

**ITEM 17 S**  
**FINAL STAFF ANALYSIS**  
**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES**

Penal Code Section 832.9

Statutes 1992, Chapter 1249

Statutes 1995, Chapter 666

*Threats Against Peace Officers*

05-PGA-44 (96-365-02)

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 *Threats Against Peace Officers* program (96-365-02) 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 *Threats Against 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 *Threats Against 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 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 *Threats Against 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

### Chronology

04/24/1997	Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopts Statement of Decision
02/27/1998	Commission adopts parameters and guidelines
03/26/1998	Commission adopts statewide cost estimate
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 <i>School Bus Safety II</i> 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 <i>Threats Against Peace Officers</i> 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 *Threats Against Peace Officers* program (96-365-02) 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

The County of San Diego filed a test claim on December 30, 1996, alleging that the test claim statutes require local governments to reimburse peace officers for certain moving expenses incurred when relocation becomes necessary because of a verified threat against the life or safety of either the officer or a member of his or her immediate family.

The Commission approved this test claim on April 24, 1997, concluding that Penal Code Section 832.9, as added or amended by Statutes 1992, Chapter 1249, and Statutes 1995, Chapter 666 constituted a reimbursable state-mandated program upon local agencies pursuant to section 6, article XIII B of the California Constitution.<sup>1</sup>

On February 27, 1998, the Commission adopted the parameters and guidelines for this program.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit A.

<sup>2</sup>Exhibit B.

## 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

### *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 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*

---

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit C.

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

*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.<sup>5</sup>

The parameters and guidelines for the *Threats Against 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.<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>5</sup> Exhibit D.

<sup>6</sup> Exhibit E.

<sup>7</sup> Exhibit F.

<sup>8</sup> The Commission is not a party to this action.

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.

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 *Threats Against Peace Officers* program.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> 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.

Inserting the source documentation and records retention boilerplate language would conform the parameters and guidelines for the *Threats Against 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.

Staff clarified that the proposed amendments would be effective on July 1, 2005.

### V. *Reimbursable Costs*

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.*

*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*

### VII. *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*

---

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

*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 *Threats Against Peace Officers* program, beginning on page 9.
- Authorize staff to make any non-substantive, technical corrections to the parameters and guidelines following the hearing.

Hearing: ~~February 26, 1998~~  
File Number: ~~CSM 96-365-02~~  
Commission Staff  
f:\mandates\pah\22698P&G.doc  
Adopted: February 27, 1998  
Proposed Amendment: [January 29, 2010](#)

Proposed Amendment to Staff's Proposed Parameters and Guidelines  
~~Revised 12/23/97~~

Penal Code Section 832.9

~~Statutes 1992, Chapter 1249, Statutes of 1992~~  
~~Statutes 1995, Chapter 666, Statutes of 1995~~

*Threats Against Peace Officers*  
05-PGA-44 (96-365-02)

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

I. Summary of the Mandate Source

~~Statutes 1992, c~~Chapter 1249, ~~Statutes of 1992~~, added Penal Code section 832.9. This statute requires governmental entities employing peace officers to reimburse the officer, or any member of his or her family for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses incurred when it is necessary to move because the officer has received a threat that a life threatening action may be taken against the officer or his or her immediate family as a result of the peace officer's employment.

~~Statutes 1995, c~~Chapter 666, ~~Statutes of 1995~~, amended Penal Code section 832.9, by specifying guidelines for reimbursement.

II. Commission on State Mandates Decision

On April 24, 1997, the Commission determined that the requirements of Penal Code section 832.9, as added by ~~Statutes 1992, c~~Chapter 1249, ~~Statutes of 1992~~, and amended by ~~Statutes 1995, c~~Chapter 666, ~~Statutes of 1995~~, imposed upon local governments, a new program or higher level of service, within the meaning of section 6, article XIII B of the California Constitution and section 17514 of the Government Code.

III. Eligible Claimants

Eligible claimants include any local governmental entity employing peace officers, as defined in Penal Code section 830. Local governmental entities include "local agencies" as defined in Government Code section 17518, and "school districts" as defined in Government Code section 17519.

IV. Period of Reimbursement

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

Section 17557 of the Government Code states 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 this state mandated program was filed on December 30, 1996, establishing eligibility for Fiscal Year 1995-96, commencing July 1, 1995. However, both test claim statutes were *not* in effect on July 1, 1995. Therefore, reimbursement claims may be filed as follows:

Actual and necessary costs incurred pursuant to Statutes 1992, cChapter 1249, Statutes of 1992, are reimbursable after July 1, 1995.

Actual and necessary costs incurred pursuant to Statutes 1995, cChapter 666, Statutes of 1995, are reimbursable after January 1, 1996.

Actual and necessary costs for one fiscal year should be included in each claim. Estimated costs for the subsequent fiscal year may be included on the same claim, if applicable. Pursuant to section 17561, subdivision (d)(3) of the Government Code, all claims for reimbursement of initial year's costs shall be submitted within 120 days of release of claiming instructions by the State Controller.

