

ITEM 17 N
FINAL STAFF ANALYSIS
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

Labor Code Section 3212.1
Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1171
Statutes 2006, Chapter 78, Section 8 (AB 1805)
Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers
05-PGA-37 (CSM-4416, 06-RL-4081/4416-01)
State Controller's Office, Requestor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a request filed by the State Controller's Office (SCO) to amend the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program (CSM-4416, 6-RL-4081/4416-01) to add language regarding source documentation, and record retention requirements during the period a claim is subject to an audit. If the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) approves the SCO's request, the amendments would be effective for costs incurred beginning on July 1, 2005.

In 2003, upon recommendation from the Bureau of State Audits, direction from the Legislature, and an SCO request, the Commission adopted amendments to parameters and guidelines that clarified what source documentation claimants are required to retain to support the claims they file to obtain reimbursement for mandated programs, and records retention language that identifies the records that must be retained to support an audit initiated by the SCO. The adopted language, commonly referred to as "boilerplate language," has been included in all parameters and guidelines adopted since 2003. In addition, section 1183 of the Commission's regulations require parameters and guidelines to include instruction on claim preparation, notice of the SCO's authority to audit claims, and the amount of time documentation must be retained during the audit period.

The SCO is now requesting that parameters and guidelines adopted prior to 2003 be amended to also include the source documentation and records retention language.

This analysis pertains only to the request to amend the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program. The staff analyses for the other 48 programs will be presented separately.

There is one issue for the Commission's consideration:

- **Should the parameters and guidelines be amended to add the current "boilerplate language"?**

Staff finds that it is appropriate to approve the SCO's request to insert the source documentation and records retention language because it would conform the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program with the parameters and guidelines adopted for other programs, and is consistent with section 1183.1 of the Commission's regulation.

Therefore, staff included the language requested by the SCO.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Adopt the SCO's proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program, beginning on page 9.
- Authorize staff to make any non-substantive, technical corrections to the parameters and guidelines following the hearing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Requestor

State Controller's Office

Test Claim Chronology

08/27/1992 Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopts Statement of Decision

01/21/1993 Commission adopts parameters and guidelines

07/18/2006 Statutes 2006, chapter 78 (AB 1805) is enacted requiring the Commission to reconsider the Statements of Decision and parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program

09/27/2007 Commission adopts Statement of Decision on Reconsideration, and amends parameters and guidelines to end reimbursement for program effective July 1, 2008

State Controller's Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines to add Boilerplate Language Chronology

01/23/2003 The Commission, upon the recommendation of the Bureau of State Audits, direction from the Legislature, and upon request from the State Controller's Office (SCO), adopts amendments to the *School Bus Safety II* parameters and guidelines to include "boilerplate language" that details the documentation necessary to support reimbursement claims. After this date, all adopted parameters and guidelines contain this language

04/07/2006 SCO requests the parameters and guidelines for 49 mandated programs adopted prior to 2003 also be amended to include boilerplate language, including the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program analyzed here

04/27/2006 Commission deems SCO's request for amendment of parameters and guidelines complete and issues for comment

07/23/2009 Commission reissues SCO's request for amendment of parameters and guidelines for comment

08/18/2009 Department of Finance files comments

10/13/2009 Commission issues draft staff analysis

Background

This is a request filed by the State Controller's Office (SCO) to amend the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program (CSM-4416, 06-RL-4081/4416-01) to add language regarding source documentation, and record retention requirements during the period a claim is subject to an audit. If the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) approves the SCO's request, the amendments would be effective for costs incurred beginning on July 1, 2005.

Test Claim Decision and Parameters and Guidelines

Labor Code section 3212.1 provides a limited presumption easing the burden of proving industrial causation for specified peace officers that developed cancer during the period of employment. Under this statute, the peace officer employee could have the benefit of the presumption that the cancer arose out of and in the course of employment if the employee could

show that he or she was exposed, while in the service of the department or unit, to a known carcinogen and that the carcinogen was reasonably linked to the disabling cancer.

On August 27, 1992, the Commission adopted a Statement of Decision on Labor Code section 3212.1, determining that the statute constituted a reimbursable state-mandated program on the ground that peace officers carry out the governmental function of providing public safety services to the public and that the presumption of industrial causation was uniquely granted to local government employees.

On January 21, 1993, the Commission adopted the parameters and guidelines for this program.

