



**AUDIT OF THE  
VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER  
FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014-15 AND 2015-16**

---

**Department of Developmental Services  
May 29, 2018**

This audit report was prepared by the  
California Department of Developmental Services  
1600 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Patti Mericantante, Deputy Director, Administration Division  
Vicky Lovell, Chief, Research, Audit, and Evaluation Branch  
Edward Yan, Manager, Audit Section  
Luciah Ellen Nzima, Chief, Regional Center Audit Unit  
Oscar Perez, Supervisor, Regional Center Audit Unit

Audit Staff: Carlos Whylesmenchaca, Chanta Ham, and Manipal Gill

For more information, please call: (916) 654-3695

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
BACKGROUND.....	5
Authority .....	6
Criteria.....	6
Audit Period.....	6
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY.....	7
I.    Purchase of Service .....	8
II.   Regional Center Operations.....	8
III.  Targeted Case Management and Regional Center Rate Study.....	9
IV.   Service Coordinator Caseload Survey.....	9
V.    Early Intervention Program (Part C Funding).....	10
VI.   Family Cost Participation Program .....	10
VII.  Annual Family Program Fee.....	11
VIII. Parental Fee Program .....	11
IX.   Procurement.....	12
X.    Statewide/Regional Center Median Rates.....	13
XI.   Other Sources of Funding from DDS.....	14
XII.  Follow-up Review on Prior DDS Audit Findings.....	15
CONCLUSIONS.....	16
VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS.....	17
RESTRICTED USE .....	18
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	19
EVALUATION OF RESPONSE.....	21
REGIONAL CENTER'S RESPONSE .....	Appendix A

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) conducted a fiscal compliance audit of Valley Mountain Regional Center (VMRC) to ensure VMRC is compliant with the requirements set forth in the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act and Related Laws/Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code; the Home and Community-based Services (HCBS) Waiver for the Developmentally Disabled; California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 17; Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars A-122 and A-133; and the contract with DDS. Overall, the audit indicated that VMRC maintains accounting records and supporting documentation for transactions in an organized manner.

The audit period was July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2016, with follow-up, as needed, into prior and subsequent periods. This report identifies some areas where VMRC's administrative and operational controls could be strengthened, but none of the findings were of a nature that would indicate systemic issues or constitute major concerns regarding VMRC's operations. A follow-up review was performed to ensure VMRC has taken corrective action to resolve the findings identified in the prior DDS audit report.

### **Findings that need to be addressed.**

#### **Finding 1: Missing Equipment (Repeat)**

The sampled review of 40 items selected from VMRC's inventory listing revealed that four items were missing. This issue was also noted in the prior audit report. This is not in compliance with the State Contract, Article IV, Section 4(a).

#### **Finding 2: Salaries for Senior Companion Program Not Recorded**

VMRC did not maintain separate payroll records for the Senior Companion Program (SCP), to ensure proper accounting for the program's funding. SCP payroll expenses for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 were recorded in the Foster Grandparents Program's (FGP) payroll expense account. This is not in compliance with the State Contract, Exhibit H, Memorandum of Understanding Senior Companion, Section IV.

#### **Finding 3: Policies and Procedures for Vendor Audits and Reviews**

The review of the list of VMRC vendors required to contract with an independent accounting firm for an audit or review of its financial statements revealed that in FYs 2013-14 and 2014-15, 72 out of 109 vendors, and 85 out of 109 vendors, respectively, did not submit the required reports. It was noted that VMRC has no procedures in place to follow up with these vendors who are required to, but have not yet

submitted audit reports or reviews. This is not in compliance with W&I Code, Section 4652.5(a)(1)(A) and (B).

## BACKGROUND

---

DDS is responsible, under the W&I Code, for ensuring that persons with developmental disabilities (DD) receive the services and supports they need to lead more independent, productive, and integrated lives. To ensure that these services and supports are available, DDS contracts with 21 private, nonprofit community agencies/corporations that provide fixed points of contact in the community for serving eligible individuals with DD and their families in California. These fixed points of contact are referred to as regional centers (RCs). The RCs are responsible under State law to help ensure that such persons receive access to the programs and services that are best suited to them throughout their lifetime.