If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed \$200, no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as otherwise allowed by Government Code section 17564.

#### V. Reimbursable Costs

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. Scope of Mandate

Eligible claimants shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred to reimburse peace officers or any member of their immediate family for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses when it is necessary to move because the officer has received a credible threat that a life threatening action may be taken against the officer or his or her immediate family as a result of the peace officer's employment.

## B. Reimbursable Activities

For the following state mandated activities, costs incurred by a local governmental entity for the direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies, services, and reimbursement payments made to a peace officer or member of his or her immediate family, residing with the peace officer, are reimbursable:

1. From July 1, 1995 through December 31, 1995
  - a. Review and approve claims for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses incurred when it is necessary to move because the officer has received a threat that a life threatening action may be taken against the officer or his or her immediate family as a result of the peace officer's employment. Costs incurred both before and after the change of residence, including costs of moving household effects either by a commercial household goods carrier or by the employee, are reimbursable.
  - b. Payment of the approved reimbursement to the peace officer or member of his or her immediate family residing with the officer for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses.
2. From January 1, 1996 through Present
  - a. Receive notification of a "credible threat." (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subds. (b)(5) & (c).)
  - b. Approve relocation plans and if necessary, verify residency of immediate family member. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subds. (a), (b)(3), -& (d).)
  - c. Review and approve claims for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses incurred when it is necessary to move because the officer has received a threat that a life threatening action may be taken against the officer or his or her immediate family as a result of the peace officer's employment. Costs incurred both before and after the change of residence, including costs of moving household effects either by a commercial household goods carrier or by the employee, are reimbursable. Approval of "actual and necessary relocation costs" is subject to the limitations set forth in Penal Code section 832.9, as amended by Chapter 666, Statutes of 1995.

- d. Payment of the approved reimbursement to the peace officer or member of his or her immediate family for actual and necessary moving and relocation expenses.

C. Non-Reimbursable Costs

1. Litigation expenses “allowable as costs” and “not allowable as costs” pursuant to section 1033.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure, are not reimbursable if incurred by claimants and/or local law enforcement agencies responding to and/or defending claims or actions brought under Penal Code section 832.9.
2. After January 1, 1996, the following costs are not reimbursable:
  - a. Moving costs that are *not* included in the Department of Personnel Administration rules governing promotional relocations. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (1).)
  - b. Loss or decrease in value to a peace officer’s residence due to a forced sale. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (b)(2).)
  - c. Costs incurred by a peace officer or member of their immediate family without prior approval of the appointing authority. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (b)(3).)
  - d. Unauthorized payment of peace officers’ salaries while moving. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (b)(4).)
  - e. Temporary relocation housing which exceeds 60 days. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (b)(6).)
  - f. Relocation costs incurred 120 days after the original notification of a viable threat if the peace officer has failed to relocate. (Pen. Code, § 832.9, subd. (b)(7).)

VI. Claim Preparation and Submission

Each claim for reimbursement pursuant to this mandate must be timely filed and provide documentation in support of the reimbursement claimed for this mandate.

A. Reporting by Components

Claimed costs must be allocated according to the components of reimbursable activity described in Section V.B.

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Salaries and Benefits

Claimed reimbursement for employee costs should be supported by name, position, hourly productive rate, hours worked, fringe benefits amount, and a brief description of assigned unit and function relative to the mandate.

2. Services and Supplies

The claimant should identify all direct costs for materials, services and supplies which have been purchased, leased, consumed or expended for purposes of compliance with the mandate.

3. Reimbursements to Peace Officer or Member of His or Her Immediate Family for Actual and Necessary Moving and Relocation Expenses

- a. Show the dates when the claimant received notification of the threat, when moving and relocation expenses were incurred, and when the officer or member of his or her immediate family was reimbursed.
- b. Submit with the claim, a copy of the contract, invoices, and receipts for the cost of moving and relocation. Identify the independent contractor or employee who provided services for moving and relocation.
- c. If confidentiality is involved to protect the officer's relocation, mark out sensitive areas of the contract, invoices, and receipts.

4. Allowable Overhead Costs

Government Code section 17564, subdivision (b), provides that claims for indirect costs shall be filed in the manner prescribed by the State Controller's Office.

VII. ~~Records Retention Supporting Data~~

~~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<sup>1</sup> 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 audit purposes, all costs claimed shall be traceable to source documents (e.g., employee time records, invoices, receipts, purchase orders, contracts, worksheets, calendars, declarations, etc.) that show evidence of the validity of such costs and their relationship to the state mandated program. All documentation in support of the claimed costs shall be made available to the~~

---

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

~~State Controller or his/her agent, as may be requested and all reimbursement claims are subject to audit during the~~

VIII. Offsetting Savings and Other Reimbursement

Any offsetting savings the claimant experiences as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate received from any source, e.g., service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds, etc. shall be identified and deducted from this claim.

IX. Required Certification

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of the claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those costs mandated by the state contained therein.