

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

1215 O Street, MS 9-90
Sacramento, CA 95814
TTY: 711
(833) 421-0061



October 28, 2022

Maureen O'Connell, Board Vice Chair
Inland Regional Center, Inc.
P.O. Box 19037
San Bernardino, CA 92423

Dear Ms. O'Connell:

The Department of Developmental Services' (DDS) Audit Section has completed the audit of the Inland Regional Center (IRC). The period of review was from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2021, with follow-up as needed into prior and subsequent periods. The enclosed report discusses the areas reviewed along with the findings and recommendations. The audit report includes the response submitted by IRC as Appendix A and DDS' reply on page 18.

If there is a disagreement with the audit findings, a written "Statement of Disputed Issues" may be filed with DDS' Audit Appeals Unit, pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 17, Section 50730, Request for Administrative Review (excerpt enclosed). The "Statement of Disputed Issues" must be filed and submitted within 30 days of receipt of this audit report to the address below:

Office of Legal Affairs
Department of Developmental Services
P.O. Box 944202
Sacramento, CA 94299-9974

The cooperation of IRC's staff in completing the audit is appreciated.

"Building Partnerships, Supporting Choices"

Maureen O'Connell, Board Vice Chair
October 28, 2022
Page two

If you have any questions regarding the audit report, please contact Edward Yan, Manager, Audit Section, at (916) 651-8207.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

38BD4A5930324CE...

PETE CERVINKA
Chief Deputy Director
Data Analytics and Strategy

Enclosure(s)

cc: Lavinia Johnson, IRC
Merissa Stewer, IRC
Bob Sands, DHCS
Carla Castañeda, DDS
Brian Winfield, DDS
Hiren Patel, DDS
Jim Knight, DDS
Ernie Cruz, DDS
Aaron Christian, DDS
Ann Nakamura, DDS
Dean Shellenberger, DDS
Edward Yan, DDS
Luciah Ellen Nzima, DDS
Oscar Perez, DDS

California Code of Regulations
Title 17, Division 2
Chapter 1 - General Provisions
Subchapter 7 - Fiscal Audit Appeals
Article 2 - Administrative Review

§50730. Request for Administrative Review.

a) An individual, entity, or organization which disagrees with any portion or aspect of an audit report issued by the Department or regional center may request an administrative review. The appellant's written request shall be submitted to the Department within 30 days after the receipt of the audit report. The request may be amended at any time during the 30-day period.

(b) If the appellant does not submit the written request within the 30-day period, the appeals review officer shall deny such request, and all audit exceptions or findings in the report shall be deemed final unless the appellant establishes good cause for late filing.

(c) The request shall be known as a "Statement of Disputed Issues." It shall be in writing, signed by the appellant or his/her authorized agent, and shall state the address of the appellant and of the agent, if any agent has been designated. An appellant shall specify the name and address of the individual authorized on behalf of the appellant to receive any and all documents, including the final decision of the Director, relating to proceedings conducted pursuant to this subchapter. The Statement of Disputed Issues need not be formal, but it shall be both complete and specific as to each audit exception or finding being protested. In addition, it shall set forth all of the appellant's contentions as to those exceptions or findings, and the estimated dollar amount of each exception or finding being appealed.

(d) If the appeals review officer determines that a Statement of Disputed Issues fails to state the grounds upon which objections to the audit report are based, with sufficient completeness and specificity for full resolution of the issues presented, he/she shall notify the appellant, in writing, that it does not comply with the requirements of this subchapter.

(e) The appellant has 15 days after the date of mailing of such notice within which to file an amended Statement of Disputed Issues. If the appellant does not amend his/her appeal to correct the stated deficiencies within the time permitted, all audit exceptions or findings affected shall be dismissed from the appeal, unless good cause is shown for the noncompliance.

(f) The appellant shall attach to the Statement of Disputed Issues all documents which he/she intends to introduce into evidence in support of stated contentions. An appellant that is unable to locate, prepare, or compile such documents within the appeal period specified in Subsection (a) above, shall include a statement to this effect in the Statement of Disputed Issues. The appellant shall have an additional 30 days after the expiration of the initial 30-day period in which to submit the documents. Documents that are not submitted within this period shall not be accepted into evidence at any stage of the appeal process unless good cause is shown for the failure to present the documents within the prescribed period.



