

**ITEM 17 G**  
**FINAL STAFF ANALYSIS**  
**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES**

Penal Code Sections 1000.93, 1000.94 and 1000.95  
Penal Code Sections 273.5, subdivisions (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i)  
Penal Code Section 1203.097

Statutes 1992, Chapters 183, and 184,  
Statutes 1993, Chapter 221, Statutes 1993-1994, Chapter 28X, Statutes 1995, Chapter 641

*Domestic Violence Treatment Services — Authorization and Case Management*

05-PGA-30 (96-281-01)

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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* program (96-281-01) 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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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

*Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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

04/23/1998	Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopts Statement of Decision
11/30/1998	Commission adopts parameters and guidelines
08/26/1999	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>Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management</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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* program (96-281-01) 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

In July 1993, the Legislature added sections to the Penal Code that require county probation departments to administer and regulate domestic violence batterer's treatment programs and perform other related case management duties for domestic violence divertees and their victims. On July 21, 1994, the Commission determined that these added Penal Code sections imposed a reimbursable state mandated program.

In 1995, the Legislature eliminated the diversion program as a pretrial option for an accused batterer and transformed the batterer's treatment program into a condition of probation, if part of the punishment and sentencing following the batterer's conviction included probation.

The County of Los Angeles filed a test claim on October 4, 1996, on the 1995 statutory changes from diversion program to batterer's treatment program. The Commission approved this test

claim on April 23, 1998, concluding that the program constituted a reimbursable state mandated program upon local agencies pursuant to section 6, article XIII B of the California Constitution.<sup>1</sup>

On November 30, 1998, the Commission adopted the parameters and guidelines for this program.<sup>2</sup>

### 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*

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit A.

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit B.

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit C.

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

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.<sup>5</sup>

The parameters and guidelines for the *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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.

---

\* 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.

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 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.

---

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

- 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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* program.<sup>9</sup>

Inserting the source documentation and records retention boilerplate language would conform the parameters and guidelines for the *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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.

### *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.*

*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*

---

<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.

*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. *Records Retention*

At the request of the SCO, staff removed the existing language regarding supporting data, 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 *Domestic Violence Treatment Services – Authorization and Case Management* 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: November 30, 1998

Proposed Amendment: January 29, 2010

J:\mandates\2005\pga\05pga17\05pga30\hearing docs\draftpga

## **Proposed Amendment to Parameters and Guidelines**

Penal Code Sections 1000.93, 1000.94 and 1000.95  
Penal Code Sections 273.5, subdivisions (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i)  
Penal Code Section 1203.097

Statutes 1992, Chapters 183/92, and 184/92,  
Statutes 1993, Chapter 221, Statutes 1993-1994, Chapter 28X/94, Statutes 1995, Chapter 641/95

*Domestic Violence Treatment Services — Authorization and Case Management*

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

### **I. Summary and Source of the Mandate**

The test claim legislation provides that if an accused is convicted of a domestic violence crime and granted probation as part of sentencing, the defendant is required to successfully complete a batterer's treatment program as a condition of probation.

The Commission determined that probation *is a penalty* for conviction of a crime. The successful completion of probation is required before the unconditional release of the defendant. If the defendant fails to successfully complete a batterer's treatment program, the test claim legislation subjects the defendant to further sentencing and incarceration.

Since the legislature changed the penalty for domestic violence crimes by changing the requirements for probation, the Commission determined that the "crimes and infractions" disclaimer in Government Code section 17556, subdivision (g), applies to this claim. Based on the plain and ordinary meaning of the words used by the Legislature, the Commission concluded that subdivision (g) applies to those activities required by the test claim legislation that are directly related to the enforcement of the statute which changed the penalty for a crime.

The Commission concluded that the activities listed below are *not* directly related to the enforcement of the test claim statute under Government Code section 17556, subdivision (g), and, therefore, are reimbursable:

- Administration and regulation of batterers' treatment programs (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subds. (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(5)) offset by the claimant's fee authority under Penal Code section 1203.097, subdivision (c)(5)(B).
- Providing services for victims of domestic violence. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (b)(4).)
- Assessing the future probability of the defendant committing murder. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (b)(3)(I).)

### **II. Eligible Claimants**

Eligible claimants include counties, and city and county.

### III. 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 reimbursement for that fiscal year. The test claim was filed by the County of Los Angeles on October 4, 1996. Statutes of 1995, Chapter 641, became effective and operative on January 1, 1996. Therefore, costs incurred on or after January 1, 1996, are eligible for reimbursement.

Actual costs for one fiscal year shall be included in each claim. Estimated costs for the subsequent year may be included on the same claim, if applicable.

Pursuant to Government Code section 17561, subdivision (d)(1), all claims for reimbursement of initial years' costs shall be submitted within 120 days of issuance of the claiming instructions by the State Controller.

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

### 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. For each eligible claimant, all direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies, services, travel and training, for the following activities are eligible for reimbursement:

- A. Administration and regulation of batterers' treatment programs (Pen. Code, §§ 1203.097, subs. (c)(1), (c)(2) and (c)(5)) offset by the claimant's fee authority under Penal Code section 1203.097, subdivision (c)(5)(B).
  1. Development of an approval and annual renewal process for batterers' programs, not previously claimed under former Penal Code sections 1000.93 and 1000.95. (One-time activity.)