DDS is also responsible for providing assurance to the Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), that services billed under California's HCBS Waiver program are provided and that criteria set forth for receiving funds have been met. As part of DDS' program for providing this assurance, the Audit Section conducts fiscal compliance audits of each RC no less than every two years, and completes follow-up reviews in alternate years. Also, DDS requires RCs to contract with independent Certified Public Accountants (CPAs) to conduct an annual financial statement audit. The DDS audit is designed to wrap around the independent CPA's audit to ensure comprehensive financial accountability.

In addition to the fiscal compliance audit, each RC will also be monitored by the DDS Federal Programs Operations Section to assess overall programmatic compliance with HCBS Waiver requirements. The HCBS Waiver compliance monitoring review has its own criteria and processes. These audits and program reviews are an essential part of an overall DDS monitoring system that provides information on RCs' fiscal, administrative, and program operations.

DDS and Valley Mountain Regional Center, Inc., entered into State Contract HD149021, effective July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2021. This contract specifies that Valley Mountain Regional Center, Inc., will operate an agency known as the Valley Mountain Regional Center (VMRC) to provide services to individuals with DD and their families in Amador, Calaveras, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne Counties. The contract is funded by state and federal funds that are dependent upon VMRC performing certain tasks, providing services to eligible consumers, and submitting billings to DDS.

This audit was conducted at VMRC from October 24, 2016, through December 1, 2016, by the Audit Section of DDS.

## **AUTHORITY**

The audit was conducted under the authority of the W&I Code, Section 4780.5 and Article IV, Section 3 of the State Contract between DDS and VMRC.

## **CRITERIA**

The following criteria were used for this audit:

- W&I Code,
- “Approved Application for the HCBS Waiver for the Developmentally Disabled,”
- CCR, Title 17,
- OMB Circulars A-122 and A-133, and
- The State Contract between DDS and VMRC, effective July 1, 2014.

## **AUDIT PERIOD**

The audit period was July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2016, with follow-up, as needed, into prior and subsequent periods.

## OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

---

This audit was conducted as part of the overall DDS monitoring system that provides information on RCs' fiscal, administrative, and program operations. The objectives of this audit were:

- To determine compliance with the W&I Code,
- To determine compliance with the provisions of the HCBS Waiver Program for the Developmentally Disabled,
- To determine compliance with CCR, Title 17 regulations,
- To determine compliance with OMB Circulars A-122 and A-133, and
- To determine that costs claimed were in compliance with the provisions of the State Contract between DDS and VMRC.

The audit was conducted in accordance with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. However, the procedures do not constitute an audit of VMRC's financial statements. DDS limited the scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that VMRC was in compliance with the objectives identified above. Accordingly, DDS examined transactions on a test basis to determine whether VMRC was in compliance with the W&I Code; the HCBS Waiver for the Developmentally Disabled; CCR, Title 17; OMB Circulars A-122 and A-133; and the State Contract between DDS and VMRC.

DDS' review of VMRC's internal control structure was conducted to gain an understanding of the transaction flow and the policies and procedures, as necessary, to develop appropriate auditing procedures.

DDS reviewed the annual audit reports that were conducted by an independent CPA firm for FYs 2013-14 and 2014-15, issued on March 9, 2015 and March 24, 2016, respectively. It was noted that no management letter was issued for VMRC. This review was performed to determine the impact, if any, upon the DDS audit and, as necessary, develop appropriate audit procedures.



The audit procedures performed included the following:

## **I. Purchase of Service**

DDS selected a sample of Purchase of Service (POS) claims billed to DDS. The sample included consumer services and vendor rates. The sample also included consumers who were eligible for the HCBS Waiver Program. For POS claims, the following procedures were performed:

- DDS tested the sample items to determine if the payments made to service providers were properly claimed and could be supported by appropriate documentation.
- DDS selected a sample of invoices for service providers with daily and hourly rates, standard monthly rates, and mileage rates to determine if supporting attendance documentation was maintained by VMRC. The rates charged for the services provided to individual consumers were reviewed to ensure compliance with the provisions of the W&I Code; the HCBS Waiver for the Developmentally Disabled; CCR, Title 17, OMB Circulars A-122 and A-133; and the State Contract between DDS and VMRC.
- DDS analyzed all of VMRC's bank accounts to determine whether DDS had signatory authority, as required by the State Contract with DDS.
- DDS selected a sample of bank reconciliations for Operations (OPS) accounts and Consumer Trust bank accounts to determine if the reconciliations were properly completed on a monthly basis.