**AUDIT OF THE
INLAND REGIONAL CENTER
FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 AND 2020-21**

Department of Developmental Services

October 28, 2022

This audit report was prepared by the
California Department of Developmental Services
1215 O Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Pete Cervinka, Chief Deputy Director, Data Analytics and Strategy
Ann Nakamura, Branch 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	2
Authority	3
Criteria.....	3
Audit Period.....	3
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY.....	4
I. Purchase of Service.....	5
II. Regional Center Operations	6
III. Targeted Case Management (TCM) and Regional Center Rate Study	6
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)	8
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 on Prior DDS Audit Findings.....	12
CONCLUSIONS	13
VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS	14
RESTRICTED USE	15
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
EVALUATION OF RESPONSE.....	18
ATTACHMENTS	A-B
REGIONAL CENTER'S RESPONSE	Appendix A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The audit period was July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2021, with follow-up, as needed, into prior and subsequent periods. This report identifies some areas where IRC'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 IRC's operations.

Findings that need to be addressed.

Finding 1: Overstated Claims

The review of the Operational Indicator reports revealed seven instances where IRC overpaid four vendors a total of \$1,425.01 due to duplicate payments and overlapping authorizations. This is not in compliance with CCR, Title 17, Sections 54326(a)(10) and 57300(c).

IRC provided supporting documentation with its response indicating the overstated claims totaling \$1,425.01 have been corrected.

Finding 2: Family Cost Participation

The review of the Family Cost Participation (FCPP) Assessment report revealed IRC assessed seven families a share of cost between March 18, 2020 and April 27, 2020. This is not in compliance with the DDS' Directive 02-032520 issued on March 12, 2020.

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 IRC Center entered into State Contract HD199008, effective July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2026. This contract specifies that IRC will operate an agency known as the Inland Regional Center (IRC) to provide services to individuals with DD and their families in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The contract is funded by state and federal funds that are dependent upon IRC performing certain tasks, providing services to eligible consumers, and submitting billings to DDS.

This audit was conducted remotely from April 25, 2022, through June 2, 2022, 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 IRC.

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 IRC, effective July 1, 2019.

AUDIT PERIOD

The audit period was July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2021, 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 IRC.

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 IRC's financial statements. DDS limited the scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that IRC was in compliance with the objectives identified above.

Accordingly, DDS examined transactions on a test basis to determine whether IRC 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 IRC.

DDS' review of IRC'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) 2020-21, issued on March 14, 2022. It was noted that no management letter was issued for IRC. 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 IRC. 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 IRC.
- DDS selected a sample of individual Consumer Trust Accounts to determine if there were any unusual activities and whether any account balances exceeded \$2,000, as prohibited by the Social Security Administration. In addition, DDS determined if any retroactive Social Security benefit payments received exceeded the \$2,000 resource limit for longer than nine months. DDS also reviewed these accounts to ensure that the interest earnings were distributed quarterly, personal and incidental funds were paid before the 10th of each month, and proper documentation for expenditures was maintained.
- The Client Trust Holding Account, an account used to hold unidentified consumer trust funds, was tested to determine whether funds received were properly identified to a consumer or returned to the Social Security Administration in a timely manner. An interview with IRC staff revealed that IRC has procedures in place to determine the correct recipient of unidentified consumer trust funds. If the correct recipient cannot be determined, the funds are returned to the Social Security Administration or other sources in a timely manner.
- DDS selected a sample of Uniform Fiscal Systems (UFS) reconciliations to determine if any accounts were out of balance or if there were any outstanding items that were not reconciled.
- DDS analyzed all of IRC'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 IRC'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 IRC'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 IRC's Rate Study. DDS examined the months of April 2020 and April 2021 and traced the reported information to source documents.
- Reviewed IRC'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

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 IRC 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 IRC 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 IRC 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 IRC 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 IRC implemented the required RFP process, DDS performed the following procedures during the audit review:

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

- Reviewed sample vendor files to determine whether IRC is using appropriately vendorized service providers and correct service codes, and that IRC 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 IRC 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 IRC 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 IRC'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;
- Family Resource Center; and
- CalFresh

XII. Follow-up Review on Prior DDS Audit Findings

A follow-up review was not conducted since DDS did not identify any findings in the prior audit report.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the audit procedures performed, DDS has determined that except for the items identified in the Findings and Recommendations section, IRC 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 IRC for the audit period, July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2021.

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

VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

DDS issued the draft audit report on August 30, 2022. The findings in the draft audit report were discussed at a formal exit conference with IRC on September 6, 2022. The views of IRC'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 IRC. 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 seven instances where IRC overpaid four vendors a total of \$1,425.01 due to duplicate payments and overlapping authorizations. IRC indicated it was an error on its part as staff did not identify the erroneous payments during the review of the Operational Indicator reports. (See Attachment A)

IRC provided supporting documentation with its response indicating the overstated claims totaling \$1,425.01 have been corrected.

