on other departments and agencies for program administration, especially with respect to highways and infrastructure projects. For example, the Appalachian Regional Development Act authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to administer the Commission's highway programs, with the Commission retaining responsibility for priorities, highway locations, and fund allocations. ARC relies on Child Agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Economic Development Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority, to administer and monitor construction related grants.

ARC ORGANIZATION CHART





APPALACHIAN REGION



Appalachia, as defined in the legislation from which the Appalachian Regional Commission derives its authority, is a 205,000-square-mile region that follows the spine of the Appalachian Mountains from southern New York to northern Mississippi. It includes all of West Virginia and parts of 12 other states: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

B. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The ARC OIG is an independent Federal audit and investigative unit that reports directly to the Agency Head.

Role and Authority

The Inspector General Act of 1978, (Pub.L. No. 95-452), as amended in 1988, states that the IG is responsible for (1) audits and investigations; (2) review of legislation; and (3) recommendation of policies for the purpose of promoting economy and efficiency in the administration of, or preventing and detecting fraud and abuse in, the program and operations of the establishment. In this regard, the IG is responsible for keeping the Agency Head and Congress fully informed about the problems and deficiencies in ARC programs and operations and the need for corrective action. The IG has authority to inquire into all ARC programs and activities that are federally funded. The inquiries may be in the form of audits, surveys, investigations, inspections, evaluations, personnel security checks, or other appropriate methods. The two primary purposes of these inquiries are (1) to assist all levels of ARC management by identifying and reporting problem areas, weaknesses, or deficiencies in procedures, policies, program implementation, and employee conduct and (2) to recommend appropriate corrective actions.

Relationship to Other Principal ARC Offices

The States' and Federal Co-Chairs, acting together as the Commission, establish policies for ARC's programs and its administration. These policies are provided under the ARC Code and implemented by the Commission staff, which is responsible for monitoring project performance and providing technical assistance as needed. The Federal Co-Chair, as the Federal fiscal officer, is responsible for the proper use and protection of Federal funds, for ensuring compliance with applicable Federal laws and regulations, and for taking appropriate action on conditions needing improvement, including those reported by the OIG. The operation of the OIG neither replaces established lines of operating authority nor eliminates the need for the Commission offices to take reasonable measures to protect and enhance the integrity and effectiveness of their operations. All Commission offices are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the programs entrusted to them and reporting information or incidences needing further audit and/or investigation to the IG.

Funding and Staffing

The OIG funding level for FY 2013 is \$642,000. Staffing consists of the Inspector General, an Assistant Inspector General for Audit, and a Confidential Assistant. Grant review activities continue to emphasize use of contracted services (e.g., independent public accounting firms or other OIG offices) supplemented by programmatic and performance reviews directed by OIG staff.

In order to comply with Pub.L. No. 110-409, the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, the OIG funding for FY 2013 includes reimbursement of other IGs for counsel, audit and investigative services via Memorandums of Understanding. We have used the Department of Commerce OIG Legal Counsel to supplement our activities. We also use other OIG offices to provide investigative services as needed.

This approach is deemed the most appropriate to date in view of the nature of ARC operations and limited resources.

In line with legislation enacted to form more regional commissions, the IG supports consolidating small regional commission OIG offices into one OIG organization to better assure sufficient OIG resources to operate more efficiently, effectively and economically.

III. OIG ACTIVITY

A. Audits, Inspections, Evaluations and Reviews

During the reporting period fifteen reports were issued, including 11 grant audit reports, three management reports and the FY 2012 Financial Statement Audit.

The grant management reviews focused on grant management from applications to closing, identification of grants without disbursement over lengthy periods, follow-up actions to address these grants and applicable grant management policies, procedures and controls. These reviews were consistent with GAO and OMB emphasis and reports previously issued by ARC-OIG.

A primary criteria used to identify older inactive open grants was ARC guidelines that provide that, at the request of a state, the Commission may revoke or revise its approval of any project if the work intended to be assisted is not under way within 18 months after the date of approval of such a project.

A follow-up review of older grants approved and partially funded by ARC, but administered by other agencies (Child Agencies) and grants administered directly by ARC disclosed continuing progress with respect to timely follow-up actions, including de-obligations and identifying the status of projects. For example, approximately \$1.6 million dollars was de-obligated after follow-up on older inactive grants in prior reports and approximately \$845,000 will be de-obligated when final reports are received from a Child Agency.

In addition, we identified 63 Child Agency grants with ARC funding approximating \$24.3 million for which the period of no disbursement of ARC funds ranged from 24 to 121 months. This included 21 grants with ARC funds approximating \$8 million for which no ARC funds had been disbursed as of four or more years since approval.