## **II. Regional Center Operations**

DDS selected a sample of OPS claims billed to DDS to determine compliance with the State Contract. The sample included various expenditures claimed for administration that were reviewed to ensure VMRC's accounting staff properly input data, transactions were recorded on a timely basis, and expenditures charged to various operating areas were valid and reasonable. The following procedures were performed:

- A sample of the personnel files, timesheets, payroll ledgers, and other support documents were selected to determine if there were any overpayments or errors in the payroll or the payroll deductions.
- A sample of OPS expenses, including, but not limited to, purchases of office supplies, consultant contracts, insurance expenses, and lease agreements, were tested to determine compliance with the State Contract.

- A sample of equipment was selected and physically inspected to determine compliance with requirements of the State Contract.
- DDS reviewed VMRC's policies and procedures for compliance with the DDS Conflict of Interest regulations, and DDS selected a sample of personnel files to determine if the policies and procedures were followed.

### **III. Targeted Case Management (TCM) and Regional Center Rate Study**

The TCM Rate Study determines the DDS rate of reimbursement from the federal government. The following procedures were performed upon the study:

- Reviewed applicable TCM records and VMRC's Rate Study. DDS examined the months of March 2014 and April 2015, and traced the reported information to source documents.
- Reviewed VMRC's TCM Time Study. DDS selected a sample of payroll timesheets for this review and compared timesheets to the Case Management Time Study Forms (DS 1916) to ensure that the forms were properly completed and supported.

### **IV. Service Coordinator Caseload Survey**

Under the W&I Code, Section 4640.6(e), RCs are required to provide service coordinator caseload data to DDS. The following average service coordinator-to-consumer ratios apply per W&I Code Section 4640.6(c)(1)(2)(3)(A)(B)(C):

- “(c) Contracts between the department and regional centers shall require regional centers to have service coordinator-to-consumer ratios, as follows:
- (1) An average service coordinator-to-consumer ratio of 1 to 62 for all consumers who have not moved from the developmental centers to the community since April 14, 1993. In no case shall a service coordinator for these consumers have an assigned caseload in excess of 79 consumers for more than 60 days.
  - (2) An average service coordinator-to-consumer ratio of 1 to 45 for all consumers who have moved from a developmental center to the community since April 14, 1993. In no case shall a service coordinator for these consumers have an assigned caseload in excess of 59 consumers for more than 60 days.
  - (3) Commencing January 1, 2004, the following coordinator-to-consumer ratios shall apply:
    - (A) All consumers three years of age and younger and for

consumers enrolled in the Home and Community-based Services Waiver program for persons with developmental disabilities, an average service coordinator-to-consumer ratio of 1 to 62.

- (B) All consumers who have moved from a developmental center to the community since April 14, 1993, and have lived continuously in the community for at least 12 months, an average service coordinator-to-consumer ratio of 1 to 62.
- (C) All consumers who have not moved from the developmental centers to the community since April 14, 1993, and who are not described in subparagraph (A), an average service coordinator-to-consumer ratio of 1 to 66.”

DDS also reviewed the Service Coordinator Caseload Survey methodology used in calculating the caseload ratios to determine reasonableness and that supporting documentation is maintained to support the survey and the ratios as required by W&I Code, Section 4640.6(e).

#### **V. Early Intervention Program (EIP; Part C Funding)**

For the EIP, there are several sections contained in the Early Start Plan. However, only the Part C section was applicable for this review.

#### **VI. Family Cost Participation Program (FCPP)**

The FCPP was created for the purpose of assessing consumer costs to parents based on income level and dependents. The family cost participation assessments are only applied to respite, day care, and camping services that are included in the child’s Individual Program Plan (IPP)/Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP). To determine whether VMRC was in compliance with CCR, Title 17, and the W&I Code, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

- Reviewed the list of consumers who received respite, day care, and camping services, for ages 0 through 17 years who live with their parents and are not Medi-Cal eligible, to determine their contribution for the FCPP.
- Reviewed the parents’ income documentation to verify their level of participation based on the FCPP Schedule.
- Reviewed copies of the notification letters to verify that the parents were notified of their assessed cost participation within 10 working days of receipt of the parents’ income documentation.