In 2006, AB 1805 (Statutes 2006, chapter 78) was enacted requiring the Commission to reconsider the Statements of Decision and parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program. On September 27, 2007, the Commission adopted a Statement of Decision on Reconsideration, finding that the effective July 1, 2008, the program was no longer a state mandated program.¹ The Commission also amended the parameters and guidelines ending reimbursement on June 30, 2008.²

Boilerplate Language

On March 28, 2002, the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) issued an audit report on the *School Bus Safety II* program, stating that the parameters and guidelines do not impose sufficient requirements regarding the documentation required to support reimbursement claims, and thus, insufficient documentation was being submitted to support claims.³ The report recommended, among other things, that the Commission work with the SCO, other affected state agencies, and interested parties to make sure the language in the parameters and guidelines and the claiming instructions for the *School Bus Safety II* program reflects the Commission's intentions as well as the SCO's expectations regarding supporting documentation. On June 10, 2002, the SCO proposed that parameters and guidelines be amended to clarify what documentation is necessary to support reimbursement claims and what records must be retained to support audits initiated by the SCO.

Based on BSA's audit findings and recommendations, the Legislature enacted Statutes 2002, chapter 1167 (AB 2781) to direct the Commission to amend the parameters and guidelines in *School Bus Safety II*, to detail the documentation necessary to support reimbursement claims.

On January 23, 2003, upon recommendation from BSA, direction from the Legislature, and the SCO's request, the Commission adopted the following language regarding source documentation and records retention to the *School Bus Safety II* parameters and guidelines:⁴

IV. Reimbursable Activities

To be eligible for mandated cost reimbursement for any fiscal year, only actual costs may be claimed. Actual costs are those costs actually incurred to implement the mandated activities. Actual costs must be traceable and supported by source documents that show the validity of such costs, when they were incurred, and their relationship to the reimbursable activities. A source document is a document created at or near the same time the actual cost was incurred for the event or activity in question. Source documents

¹ Exhibit A.

² Exhibit B.

³ Exhibit C.

⁴ The Commission also adopted other boilerplate language that is not relevant to this request.

may include, but are not limited to, employee time records or time logs, sign-in sheets, invoices, and receipts.

Evidence corroborating the source documents may include, but is not limited to, worksheets, cost allocation reports (system generated), purchase orders, contracts, agendas, training packets, and declarations. Declarations must include a certification or declaration stating, "I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct based upon personal knowledge."

Evidence corroborating the source documents may include data relevant to the reimbursable activities otherwise in compliance with local, state, and federal government requirements. However, corroborating documents cannot be substituted for source documents.

The claimant is only allowed to claim and be reimbursed for increased costs for reimbursable activities identified below. Increased cost is limited to the cost of an activity that the claimant is required to incur as a result of the mandate.

VI. Record Retention

Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, subdivision (a), a reimbursement claim for actual costs filed by a local agency or school district pursuant to this chapter is subject to the initiation of an audit by the Controller no later than three years after the date that the actual reimbursement claim is filed or last amended, whichever is later. However, if no funds are appropriated or no payment is made to a claimant for the program for the fiscal year for which the claim is filed, the time for the Controller to initiate an audit shall commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim. All documents used to support the reimbursable activities, as described in Section IV, must be retained during the period subject to audit. If an audit has been initiated by the Controller during the period subject to audit, the retention period is extended until the ultimate resolution of any audit findings.*

The Commission has included this language, commonly referred to as "boilerplate language," in all parameters and guidelines adopted on or after January 23, 2003.

SCO Request to Amend Parameters and Guidelines

On April 7, 2006, the SCO requested that the parameters and guidelines for 49 mandated programs that were adopted prior to 2003 be amended to also include the boilerplate language regarding source documentation and records retention that was adopted by the Commission in 2003.⁵

The parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program is one of the 49 programs the SCO is requesting be amended.

Comments on the Proposal

On April 27, 2006, the Commission issued the SCO's request to amend the parameters and guidelines for comment. No comments were filed. On July 23, 2009, the Commission reissued the proposal for comment. On August 18, 2009, Department of Finance submitted comments.⁶

* This refers to Title 2, division 4, part 7, chapter 4 of the Government Code.

⁵ Exhibit D.

⁶ Exhibit E.

In its comments, Finance stated it was neutral on the proposal, because the request to include boilerplate language in the parameters and guidelines for the 49 programs would allow the Controller to complete audit related tasks more efficiently, and provide the claimant with more information and record retention requirements, as well as the statute of limitations for audits.

Commission staff issued the draft staff analysis on October 13, 2009.⁷ No comments were filed.

Related Litigation (Clovis Unified School Dist., et al. v. State Controller)

This case involves a challenge by school districts and community college districts on reductions made by the State Controller's Office to reimbursement claims for several mandated programs.⁸ The school districts argue that reductions made on the ground that school districts do not have contemporaneous source documents are invalid.

