



**AUDIT OF THE  
REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER  
FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 AND 2018-19**

---

**Department of Developmental Services**

**July 15, 2020**

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

Jim Knight, Deputy Director, Administration  
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: Chanta Ham, Carlos Whylesmenchaca and Gordon Ho

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
BACKGROUND .....	3
AUTHORITY .....	4
CRITERIA.....	4
AUDIT PERIOD .....	4
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY.....	5
I. Purchase of Service .....	6
II. Regional Center Operations .....	6
III. Targeted Case Management (TCM) and Regional Center Rate Study .....	7
IV. Service Coordinator Caseload Survey.....	7
V. Early Intervention Program (EIP; Part C Funding).....	8
VI. Family Cost Participation Program (FCPP) .....	8
VII. Annual Family Program Fee (AFPF).....	9
VIII. Parental Fee Program (PFP) .....	9
IX. Procurement.....	10
X. Statewide/Regional Center Median Rates .....	11
XI. Other Sources of Funding from DDS.....	12
XII. Follow-up Review of Prior DDS Audit Findings.....	13
CONCLUSIONS.....	14
VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS .....	15
RESTRICTED USE .....	16
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	17
EVALUATION OF RESPONSE.....	20
ATTACHMENTS A - D .....	21
APPENDIX A.....	22

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) conducted a fiscal compliance audit of Redwood Coast Regional Center (RCRC) to ensure that RCRC 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 RCRC maintains accounting records and supporting documentation for transactions in an organized manner.

The audit period was July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019, with follow-up, as needed, into prior and subsequent periods. This report identified areas in which RCRC's administrative and operational controls could be strengthened, but the findings were not of a nature that would indicate a systemic issue or constitute a major concern regarding RCRC's operations. A follow-up review was performed to ensure RCRC has taken corrective action to resolve the finding identified in the prior DDS audit report.

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

#### **Finding 1: Overstated Claims**

The review of the Operational Indicator Reports revealed 15 instances where RCRC overpaid five vendors a total of \$2,805.22. The overstated claims were due to duplicate payments, overlapping authorizations, or payments made above the authorized number of units. This is not in compliance with CCR, Title 17, Section 54326(a)(10) and Section 57300(c)(2).

RCRC provided additional documentation with its response indicating that overpayments totaling \$2,720.27 out of \$2,805.22 have been resolved. Therefore, the outstanding overpayment is \$84.95.

#### **Finding 2: Equipment Inventory**

##### **A. Inaccurate Equipment Inventory Listing**

RCRC's inventory process was reviewed to determine if the current Equipment Inventory listing was accurate. It was noted that the listing contained 18 duplicate items, 108 items that had been surveyed, and three items that were not in the location listed on the inventory listing. In addition, there were five items that were not included in the inventory listing. Also, the review of 50 sampled items from the Equipment

Inventory listing revealed 22 items were missing. This is not in compliance with the State's Equipment Management Systems Guidelines, Section III(D) and the State Contract, Article IV, Section 4(a).

RCRC provided an updated Equipment Inventory Listing with its response indicating that its listing has been corrected.

**B. Equipment Purchases Not Reported Quarterly**

The review of RCRC's Equipment Acquired Under Contract forms (DS 2130) revealed that RCRC did not provide to DDS a quarterly listing of nonexpendable and sensitive items purchased during FYs 2017-18 and 2018-19. This is not in compliance with the State's Equipment Management Guidelines, Section III(B).

**Finding 3: Vendor Audit Reports Not Submitted**

The review of RCRC's listing of vendors that submitted independent audit reports revealed that RCRC did not submit copies of the reports to DDS. This is not in compliance with the W&I Code, Section 4652.5(d)(2).

## BACKGROUND

---

DDS is responsible, under the W&I Code, for ensuring that persons with developmental disabilities (DD) receives 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 contacts 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 the 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 Redwood Coast Regional Center, Inc. entered into State Contract HD149013, effective July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2021. This contract specifies that Redwood Coast Regional Center, Inc. will operate an agency known as RCRC to provide services to individuals with DD and their families in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Lake Counties. The contract is funded by state and federal funds that are dependent upon RCRC performing certain tasks, providing services to eligible consumers, and submitting billings to DDS.

This audit was conducted at RCRC from October 15, 2019 through November 8, 2019 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 RCRC.

## **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 RCRC, effective July 1, 2014.

## **AUDIT PERIOD**

The audit period was July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019, 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 RCRC.