- Reviewed vendor payments to verify that VMRC was paying for only its assessed share of cost.

## **VII. Annual Family Program Fee (AFPF)**

The AFPF was created for the purpose of assessing an annual fee of up to \$200 based on the income level of families with children between the ages of 0 through 17 years receiving qualifying services through the RC. The AFPF fee shall not be assessed or collected if the child receives only respite, day care, or camping services from the RC and a cost for participation was assessed to the parents under FCPP. To determine whether VMRC was in compliance with the W&I Code, Section 4785, DDS requested a list of AFPF assessments and verified the following:

- The adjusted gross family income is at or above 400 percent of the federal poverty level based upon family size.
- The child has a DD or is eligible for services under the California Early Intervention Services Act.
- The child is less than 18 years of age and lives with his or her parent.
- The child or family receives services beyond eligibility determination, needs assessment, and service coordination.
- The child does not receive services through the Medi-Cal program.
- Documentation was maintained by the RC to support reduced assessments.

## **VIII. Parental Fee Program (PFP)**

The PFP was created for the purpose of prescribing financial responsibility to parents of children under the age of 18 years who are receiving 24-hour, out-of-home care services through an RC or who are residents of a state hospital or on leave from a state hospital. Parents shall be required to pay a fee depending upon their ability to pay, but not to exceed (1) the cost of caring for a child without DD at home, as determined by the Director of DDS, or (2) the cost of services provided, whichever is less. To determine whether VMRC is in compliance with the W&I Code, Section 4782, DDS requested a list of PFP assessments and verified the following:

- Identified all children with DD that are receiving the following services:
  - (a) All 24-hour, out-of-home community care received through an RC for children under the age of 18 years;

(b) 24-hour care for such minor children in state hospitals. Provided, however, that no ability to pay determination shall be made for services required by state or federal law, or both, to be provided to children without charge to their parents.

- Provided DDS with a listing of new placements, terminated cases, and client deaths for those clients. Such listings shall be provided not later than the 20th day of the month following the month of such occurrence.
- Informed parents of children who will be receiving services that DDS is required to determine parents' ability to pay and to assess, bill, and collect parental fees.
- Within 10 working days after placement of a minor child, provide the parents a package containing an informational letter, a Family Financial Statement (FFS), and a return envelope.
- A copy of each informational letter given or sent to parents, indicating the addressee and the date given or mailed, shall be submitted to DDS.

## **IX. Procurement**

The Request for Proposal (RFP) process was implemented to ensure RCs outline the vendor selection process when using the RFP process to address consumer service needs. As of January 1, 2011, DDS requires RCs to document their contracting practices, as well as how particular vendors are selected to provide consumer services. By implementing a procurement process, RCs will ensure that the most cost-effective service providers, amongst comparable service providers, are selected, as required by the Lanterman Act and the State Contract, as amended. To determine whether VMRC implemented the required RFP process, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

- Reviewed the VMRC contracting process to ensure the existence of a Board-approved procurement policy and to verify that the RFP process ensures competitive bidding, as required by Article II of the State Contract, as amended.
- Reviewed the RFP contracting policy to determine whether the protocols in place included applicable dollar thresholds and comply with Article II of the State Contract, as amended.
- Reviewed the RFP notification process to verify that it is open to the public and clearly communicated to all vendors. All submitted proposals are evaluated by a team of individuals to determine whether proposals are properly documented, recorded, and authorized by appropriate officials at VMRC. The process was reviewed to ensure that the vendor selection

process is transparent and impartial and avoids the appearance of favoritism. Additionally, DDS verified that supporting documentation is retained for the selection process and, in instances where a vendor with a higher bid is selected, written documentation is retained as justification for such a selection.

DDS performed the following procedures to determine compliance with Article II of the State Contract for contracts in place as of January 1, 2011:

- Selected a sample of Operations, Community Placement Plan (CPP), and negotiated POS contracts subject to competitive bidding to ensure VMRC notified the vendor community and the public of contracting opportunities available.
- Reviewed the contracts to ensure that VMRC has adequate and detailed documentation for the selection and evaluation process of vendor proposals and written justification for final vendor selection decisions and that those contracts were properly signed and executed by both parties to the contract.