Trial Court Ruling. On January 2, 2009, the Sacramento County Superior Court (Case No. 06CS00748) issued a clarification of ruling and on February 19, 2009, issued a Judgment and Writ, finding that reductions made by the Controller on the ground that claimants did not have contemporaneous source documents supporting their reimbursement claims were invalid as an underground regulation *if* the contemporaneous source document requirement was not in the Commission's parameters and guidelines. The court held that the Controller has no authority to reduce a claim on the ground that a claimant did not maintain contemporaneous source documents to support their claim, absent statutory or regulatory authority to require contemporaneous source documents, or language in the parameters and guidelines requiring it. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558, the Controller's claiming instructions shall be derived from the test claim decision and the adopted parameters and guidelines. Thus, the court granted declaratory relief and a writ of mandate requiring the Controller to set aside the reduction and pay the school district plaintiffs the amounts reduced on two mandated programs that did not have parameters and guidelines language requiring claimants to maintain contemporaneous source documents.

Court of Appeal Filings (Third District Court of Appeal, Case No. C061696). Notices of appeal and cross-appeal have been filed by the SCO, the community college districts, and the school districts, and opening briefs have been filed. The appeal on the issue of the validity of the contemporaneous source documentation requirement remains pending.

Discussion

The proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines raise the following issue for determination by the Commission:

Issue: Should the parameters and guidelines be amended to add the Commission's current "boilerplate language"?

In 2003, following recommendation from the BSA and direction from the Legislature, the SCO requested, and the Commission adopted amendments to parameters and guidelines that clarify what source documentation claimants are required to retain to support the claims they file to obtain reimbursement for mandated programs, and records retention language that identifies the records that must be retained to support an audit initiated by the SCO. The adopted language, as detailed on pages 4 and 5 of this analysis, has been included in all parameters and guidelines adopted since 2003.

⁷ Exhibit F.

⁸ The Commission is not a party to this action.

In addition, section 1183.1, subdivision (a) (5) and (6) require that the parameters and guidelines contain, among other things, the following:

- Claim preparation. Instruction on claim preparation, including instruction for direct and indirect cost reporting, or application of a reasonable reimbursement methodology.
- Record retention. Notice of the Office of the State Controller's authority to audit claims and the amount of time supporting documents must be retained during period subject to audit.

The SCO is now requesting that parameters and guidelines adopted prior to 2003 be amended to also include the source documentation and records retention language. This analysis pertains to the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program.⁹

Inserting the source documentation and records retention boilerplate language would conform the parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program with the parameters and guidelines adopted for other programs, and is consistent with section 1183.1 of the Commission's regulations.

Therefore, staff finds that it is appropriate to approve the SCO's request, and made the following modifications to the parameters and guidelines:

III. Period of Reimbursement

Government Code section 17557, subdivision (d) states that a parameters and guidelines amendment filed on or before the claiming deadline following a fiscal year, shall establish reimbursement eligibility for that fiscal year. This amendment was filed on April 7, 2006, (after the claiming deadline) establishing reimbursement for fiscal year 2005-2006. Therefore, reimbursement for this amendment shall begin on July 1, 2005, and end on June 30, 2008 because the reimbursement for the program ends on that date.

Staff clarified that the proposed amendments would be effective from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008.

IV. Reimbursable Activities

Staff inserted the following boilerplate language regarding source documentation, as requested by the SCO:

To be eligible for mandated cost reimbursement for any fiscal year, only actual costs may be claimed. Actual costs are those costs actually incurred to implement the mandated activities. Actual costs must be traceable and supported by source documents that show the validity of such costs, when they were incurred, and their relationship to the reimbursable activities. A source document is a document created at or near the same time the actual cost was incurred for the event or activity in question. Source documents may include, but are not limited to, employee time records or time logs, sign-in sheets, invoices, and receipts.

⁹ The SCO only requested that the portions of the boilerplate language regarding source documentation and records retention be added to the parameters and guidelines for the 49 programs. There are other sections of the boilerplate language regarding the remedies available before the Commission, and the legal and factual basis for the parameters and guidelines. Staff did not include these sections because the SCO did not request that they be included.

Evidence corroborating the source documents may include, but is not limited to, worksheets, cost allocation reports (system generated), purchase orders, contracts, agendas, training packets, and declarations. Declarations must include a certification or declaration stating, "I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct based upon personal knowledge." Evidence corroborating the source documents may include data relevant to the reimbursable activities otherwise in compliance with local, state, and federal government requirements. However, corroborating documents cannot be substituted for source documents.