CCR, Title 17, Section 54326(a)(10) states in pertinent 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.”

CCR, Title 17, Section 57300(c) states:

“Regional centers shall not reimburse vendors:

(1) Unless they have a rate established pursuant to these regulations which is currently in effect; nor

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

Recommendation:

IRC should monitor the Operational Indicator reports for errors that may have occurred while doing business with its vendors.

Finding 2: Family Cost Participation

The review of the FCPP Assessment report revealed IRC assessed seven families a share of cost after DDS waived this FCPP requirement on March 12, 2020. The assessments occurred between March 18, 2020 and April 27, 2020. IRC indicated that the families were assessed a share

of cost prior to receiving the DDS' Directive to Waive FCPP assessments during COVID. (See Attachment B)

DDS Directive 02-032520: Requirements Waived Due To COVID-19 states in pertinent part:

“Retroactive to March 12, 2020, regional centers shall not conduct assessments and families shall not be required to pay costs or fees associated with FCPP or AFPF.”

Recommendation:

IRC must follow the DDS' directive and ensure families are not assessed share of cost. In addition, IRC must ensure any families assessed a share of cost after March 12, 2020, are reassessed a zero percent share of cost.

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE

As part of the audit report process, IRC was provided with a draft audit report and requested to provide a response to the findings. IRC's response dated October 7, 2022, is provided as Appendix A.

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

Finding 1: Overstated Claims

IRC agrees with six instances of overpayments totaling \$1,395.01 out of \$1,425.01 and provided supporting documentation indicating the overpaid amount has been reimbursed to DDS. In addition, IRC provided documentation indicating that one payment totaling \$30 was correct.

Finding 2: Family Cost Participation

IRC agrees with the finding that it assessed families a share of cost after the FCPP requirements were suspended. IRC reassessed the families to a zero percent share of cost for all active services to correct the issue. In addition, IRC also stated that the majority of the families did not utilize services as it only reduced the authorized units.

**Inland Regional Center
Overstated Claims
Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21**

No.	Unique Client Identification Number	Vendor Number	Service Code	Sub Code	Service Month	Authorization Number	Overstated Amount	Corrected Amount	Outstanding Balance
1	5625496	PJ5018	491	PIP	Nov-19	20614899	\$37.12	\$37.12	\$0.00
2	5625496	PJ5018	491	PIP	Dec-19	20614899	\$110.64	\$110.64	\$0.00
3	6956057	PJ5018	491	PIP	Dec-19	20621205	\$103.50	\$103.50	\$0.00
4	8283646	PJ4295	773	ICP	Dec-20	21698992	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$0.00
5	8283140	PJ4926	116	OCTCB	Nov-19	20667492	\$196.70	\$196.70	\$0.00
6	8283140	PJ4926	116	OCTCB	Dec-19	20667492	\$295.05	\$295.05	\$0.00
7	8294863	PJ4971	56	ASMNT	Oct-20	21682504	\$652.00	\$652.00	\$0.00
Total Overstated Claims									\$0.00

**Inland Regional Center
FCPP Assessments After Directive
Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21**

No.	Unique Client Identification Number	Assessment Date	FCPP %
1	8269437	4/27/2020	10
2	6940123	4/9/2020	12
3	8267868	4/16/2020	12
4	6966629	4/1/2020	16
5	8230644	3/18/2020	17
6	8267925	4/7/2020	35
7	8266139	4/14/2020	100

APPENDIX A

INLAND REGIONAL CENTER

RESPONSE TO AUDIT FINDINGS

(Certain documents provided by the Inland Regional Center as attachments to its response are not included in this report due to the detailed and sometimes confidential nature of the information.)



INLAND REGIONAL CENTER

Enhancing Lives

...valuing independence, inclusion and empowerment

P. O. Box 19037, San Bernardino, CA 92423

Telephone: (909) 890-3000

Fax: (909) 890-3001

October 7, 2022

Mr. Ed Yan
Manager, Audit Branch
Department of Developmental Services
1600 Ninth Street, Room 230, MS 2-10
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Draft Audit of the Inland Regional Center for Fiscal Year 2019-21

Dear Mr. Yan:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the Department of Developmental Services' (DDS) Draft Audit Report of Findings of Inland Regional Center (IRC) for Fiscal Years 2019-21 dated August 30, 2022. Members of the DDS audit team had a conference call with IRC's executive management on September 6, 2022 to review the findings contained in the audit report. The DDS' recommendation and IRC's response are included in the following pages. Supporting documentations were already provided to the DDS audit team through a secured portal and emails.