In addition, DDS performed the following procedures:

- To determine compliance with the W&I Code, Section 4625.5 for contracts in place as of March 24, 2011: Reviewed to ensure VMRC has a written policy requiring the Board to review and approve any of its contracts of two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) or more before entering into a contract with the vendor.
- Reviewed VMRC Board-approved Operations, Start-Up, and POS vendor contracts of \$250,000 or more, to ensure the inclusion of a provision for fair and equitable recoupment of funds for vendors that cease to provide services to consumers; verified that the funds provided were specifically used to establish new or additional services to consumers, the usage of funds is of direct benefit to consumers, and the contracts are supported with sufficiently detailed and measurable performance expectations and results.

The process above was conducted in order to assess VMRC's current RFP process and Board approval for contracts of \$250,000 or more, as well as to determine whether the process in place satisfies the W&I Code and VMRC's State Contract requirements, as amended.

## **X. Statewide/Regional Center Median Rates**

The Statewide and RC Median Rates were implemented on July 1, 2008, and amended on December 15, 2011, to ensure that RCs are not negotiating rates

higher than the set median rates for services. Despite the median rate requirement, rate increases could be obtained from DDS under health and safety exemptions where RCs demonstrate the exemption is necessary for the health and safety of the consumers.

To determine whether VMRC was in compliance with the Lanterman Act, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

- Reviewed sample vendor files to determine whether VMRC is using appropriately vendorized service providers and correct service codes, and that VMRC is paying authorized contract rates and complying with the median rate requirements of W&I Code, Section 4691.9.
- Reviewed vendor contracts to ensure that VMRC is reimbursing vendors using authorized contract median rates and verified that rates paid represented the lower of the statewide or RC median rate set after June 30, 2008. Additionally, DDS verified that providers vendorized before June 30, 2008, did not receive any unauthorized rate increases, except in situations where required by regulation, or health and safety exemptions were granted by DDS.
- Reviewed vendor contracts to ensure that VMRC did not negotiate rates with new service providers for services which are higher than the RC's median rate for the same service code and unit of service, or the statewide median rate for the same service code and unit of service, whichever is lower. DDS also ensured that units of service designations conformed with existing RC designations or, if none exists, ensured that units of service conformed to a designation used to calculate the statewide median rate for the same service code.

## **XI. Other Sources of Funding from DDS**

RCs may receive other sources of funding from DDS. DDS performed sample tests on identified sources of funds from DDS to ensure VMRC's accounting staff were inputting data properly, and that transactions were properly recorded and claimed. In addition, tests were performed to determine if the expenditures were reasonable and supported by documentation. The sources of funding from DDS identified in this audit are:

- CPP;
- Part C – Early Start Program;
- Foster Grandparent Program; and
- Senior Companion Program

## **XII. Follow-up Review on Prior DDS Audit Findings**

As an essential part of the overall DDS monitoring system, a follow-up review of the prior DDS audit findings was conducted. DDS identified prior audit findings that were reported to VMRC and reviewed supporting documentation to determine the degree of completeness of VMRC's implementation of corrective actions.



## CONCLUSIONS

---

Based upon the audit procedures performed, DDS has determined that except for the items identified in the Findings and Recommendations section, VMRC was in compliance with applicable sections of the W&I Code; the HCBS Waiver for the Developmentally Disabled; CCR, Title 17; OMB Circulars A-122 and A-133; and the State Contract between DDS and VMRC for the audit period, July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2016.

The costs claimed during the audit period were for program purposes and adequately supported.

From the review of prior audit issues, it has been determined that VMRC has not taken appropriate corrective action to resolve one prior audit issue.

## **VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS**

---

DDS issued the draft audit report on February 16, 2018. The findings in the draft audit report were discussed at a formal exit conference with VMRC on February 21, 2018. The views of VMRC's responsible officials are included in this final audit report.

## **RESTRICTED USE**

---

This audit report is solely for the information and use of DDS, Department of Health Care Services, CMS, and VMRC. This restriction does not limit distribution of this audit report, which is a matter of public record.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### Findings that need to be addressed.

#### **Finding 1: Missing Equipment (Repeat)**

The sampled review of 40 items selected from VMRC's inventory listing revealed that four items were missing. VMRC stated this occurred due to an oversight, as the items may have been disposed of and form Std. 152, Property Survey Report was not completed for each of the four missing items. This issue was also noted in the prior audit report.