The claimant is only allowed to claim and be reimbursed for increased costs for reimbursable activities identified below. Increased cost is limited to the cost of an activity that the claimant is required to incur as a result of the mandate

VI. D. Records Retention

At the request of the SCO, staff removed the existing language regarding records retention, and replaced it with the following boilerplate language regarding records retention.

Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, subdivision (a), a reimbursement claim for actual costs filed by a local agency or school district pursuant to this chapter is subject to the initiation of an audit by the Controller no later than three years after the date that the actual reimbursement claim is filed or last amended, whichever is later. However, if no funds are appropriated or no payment is made to a claimant for the program for the fiscal year for which the claim is filed, the time for the Controller to initiate an audit shall commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim. All documents used to support the reimbursable activities, as described in Section IV, must be retained during the period subject to audit. If an audit has been initiated by the Controller during the period subject to audit, the retention period is extended until the ultimate resolution of any audit findings.*

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Adopt the proposed amendments to parameters and guidelines for the *Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers* program, beginning on page 9.
- Authorize staff to make any non-substantive, technical corrections to the parameters and guidelines following the hearing.

* This refers to Title 2, division 4, part 7, chapter 4 of the Government Code.

Adopted: January 21, 1993
Amended: September 27, 2007
Proposed Amendment: December 3, 2009

Proposed Amendment to Parameters and Guidelines

Labor Code Section 3212.1

Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1171

Statutes 2006, Chapter 78, Section 8 (AB 1805); ~~Statutes of 2989~~

Cancer Presumption-Peace Officers

05-PGA-37 (CSM-4416, 06-RL-4081/4416-01)

This amendment is effective beginning with claims filed for the July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 period of reimbursement and ends on June 30, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF MANDATE

Chapter 1171, Statutes of 1989, amended Section 3212.1 of the Labor Code to add "peace officers as defined in Section 830.1 and subdivision (a) of Section 830.2 of the Penal Code who are primarily engaged in active law enforcement activities" to the category of public employees that are covered by its provisions. Previously, the provisions only applied to public sector fire fighting personnel. This section states that cancer that has developed or manifested itself in peace officers will be presumed to have arisen out of and in the course of employment, unless the presumption is controverted by other evidence. The presumption is extended to a peace officer following termination of service for a period of three calendar months for each year of requisite service, but not to exceed sixty (60) months in any circumstance, commencing with the last date actually worked in the specified capacity.

II. COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES' DECISION

On July 23, 1992, the Commission on State Mandates determined that local law enforcement agencies will incur "cost mandated by the state" as a result of Chapter 1171, Statutes of 1989.

III. ELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS

Any law enforcement department or office of a city, county, a city and county, a special district or school district of the state which employs peace officers as defined in Sections 830.1 and 830.2 of the Penal Code and incurs increased cost as a result of this statute.

IV. PERIOD OF CLAIM

This amendment is effective beginning with claims filed for the July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 period of reimbursement and ends on June 30, 2008, because reimbursement for this program ended on June 30, 2008.

Chapter 1171/89 became effective on September 30, 1989. Section 17557 of the Government Code provides that a test claim must be submitted on or before December 31 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year. The test claim for Chapter 1171/89 was initially filed on December 30, 1991, therefore the reimbursable costs to the local agencies are all

such permitted costs incurred on or after July 1, 1990. Beginning July 1, 2008, reimbursement is not required for this program.

V. FORMULA FOR DETERMINATION OF CASES SUBJECT TO REIMBURSEMENT

Reimbursement requires a demonstration of elements as follows:

- A. A claim under Chapter 1171, Statutes of 1989 is reimbursable if:
1. The worker is a peace officer within the meaning of Penal Code Section 830.1 and subdivision (a) of Section 830.2 of the Penal Code who are primarily engaged in active law enforcement activities;
 2. The worker has cancer which has caused the disability;
 3. The worker's cancer developed or manifested itself during a period while the worker was in the service of the employer, or within the extended period provided or in Labor Code Section 3212.1;
 4. The worker was exposed, while in the service of the employer, to one or more known carcinogens as defined by the International Agency for Research on Cancer or the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations; and
 5. The one or more carcinogens to which the worker was exposed are reasonably linked to the disabling cancer, as demonstrated by competent medical evidence.

VI. REIMBURSABLE COSTS

A case meeting all the above five conditions is eligible for reimbursement at fifty percent (50%) of the reimbursable costs defined below.

To be eligible for mandated cost reimbursement for any fiscal year, only actual costs may be claimed. Actual costs are those costs actually incurred to implement the mandated activities. Actual costs must be traceable and supported by source documents that show the validity of such costs, when they were incurred, and their relationship to the reimbursable activities. A source document is a document created at or near the same time the actual cost was incurred for the event or activity in question. Source documents may include, but are not limited to, employee time records or time logs, sign-in sheets, invoices, and receipts.