Follow-up actions on 76 older open Child Agency grants included in our prior report identified subsequent start-up actions in many cases and de-obligations of \$1.5 million in three instances. 52 of the grants included in prior reports were included in this report as having no ARC disbursements.

ARC has initiated follow-up action, including introduction of the Basic Agency Monitoring Report (BAMR), which will provide detailed annual Child Agency reporting to ARC on the status of older open projects including expenditures, projects phase and reason for delays. As of our review the initial BAMR reports were submitted by the responsible agencies in 11 of the 13 Appalachian states.

Although there remained no disbursements of ARC funds for most of the cases cited in our prior report, the first BAMR reports identified project start up in many cases. The control provides an improved basis for effective follow-up on grants with no ARC disbursements, including assessments about potential grant actions such as cancellation, de-obligations, long un-liquidated obligations, and justifications for lengthy delays and continued need for ARC funds.

Also, 27 additional Child Agency grants for which no disbursements had been reported 18 to 24 months subsequent to approval and having ARC balances approximating \$7.7 million were also identified as were 13 grants valued at approximately \$1 million for which there were initial disbursements followed by no disbursements for lengthy periods.

In 22 cases ARC records noted that approximately \$845,00 could be de-obligated if necessary closing information was received from the Child Agency administering these grants.

We recognize that Child Agencies administer construction projects and that various factors contribute to delayed start up for construction grants. However, periodic follow-up and documented decisions with respect to older open grants and projects for which no disbursements have been made is considered appropriate.

With respect to older open grants directly administered by ARC we identified only 17 cases with ARC funding approximating \$2 million, for which, with two exceptions, no ARC disbursements had been made 18 to 30 months since approval. In six cases, grants with disbursements but no recent activity for lengthy periods (15 to 58 months) had balances totaling \$652,000.

ARC administered grants identify estimated project end dates and a report identified 45 grants valued at approximately \$2.3 million with expired end dates. This included 9 grants, valued at about \$1 million for which no funds had been disbursed at least 18 months since grant approval. Adherence to end dates is particularly important since, without justified and documented extensions, expenditures incurred after identified end dates are generally considered un-allowable expenses.

Overall, only about one percent of ARC grants approved more than four years prior to 3/31/13 had no disbursements although the Child Agency administered grants have a higher percentage of these grants.

A primary recommendation was to increase use of the 18 month provision which, in correlation with the BAMR, would provide a more effective control for identifying projects needing follow-up and potential de-obligations. Other recommendations pertained to continued emphasis on, and follow-up on older inactive grants, addressing grants with expired end dates and closing grants with zero balances.

A review of the grant management process and grant audits reported overall implementation of grants in accordance with policies, procedures and regulations. Recommendations emphasized documentation of matching costs, timely progress reports, improved contracting practices, emphasis on servicing primary clients, additional policies and procedures and identifying outcomes. Unsupported costs approximating \$163,000 were identified in grant audits.

ARC Financial Statement Audit

The financial statement audit for FY 2012 was issued with a clean opinion. The prior four reports have also been issued with a clean audit opinion since ARC adopted federal financial reporting rules in 2007.

Peer Review

Offices of the Inspectors General (OIGs) are required to perform (and undergo) reviews of other OIG offices every three years to ensure policies and/or procedural systems are in place that provide reasonable assurance of compliance with government auditing standards (GAS). The next audit peer review of ARC OIG is scheduled for FY 2013.

The current audit peer review process, as legislatively mandated, assesses compliance with auditing standards but does not address issues impacting the efficiency and effectiveness of audit operations which comprises the largest segment of OIG offices.

The IG continues to recommend to the Council of Inspector General and Legislative Staff that OIG peer reviews be revised to incorporate assessments of key OIG operational elements such as: planning; timely reporting; staff development, including training, utilization and supervision; audit follow-up and inclusion of actual results in Semi-Annual and Annual OIG reports based on implementation of recommendations

B. INVESTIGATIONS

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, provides that the IG may receive and investigate complaints or information concerning the possible existence of an activity constituting a violation of law, rules, or regulations; mismanagement; gross waste of funds; or abuse of authority. The OIG does not employ criminal investigators. When the need has arisen, the matter has been referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or assistance was contracted with another Federal OIG. Also, the results of investigations may be referred to the appropriate Federal, State, or local prospective authorities for action.

C. OTHER

Smaller OIG Groups

Smaller OIG offices have some significantly different operational concerns than larger OIG offices in trying to maintain effective and efficient oversight of agency programs. One challenge involves the significant human and capital resources being allocated to the ever growing number of mandated reviews.

The IG is the current coordinator/chair of this group that meets periodically to discuss such issues and recommends actions/best practices to facilitate smaller OIG operations.