We want to thank Mr. Oscar Perez and his team for their utmost professionalism and collaboration with IRC's staff during this audit.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (909) 890-3455.

Sincerely,

Merissa Steuwer
Chief Financial Officer
Inland Regional Center
1365 S Waterman Ave
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Phone: (909) 890-3455
Fax: (909) 890-3101
msteuwer@inlandrc.org

RESPONSES BY IRC TO DDS' DRAFT AUDIT REPORT FOR FY 2019-21

Finding 1: Overstated Claims

The review of the Operational Indicator reports revealed seven instances where IRC overpaid four vendors a total of \$1,425.01 due to duplicate payments and overlapping authorizations. IRC indicated it was an error on its part as staff did not identify the erroneous payments during the review of the Operational Indicator reports. (See Attachment A)

CCR, Title 17, Section 54326(a)(10) states in pertinent 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."

CCR, Title 17, Section 57300(c) states:

"Regional centers shall not reimburse vendors:

- (1) Unless they have a rate established pursuant to these regulations which is currently in effect; nor
- (2) For services in an amount greater than the rate established pursuant to these regulations."

Recommendation:

IRC must reimburse to DDS the overpayment totaling \$1,425.01. In addition, IRC should monitor the Operational Indicator reports for errors that may have occurred while doing business with its vendors.

IRC Response to Finding 1:

IRC has corrected this finding. Please see below our responses and actions to each payment. IRC continues to monitor the Operational Indicator reports.

No.	Unique Client Identification Number	Vendor Number	Service Code	Sub Code	Service Month	Authorization Number	Overstated Amount	IRC's Response
1	5625496	PJ5018	491	PIP	19-Nov	20614899	\$37.12	Corrected. Vendor refunded. Check sent to DDS.
2	5625496	PJ5018	491	PIP	19-Dec	20614899	\$110.64	Corrected. Vendor refunded. Check sent to DDS.
3	6956057	PJ5018	491	PIP	19-Dec	20621205	\$103.50	Corrected. Vendor refunded. Check sent to DDS.
4	8283646	PJ4295	773	ICP	20-Dec	21698992	\$30.00	Amended authorization. Not an overpayment.
5	8283140	PJ4926	116	OCTCB	19-Nov	20667492	\$196.70	Corrected. Deducted from vendor payment.
6	8283140	PJ4926	116	OCTCB	19-Dec	20667492	\$295.05	Corrected. Deducted from vendor payment.
7	8294863	PJ4971	56	ASMNT	20-Oct	21682504	\$652.00	Corrected. Check sent to DDS.
Total Overstated Claims							\$1,425.01	

Finding 2: Family Cost Participation

The review of the FCPP Assessment report revealed IRC assessed seven families a share of cost after DDS waived this FCPP requirement on March 12, 2020. The assessments occurred between March 18, 2020, through April 27, 2020. IRC indicated that the families were assessed a share of cost prior to receiving the DDS' Directive to Waive FCPP assessments during COVID. (See Attachment B)

DDS' Directive 02-032520: Requirements Waived Due To COVID-19 states in pertinent part:

"Retroactive to March 12, 2020, regional centers shall not conduct assessments and families shall not be required to pay costs or fees associated with FCPP or AFPF. "

Recommendation:

IRC must follow the DDS' Directive and ensure families are not assessed share of cost. In addition, IRC must ensure any families assessed a share of cost after March 12, 2020, are reassessed a zero percent share of cost.

IRC Response to Finding 2:

Even though IRC originally assessed FCPP % share of cost, none of below families have paid share of cost. IRC adjusted authorized units of service to reflect FCPP % share of cost. Authorized units of service were reduced with FCPP % share of cost. Even with reduced authorized units of service, majority of families did not fully utilize them. Besides, IRC has corrected this finding. Consumers in below table were all reassessed with FCPP 0% share cost and their families have been informed. For services that are still currently active, authorized units of service were restored and increased to reflect FCPP 0% share of cost.

No.	Unique Client Identification Number	Assessment Date	FCPP %
1	8269437	4/27/2020	10
2	6940123	4/9/2020	12
3	8267868	4/16/2020	12
4	6966629	4/1/2020	16
5	8230644	3/18/2020	17
6	8267925	4/7/2020	35
7	8266139	4/14/2020	100