Evidence corroborating the source documents may include, but is not limited to, worksheets, cost allocation reports (system generated), purchase orders, contracts, agendas, training packets, and declarations. Declarations must include a certification or declaration stating, "I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct based upon personal knowledge." Evidence corroborating the source documents may include data relevant to the reimbursable activities otherwise in compliance with local, state, and federal government requirements. However, corroborating documents cannot be substituted for source documents.

The claimant is only allowed to claim and be reimbursed for increased costs for reimbursable activities identified below. Increased cost is limited to the cost of an activity that the claimant is required to incur as a result of the mandate.

A. Insured Local Agencies

If an insured local entity (insured through State Compensation Insurance Fund) incurred any increased costs as a result of Chapter 1171/89, they would be entitled to seek reimbursement for such costs which are specifically attributable to Labor Code Section 3212.1.

If the local entity can show that its experience modification premium was increased or its dividends were decreased, 50% of those respective increases or decreases will be reimbursed.

B. Local Agencies Covered by a Joint Powers Agreement or Other Carrier

Local agencies covered by a joint powers agreement or other insurance carrier for workers' compensation may claim in the same manner as above for insured local agencies provided;

- (1) Insurance premiums or contributions are based on the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau rates and the current loss experience modification factor, and
- (2) The insurer is responsible for claims of terminated or withdrawn local agencies if such claims arose while insured by the insurer.

C. Self-Insured Local Agencies

All actual costs of a claim based upon the presumption set forth in Labor Code Section 3212.1 are reimbursable, including but not limited to the following:

(1) Administrative Costs

(a) Staff Costs

- Salaries and employee benefits
- Costs of supplies
- Legal counsel costs
- Clerical support
- Normal local rates of reimbursement for necessary and reasonable travel and related expenses for staff
- Amounts paid to adjusting agencies

(b) Overhead Costs

Counties, cities and special district may claim indirect cost through an indirect cost rate proposal prepared in accordance with the provision of the Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, "Cost Principles for Grants to State and Local Governments" as a percentage of direct salaries and wages. Indirect costs may include costs of space, equipment, utilities, insurance, administration, etc. (i.e., those elements of indirect costs incurred as the result of the mandate originating in the performing unit and the costs of central government services distributed through the central services cost services cost allocation plan and not otherwise treated as direct costs). Computation of the indirect cost rate must accompany the claim showing how the rate was derived.

(2) Benefit Costs

Actual benefit costs under this presumption shall be reimbursable and shall include, but are not limited to:

- Permanent disability benefits
- Death benefits
- Temporary disability benefits or full salary in lieu of temporary disability benefits as required by Labor Code Section 4850, or other local charter provision or ordinance in existence on January 1, 1990. Provided, however, that salary in lieu of temporary disability benefits were payable under local charter provision or ordinance shall be reimbursable only to the extent that those benefits do not exceed the benefits required by Labor Code Section 4850.

VII. OFFSETTING SAVINGS AND OTHER REIMBURSEMENT

Any offsetting savings the claimants experience as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the cost claimed. Such offsetting savings shall include, but not be limited to, savings in the cost of personnel, service or supplies, or increased revenues obtained by the claimant. In addition, reimbursements received from any source (e.g., federal, state, etc.) for this mandate shall be identified and deducted from the claim.

VIII. ~~CLAIMING FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS~~ RECORD RETENTION

Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, subdivision (a), a reimbursement claim for actual costs filed by a local agency or school district pursuant to this chapter¹ is subject to the initiation of an audit by the Controller no later than three years after the date that the actual reimbursement claim is filed or last amended, whichever is later. However, if no funds are appropriated or no payment is made to a claimant for the program for the fiscal year for which the claim is filed, the time for the Controller to initiate an audit shall commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim. In any case, an audit shall be completed not later than two years after the date that the audit is commenced. All documents used to support the reimbursable activities, as described in Section V, must be retained during the period subject to audit. If the Controller has initiated an audit during the period subject to audit, the retention period is extended until the ultimate resolution of any audit findings.

~~For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. These documents must be kept on file and made available on the request of the State Controller.~~

IX. Required Certification

The following certification must accompany the claim:

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

That Section 1090 to 1096, inclusive, of the Government Code and other applicable provisions of the law have been complied with; and

THAT I am the person authorized by the local agency to file claims with the State of California.

¹ This refers to Title 2, division 4, part 7, chapter 4 of the Government Code.