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 RCRC's financial statements. DDS limited the scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that RCRC was in compliance with the objectives identified above. Accordingly, DDS examined transactions on a test basis to determine whether RCRC 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 RCRC.

DDS' review of RCRC'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 report that was conducted by an independent CPA firm for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18, issued on March 16, 2019. It was noted that a management letter was issued for RCRC. 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 RCRC. The rates charged for the services provided to individual consumers were reviewed to ensure compliance with the provision 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 RCRC.
- DDS analyzed all of RCRC'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 RCRC'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 CCR, Title 17, and the State Contract.

- A sample of equipment was selected and physically inspected to determine compliance with requirements of the State Contract.
- DDS reviewed RCRC'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 RCRC's Rate Study. DDS examined the months of April 2018 and April 2019 and traced the reported information to source documents.
- Reviewed RCRC's TCM Time Study. DDS selected a sample of payroll timesheets for this review and compared it 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 IPP/IFSP. To determine whether RCRC was in compliance with CCR, Title 17, and the W&I Code, Section 4783, 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 RCRC 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 RCRC 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 RCRC 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 who 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.
- Provided parents a package containing an informational letter, a Family Financial Statement (FFS), and a return envelope within 10 working days after placement of a minor child.
- Provided DDS a copy of each informational letter given or sent to parents, indicating the addressee and the date given or mailed.

## **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. To determine whether RCRC implemented the required RFP process, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

- Reviewed RCRC's 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 RCRC. 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 RCRC notified the vendor community and the public of contracting opportunities available.
- Reviewed the contracts to ensure that RCRC 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 RCRC 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 RCRC 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 RCRC'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 RCRC'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 and July 1, 2016, 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 RCRC was in compliance with the Lanterman Act, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

- Reviewed sample vendor files to determine whether RCRC is using appropriately vendorized service providers and correct service codes, and that RCRC 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 RCRC 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 RCRC 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 RCRC'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; and
- Self Determination.

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

As an essential part of the overall DDS monitoring system, a follow-up review of the prior DDS audit finding was conducted. DDS identified the prior audit finding that was reported to RCRC and reviewed the supporting documentation to determine the degree of completeness of RCRC'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, RCRC 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 RCRC for the audit period, July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019.

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

From the review of the one prior audit finding, it has been determined that RCRC has taken appropriate corrective action to resolve the finding.

## **VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS**

---

DDS issued the draft audit report on March 12, 2020. The findings in the draft audit report were discussed at a formal exit conference with RCRC on March 12, 2020. The views of RCRC's responsible officials are included in this final audit report.

## **RESTRICTED USE**

---

This audit report is solely for the information and use of DDS, CMS, Department of Health Care Services, and RCRC. 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: Overstated Claims

The review of the Operational Indicator Reports revealed 15 instances where RCRC overstated claims for 10 vendors totaling \$2,805.22. The overstated claims were due to duplicate payments, overlapping authorizations, or payments made above the authorized number of units. RCRC indicated that the overpayments occurred due to an error on its part. (See Attachment A)

RCRC provided additional documentation with its response indicating that overpayments totaling \$2,720.27 out of \$2,805.22 have been resolved. Therefore, the outstanding overpayment is \$84.95.

Title 17, Section 54326(a)(10) states in part:

(a) "All vendors shall...

(10) Bill only for services which are actually provided to consumers and which have been authorized by the referring regional center."

In addition, Title 17, section 57300(c)(2) states in part:

(c) "Regional centers shall not reimburse vendors: ...

(2) For services in an amount greater than the rate established pursuant to these regulations."

#### Recommendation:

RCRC must reimburse DDS \$84.95 for the outstanding overpayment. In addition, RCRC must ensure its staff monitor the Operational Indicator Reports for errors that may have occurred while doing business with its vendors.

#### Finding 2: Equipment Inventory

##### A. Inaccurate Equipment Inventory Listing

RCRC's inventory process was reviewed to determine if the current Equipment Inventory listing was accurate. It was noted that the listing

contained 18 duplicate items, 108 items that had been surveyed, and three items were not in the location listed in the inventory listing. In addition, there were five items that were not included in the Equipment Inventory listing. (See Attachment B) Also, the review of 50 sampled items from the Equipment Inventory listing revealed 22 items were missing. RCRC indicated this occurred because the Property Custodian was not notified when items were purchased, disposed or moved to different location. (See Attachment C)

RCRC provided an updated Equipment Inventory Listing with its response indicating that its listing has been corrected.