- a. Meeting and conferring with and soliciting input from criminal justice agencies and domestic violence victim advocacy programs.
  - b. Staff training regarding the administration and regulation of batterers' treatment programs. (One-time for each employee performing the mandated activity.)
- 2. Processing of initial and annual renewal approvals for vendors, including:
  - a. Application review.
  - b. On-site evaluations.
  - c. Notification of application approval, denial, suspension or revocation.
- B. Victim Notification. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (b)(4).)
  - 1. The probation department shall attempt to:
    - a. Notify victims regarding the requirement for the defendant's participation in a batterer's program.
    - b. Notify victims regarding available victim resources.
    - c. Inform victims that attendance in any program does not guarantee that an abuser will not be violent.
  - 2. Staff training on the following activities:
    - a. Notify victims regarding the requirement for the defendant's participation in a batterer's program, and inform victims that attendance in any program does not guarantee that an abuser will not be violent. (One-time for each employee performing the mandated activities.)
    - b. Notify victims regarding available victim resources. (Once-a-year training for each employee performing the mandated activity.)
- C. Assessing the future probability of the defendant committing murder. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (b)(3)(I).)
  - 1. Evaluation and selection of a homicidal risk assessment instrument.
  - 2. Purchasing or developing a homicidal risk assessment instrument.
  - 3. Training staff on the use of the homicidal risk assessment instrument.
  - 4. Evaluation of the defendant using the homicidal risk assessment instrument, interviews and investigation, to assess the future probability of the defendant committing murder.

In the event a local agency obtains a new homicidal risk assessment instrument, documentation substantiating the improved value of the new instrument is required to be provided with the claim.

## **V. Claim Preparation**

Claims for reimbursement must be timely filed and identify each cost element for which reimbursement is claimed under this mandate. Claimed costs must be identified to each reimbursable activity identified in Section IV of this document.

## SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Claimed costs shall be supported by the following cost element information:

### A. Direct Costs

Direct Costs are defined as costs that can be traced to specific goods, services, units, programs, activities or functions.

Claimed costs shall be supported by the following cost element information:

#### 1. Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s), and/or show the classification of the employee(s) involved. Describe the reimbursable activities performed and specify the actual time devoted to each reimbursable activity by each employee, productive hourly rate and related fringe benefits.

Reimbursement for personal services includes compensation paid for salaries, wages and employee fringe benefits. Employee fringe benefits include regular compensation paid to an employee during periods of authorized absences (e.g., annual leave, sick leave) and the employer's contribution of social security, pension plans, insurance and worker's compensation insurance. Fringe benefits are eligible for reimbursement when distributed equitably to all job activities which the employee performs.

#### 2. Materials and Supplies

Only expenditures that can be identified as direct costs of this mandate may be claimed. List the cost of the materials and supplies consumed specifically for the purposes of this mandate. Purchases shall be claimed at the actual price after deducting cash discounts, rebates and allowances received by the claimant. Supplies that are withdrawn from inventory shall be charged based on a recognized method of costing, consistently applied.

#### 3. Contract Services

Provide the name(s) of the contractor(s) who performed the services, including any fixed contracts for services. Describe the reimbursable activity(ies) performed by each named contractor and give the number of actual hours spent on the activities, if applicable. Show the inclusive dates when services were performed and itemize all costs for those services.

#### 4. Fixed Assets

List the costs of the fixed assets that have been acquired specifically for the purpose of this mandate. If the fixed asset is utilized in some way not directly related to the mandated program, only the pro-rata portion of the asset which is used for the purposes of the mandated program is eligible for reimbursement.

#### 5. Travel

Travel expenses for mileage, per diem, lodging and other employee entitlements are eligible for reimbursement in accordance with the rules of the local jurisdiction. Provide the name(s) of the traveler(s), purpose of travel, inclusive dates and times of travel, destination points and travel costs.

## 6. Training

The cost of training an employee to perform the mandated activities is eligible for reimbursement. Identify the employee(s) by name and job classification. Provide the title and subject of the training session, the date(s) attended and the location. Reimbursable costs may include salaries and benefits, registration fees, transportation, lodging and per diem.

## B. Indirect Costs

Indirect costs are defined as costs which are incurred for a common or joint purpose, benefiting more than one program and are not directly assignable to a particular department or program without efforts disproportionate to the result achieved. Indirect costs may include both (1) overhead costs of the unit performing the mandate; and (2) the costs of central government services distributed to other departments based on a systematic and rational basis through a cost allocation plan.

Compensation for indirect costs is eligible for reimbursement utilizing the procedure provided in the OMB A-87. Claimants have the option of using 10% of direct labor, excluding fringe benefits, or preparing an Indirect Cost Rate Proposal (ICRP) for the department if the indirect cost rate claimed exceeds 10%. If more than one department is claiming indirect costs for the mandated program, each department must have its own ICRP prepared in accordance with OMB A-87. An ICRP must be submitted with the claim when the indirect cost rate exceeds 10%.

## VI. 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 IV, 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 State Controller's Office, as may be requested, and all reimbursement claims are subject to audit during the period specified in Government Code section 17558.5, subdivision (a).~~

## VII. Data for Development of a Statewide Cost Estimate

The State Controller's Office is directed to include in the claiming instructions a request that claimants send an additional copy of the test claim specific form for the initial years' reimbursement claim by mail or facsimile to the Commission on State Mandates, 1300 I Street,

---

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

Suite 950, Sacramento, California 95814, Facsimile number: (916) 445-0278. Although providing this information to the Commission on State Mandates is not a condition of reimbursement, claimants are encouraged to provide this information to enable the Commission to develop a statewide cost estimate which will be the basis for the Legislature's appropriation for this program.

#### **VIII. Offsetting Savings and Other Reimbursement**

Any offsetting savings the claimant experiences as a direct result of the subject mandate must be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate received from any source, including but not limited to, service fees collected under Penal Code section 1203.097, subdivision (c)(5)(B), federal funds and other state funds shall be identified and deducted from this claim.

#### **IX. State Controller's Office Required Certification**

An authorized representative of the claimant shall 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 herein.