Requests for Information

Each year we receive and comply with requests for information from various governmental entities compiling statistics on OIG offices or their auditee agencies. CIGIE requests information for its annual OIG profile update and compilation of OIG statistics. The yearly compilation summarizes the results of audit and inspection activities for of all federal OIG offices.

Information provided concerns the dollar value of management decisions related to questioned costs and funds put to better use and OIG recommendations related to questioned costs. The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform request information concerning the number and type or status of our recommendations. We also comply with information requests from other government regulatory bodies.

Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) Audits

Since Fiscal Year 1999, ADHS has been funded by the Highway Trust Fund, which is administered in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). ARC retains certain programmatic responsibilities, but the funding source is the Highway Trust Fund. Under new legislation the ADHS is a part of a larger Surface Transportation Program grant to Appalachian states, with the states using the funding at their own direction.

Implementation of OIG Reform Act

The OIG has implemented all of the requirements of Pub.L. No. 110-409 the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008. A Memorandum of Agreement for Counsel Services has been in place with the Department of Commerce OIG.

Going Green

ARC management has implemented green measures within the organization's internal operations. Examples include a document scanning system that has been linked to ARC's e-mail system and an expansion of ARC net to include operational elements. ARC continues to encourage state partners to move to a paperless application process. Reduction in paper utilization can reduce cost, improve the timeliness of management decisions through better document storage and retrieval, and helps to reduce demands on our earth's ecological systems. Our office, in alignment with management's initiative, is committed to "going green" and we continue to work toward that end.

IV. REPORTING FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE

A region wide toll-free hotline is maintained to enable direct and confidential contact with the ARC OIG, in line with governmental and longstanding OIG initiatives as identified in the IG Act of 1978; to afford opportunities for identification of areas subject to fraud, waste, or abuse. Also, in accordance with the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, the ARC OIG implemented another communication channel allowing anonymous reporting of fraud, waste or abuse via a link on our website's home page. The web link is, <http://ig.arc.gov/>.

V. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY REVIEW

The OIG continues to review and provide comment on legislation germane to ARC, OIG and the OIG community. Our comments are provided, as appropriate to agency officials, and/or to the CIGIE for incorporation with comments from all other OIGs.

VI. DODD-FRANK LEGISLATION – Reporting to Full Commission

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Pub. L. No.111-203) amended the Inspector General Act changing the entity head of ARC from the Federal Co-Chair to the Commission. The Office of Management & Budget (OMB) has not yet provided guidance on these changes through the required notice and publication of the List of Designated Federal Entities (DFEs) which are to be published annually under the IG Act. This Act provides that the Inspector General report to the full Commission that includes the Federal Co-Chair and 13 Appalachian Governors.

We believe ARC and other economic development Commissions are among the few DFEs that have a majority of non-Presidentially (or non-federal) appointed Commission members. Although the Dodd-Frank legislation provides tenure protection to DFE IG's, a question remains as to whether some of the provisions were intended to apply to Commission's composed primarily of non-Federal, non-Presidentially appointed members. In addition to surfacing the issue of non-Federal appointees authority to employ IG's, whose primary responsibility is to oversight the use of Federal funds, the related issue of the federal versus the non-federal status of the OIG Office, needs Congressional or OMB resolution.

We have recommended that DFE's having a majority of non-Presidential appointees as Commission or Board members be exempt from the OIG provisions in the Dodd-Frank Act, or if the Agency Head remains the full Commission that the OIG Office, including the IG and current Federal OIG Staff, remain Federal.

Pending additional OMB guidance or direction on Dodd-Frank issues that impact the ARC OIG the Commission considers the legislated requirement for the entire Commission to be the Agency Head. Decisions with respect to the Federal/non-Federal status of the OIG have been delayed until the final effect of the Dodd-Frank legislation has been settled.

SCHEDULE OF AUDIT, INSPECTION, EVALUATION & REVIEW REPORTS
ISSUED OCTOBER 1, 2012 TO MARCH 31, 2013

Report No.	Report Title/Description	Program Dollars or Contract/Grant Amount*	Questioned/Unsupported Costs**	Funds to Better Use***
13-01	Financial Statement Audit			
13-02	Virginia Technical Assistance	\$240,000		
13-03	Mississippi State University	\$440,200	\$ 45,675	
13-04	Project Navigator Mississippi State University	\$600,000	\$ 93,191	
13-05	Tri County Council of Western MD LDD	\$148,000		
13-06	Kid One Transport System, AL	\$150,000		
13-08	KY Science of Technology Corp.	\$550,000		
13-09	KY Research Foundation Youth E-Discovery Challenge	\$475,000	\$ 22,618	
13-10	Tennessee Technical Assistance	\$220,000		
13-11	Fentress County TN Children's Center	\$341,497		
13-13	Georgia Technical Assistance	\$223,300		
13-14	WV Region II planning and Development Council	\$ 84,000	\$ 1,388	

13-17	ARC Grant Management			
13-18	Older Child Agency Administered Grants	\$33,082,453		
13-19	Older ARC Administered Grants	\$2,644,551		
Total		\$39,198,801 ¹	\$162,872 ²	\$2,548,287 ³

¹ Includes \$2,644,551 applicable to 11 grant reviews and \$36,530,591 applicable to older grants recommended for follow-up to determine grant status and potential for closing and recoveries and use of funds for other needed projects in Appalachia.