Section III(D), of the State's Equipment Management Systems Guidelines, dated February 1, 2003, states in part:

“A record of state-owned, nonexpendable equipment and sensitive equipment shall be maintained by the RC Property Custodian in a format that includes the following information: description of the equipment item, the locations (e.g., RC office or room number), the state I.D. tag number, the serial number (if any), the acquisition date, and the original cost.”

Article IV, Section 4a of the contract between DDS and RCRC states:

“Contractor shall maintain and administer, in accordance with sound business practice, a program for the utilization, care, maintenance, protection and preservation of State of California property so as to assure its full availability and usefulness for the performance of this contract. Contractor shall comply with the State's Equipment Management System Guidelines for regional center equipment and appropriate directions and instructions which the State may prescribe as reasonably necessary for the protection of State of California property.”

**Recommendation:**

RCRC must ensure its Equipment Inventory listing is accurate and that all equipment affixed with a state tag is accounted for on the equipment listing. In addition, if RCRC is unable to locate the missing items, RCRC must properly survey the items and remove them from the equipment listing.

**B. Equipment Purchases Not Reported Quarterly**

The review of RCRC's Equipment Acquired Under Contract, DS 2130, revealed RCRC did not provide DDS a listing of 105 nonexpendable

and sensitive items purchased during the FYs 2017-18 and 2018-19. The items should have been forwarded to DDS' Customer Support Section (CSS) on a quarterly basis. RCRC indicated that the DS 2130 forms were completed yearly but the Property Custodian was not being notified of newly acquired equipment until the end of each year. (See Attachment D)

State's Equipment Management Guidelines Section III(B) states in part:

“RCs will also provide the Department of Developmental Services' (DDS) Customer Support Section (CSS) with a list of all state-owned, nonexpendable and sensitive equipment received during each calendar quarter. This information is to be provided to CSS quarterly, utilizing the Equipment Acquired Under Contract form (DS 2130), or suitable electronic alternative.”

**Recommendation:**

RCRC must provide DDS' CSS a listing of all state-owned, nonexpendable and sensitive equipment purchased on a quarterly basis.

**Finding 3: Vendor Audit Reports Not Submitted**

The review of RCRC's listing of vendors that submitted independent audit reports revealed that RCRC did not submit copies of the independent audit reports to DDS for its review. RCRC indicated that it was not aware that audit reports must be submitted to DDS for review.

Welfare & Institutions Code, Section 4652.5(d)(2), states in part:

“A regional center shall submit copies of all independent audit reports that it receives to the department for review. The department shall compile data, by regional center, on vendor compliance with audit requirements and opinions resulting from audit reports and shall annually publish the data in the performance dashboard developed pursuant to Section 4572.”

**Recommendation:**

RCRC must ensure all independent audit reports it received from vendors are submitted to DDS for review.

## EVALUATION OF RESPONSE

---

As part of the audit report process, RCRC was provided with a draft audit report and requested to provide a response to the findings. RCRC's response dated April 29, 2020, is provided as Appendix A.

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

### **Finding 1: Overstated Claims**

RCRC provided documentation indicating that a total of \$628.00 out of \$2,805.22 were legitimate payments for services provided to consumers during transition from one Trust Management company to another. In addition, RCRC stated that it corrected payments totaling \$2,092.27 and had requested repayment of \$84.95 from a vendor. Therefore, RCRC must reimburse DDS the overpayment totaling \$84.95 still remaining.

### **Finding 2: Equipment Inventory**

#### **A. Inaccurate Equipment Inventory Listing**

RCRC agreed with the finding and provided an updated Equipment Inventory Listing with its response which indicated that this issue has been resolved.

#### **B. Equipment Purchases Not Reported Quarterly**

RCRC agreed with the finding and stated that it will begin to submit a listing of all state-owned, nonexpendable and sensitive equipment to DDS on a quarterly basis.

### **Finding 3: Vendor Audit Reports Not Submitted**

RCRC agreed with the finding and stated it will adhere to its policies and procedures to ensure all independent audit reports received from vendors are submitted to DDS for review.

**ATTACHMENTS A - D**

**REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER**

**To request a copy of the attachments for this audit report, please contact the DDS  
Audit Section at (916) 654-3695.**



**Appendix A**

**REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER**

**RESPONSE  
TO AUDIT FINDINGS**

**To request a copy of the regional center response to the audit findings, please contact the DDS Audit Section at (916) 654-3695.**