State's Equipment Management System Guidelines, Section III, E states in part:

"RCs will conform with the following guidelines for any state-owned equipment that is junked, recycled, lost, stolen, donated, destroyed, traded-in, transferred or otherwise removed from the control of the RC.

RCs shall work directly with their regional Department of General Services' (DGS) office to properly dispose of State-owned equipment. RCs will complete a Property Survey Report (Std. 152) for all State-owned equipment subject to disposal. DGS must review and approve the Std. 152 before the equipment is actually disposed."

#### **Recommendation:**

VMRC must ensure all state owned equipment is properly safeguarded. Also, any equipment subject to disposal must be properly surveyed as required by State's Equipment Management System Guidelines.

#### **Finding 2: Salaries for Senior Companion Program Not Recorded**

VMRC did not maintain separate payroll records for the SCP, to ensure proper accounting for the program's funding. SCP payroll expenses for FY 2015-16 were recorded in the FGP's payroll expense account. VMRC indicated this occurred due to an oversight.

State Contract, Exhibit H, Memorandum of Understanding Senior Companion, Section IV states in part:

"Contractor shall maintain separate records and accounts for the Senior Companion Program as deemed necessary by DDS (including property, personnel, and financial records) to enable it to meet DDS' fiscal responsibilities to the Corporation for National and Community

Services, and to assure a proper accounting for all Program funds, both federal and non-federal shares.”

**Recommendation:**

VMRC must adjust its General Ledger to ensure all expenses related to the SCP are correctly recorded. This will ensure accurate information is utilized when reporting the SCP funding source.

**Finding 3: Policies and Procedures for Vendor Audits and Reviews**

The review of the list of VMRC vendors required to contract with an independent accounting firm for an audit or review of its financial statements revealed that in FYs 2013-14 and 2014-15, 72 out of 109 vendors, and 85 out of 109 vendors, respectively, did not submit the required reports. However, VMRC has no procedures in place to follow up with vendors who are required to but have not yet submitted audit reports or reviews.

W&I Code Section 4652.5(a)(1)(A) and (B) states in part:

“(a)(1) An entity receiving payments from one or more regional centers shall contract with an independent accounting firm for an audit or review of its financial statements subject to all of the following:

- (A) When the amount received from the regional center or regional centers during the entity's fiscal year is more than or equal to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) but less than five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), the entity shall obtain an independent audit or independent review report of its financial statements for the period.
- (B) When the amount received from the regional center or regional centers during the entity's fiscal year is equal to or more than five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), the entity shall obtain an independent audit of its financial statements for the period.”

**Recommendation:**

VMRC must develop policies to ensure it is properly tracking and following up with vendors who are required to, but have not yet, submitted audit reports or reviews. Failure to receive these reports limits VMRC’s ability to detect issues that may have an impact on RC services.

## EVALUATION OF RESPONSE

---

As part of the audit report process, VMRC was provided with a draft audit report and requested to provide a response to the findings. VMRC's response dated February 21, 2018, is provided as Appendix A.

DDS' Audit Section has evaluated VMRC's response and will confirm the appropriate corrective actions have been taken during the next scheduled audit.

**Finding 1: Missing Equipment (Repeat)**

VMRC agrees with the finding, and has revised its procedures to ensure items are properly disposed. A follow-up will be conducted during the next scheduled audit to ensure items are properly safeguarded and disposed items are properly surveyed.

**Finding 2: Salaries for Senior Companion Program Not Recorded**

VMRC agrees with the finding. VMRC stated that through consultation with its DDS liaison, commencing with FY 2018-19, VMRC will allocate the FGP/SCP salaries to each individual program's general ledger account on a monthly basis. A follow-up will be conducted during the next scheduled audit to ensure VMRC is properly accounting for the SCP salary expenditures.

**Finding 3: Policies and Procedures for Vendor Audits and Reviews**

VMRC agrees with the finding and indicated it has developed policies and established a position to monitor the VMRC vendors required to contract with an independent accounting firm for an audit or review. A follow-up will be conducted during the next scheduled audit to ensure vendors are submitting the required reports.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER**

#### **RESPONSE TO AUDIT FINDINGS**

**The regional center response to the audit findings is currently not compliant with the digital accessibility law. To request a copy of this document, please contact the DDS Audit Section at (916) 654-3695.**