² Involves primarily unsupported matching funds.

³ Additional grants and values included in prior reports for which recovery actions were initiated or completed.

SCHEDULE OF AUDIT, INSPECTION, EVALUATION & REVIEW REPORTS
OF QUESTIONED OR UNSUPPORTED COSTS

	<u>No. of Reports</u>	<u>Questioned Costs</u>	<u>Unsupported Costs</u>
A. For which no management decision was made by the commencement of the reporting period	\$0	\$0	\$0
B. Which were issued during the reporting period	4		
Subtotals (A + B)	4		
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period			
(i) dollar value of disallowed costs	1	\$0	\$0
(ii) dollar value of costs not disallowed	1	\$0	\$0
D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	2	\$0	\$0
E. Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	0	\$0	\$0

SCHEDULE OF AUDIT, INSPECTION, EVALUATION & REVIEW REPORTS WITH
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT FUNDS BE PUT TO BETTER USE AND SUMMARY OF
MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

	<u>No. of Reports</u>	<u>Dollar Value</u>
A. For which no management decision was made by the commencement of the reporting period	0	\$ 0
B. Which were issued during the reporting period	2	\$ 0
Subtotals (A + B)	2	\$ 0
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period		
(i) dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management		
--based on proposed management action	2	\$2,548,287 ¹
--based on proposed legislative action	0	\$ 0
(ii) dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management	0	\$ 0
D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	0	\$ 0
E. Reports for which no final management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	0	\$ 0

1. Actions resulting from ARC follow-up on grants recommended for follow-up in prior reports. Available funds to be used for additional needed projects in Appalachia. Follow-up actions on current period reports will be identified in subsequent semi-annual reports.

APPENDIX D

**SCHEDULE OF AUDIT, INSPECTION, EVALUATION & REVIEW REPORTS WITH
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT FUNDS BE PUT TO BETTER USE AND SUMMARY OF
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS**

<u>OIG Audit Reports</u>	<u>Number of Reports</u>	<u>Amounts Recommended by OIG</u>	<u>Amounts Agreed to by Management (Disallowed)</u>
A. For which final action by management had not been taken by the commencement of the reporting period	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
B. On which management decisions were made during the reporting period	2	\$ 0	\$ 0
C. For which final action was taken by management during the reporting period			
Dollar value of recommendations that were actually completed	2	\$ 0	\$ 1,682,337
(ii) the dollar value of recommendations that management has subsequently concluded should not or could not be implemented or completed	0	\$ 0	\$ 0
D. For which no final action had been taken by the end of the reporting period	1	\$ 0	\$865,950

**Prior Reports recommended follow-up on older open grants, and resulting agency actions are identified in subsequent SARs, ARC follow-up and actions on inactive grants is continuing and ongoing process.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following definitions apply to terms used in reporting audit statistics:

Questioned Cost	A cost which the Office of Inspector General (OIG) questioned because of an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, or other agreement or document governing the expenditure of funds; such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.
Unsupported Cost	A cost which the OIG questioned because the cost was not supported by adequate documentation at the time of the audit.
Disallowed Cost	A questioned cost that management, in a management decision, has sustained or agreed should not be charged to the Commission.
Funds Be Put To Better Use	A recommendation made by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if management took actions to implement and complete the recommendation.
Management Decision	Management's evaluation of the findings and recommendations included in the audit report and the issuance of a final decision by management concerning its response to such findings and recommendations, including actions concluded to be necessary. Interim decisions and actions are not considered final management decisions for the purpose of the tables in this report.
Final Action	The completion of all management actions that are described in a management decision with respect to audit findings and recommendations. If management concluded that no actions were necessary, final action occurs when a management decision is issued.

**THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION**

**serves American taxpayers
by investigating reports of waste, fraud, or abuse
involving Federal funds.**

**If you believe an activity is
wasteful, fraudulent, or abusive of Federal funds,
please call
toll free 1-800-532-4611
or (202) 884-7667 in the Washington metropolitan area**

or write to:

**Office of Inspector General
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Rm. 700
Washington, DC 20009-1068**

**Information can be provided anonymously.
Federal Government employees are protected from reprisal,
and anyone may have his or her identity held in confidence.**

Appalachian Regional Commission

Office of Inspector General
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20009-1068

