



BETTY T. YEE
California State Controller

July 20, 2015

Tom Baumgarten, District Superintendent
Morongo Unified School District
5715 Utah Trail
Twentynine Palms, CA 92277

Dear Mr. Baumgarten:

The State Controller's Office performed a desk review of costs claimed by the Morongo Unified School District for the legislatively mandated Collective Bargaining and Collective Bargaining Agreement Disclosure Program (Chapter 961, Statutes of 1975; and Chapter 1213, Statutes of 1991) for the period of July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2012. We conducted our review under the authority of Government Code sections 12410, 17558.5, and 17561. Our review was limited to ensuring that direct and indirect costs were properly reported in accordance with program requirements.

The district claimed \$131,338 for the mandated program. Our review found that \$112,390 is allowable and \$18,948 is unallowable. The costs are unallowable because the district did not report the Winton Act base-year costs and did not claim indirect costs for contract services, as described in the attached Summary of Program Costs and the Review Results. The State made no payments to the district. The State will pay \$112,390, contingent upon available appropriations.

We informed Sharon Flores, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, of the findings via email on June 29, 2015. We did not receive a response from the district.

If you disagree with the review findings, you may file an Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (Commission). The IRC must be filed within three years following the date of this report. You may obtain IRC information at the Commission's website at www.csm.ca.gov/docs/IRCForm.pdf.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim L. Spano, Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, by telephone at (916) 323-5849.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

JVB/as

Attachments

RE: S15-MCC-9040

cc: Sharon Flores, Assistant Superintendent
Business Services
Morongo Unified School District
Lynn K. Lee, Director of Fiscal Services
Morongo Unified School District
Cynna Hinkle, Director
Business Advisory Services
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools
Peter Foggiato, Director
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Amy Tang-Paterno, Education Fiscal Services Consultant
Government Affairs Division
California Department of Education
Thomas Todd, Assistant Program Budget Manager
Education Systems Unit, California Department of Finance
Jay Lal, Manager
Division of Accounting and Reporting
State Controller's Office

Attachment 1— Summary of Program Costs July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2012

Cost Elements	Actual Costs Claimed	Allowable per Review	Review Adjustment	Reference ¹
<u>July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011</u>				
Direct costs:				
Component activities G1 through G3:				
Salaries and benefits	\$ 42,569	\$ 42,569	\$ -	
Materials and supplies	1,044	1,044	-	
Travel	1,218	1,218	-	
Contract services	19,272	19,272	-	
Subtotal	64,103	64,103	-	
Less base-year direct costs adjusted by the Implicit Price Deflator	-	(9,771)	(9,771)	Finding 1
Increased direct costs, G1 through G3	64,103	54,332	(9,771)	
Component activities G4 through G7:				
Salaries and benefits	13,782	13,782	-	
Materials and supplies	718	718	-	
Contract services	1,215	1,215	-	
Increased direct costs, G4 through G7	15,715	15,715	-	
Total increased direct costs, G1 through G7	79,818	70,047	(9,771)	
Indirect costs	3,204	3,782	578	Findings 1, 2
Total program costs	\$ 83,022	73,829	\$ (9,193)	
Less amount paid by the State		-		
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		\$ 73,829		
<u>July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012</u>				
Direct costs:				
Component activities G1 through G3:				
Salaries and benefits	\$ 19,156	\$ 19,156	\$ -	
Materials and supplies	350	350	-	
Travel	1,667	1,667	-	
Contract services	13,838	13,838	-	
Subtotal	35,011	35,011	-	
Less base-year direct costs adjusted by the Implicit Price Deflator	-	(10,101)	(10,101)	Finding 1
Increased direct costs, G1 through G3	35,011	24,910	(10,101)	
Component activities G4 through G7:				
Salaries and benefits	6,695	6,695	-	
Materials and supplies	2,571	2,571	-	
Contract services	2,295	2,295	-	
Increased direct costs, G4 through G7	11,561	11,561	-	
Total increased direct costs, G1 through G7	46,572	36,471	(10,101)	
Indirect costs	1,744	2,090	346	Findings 1, 2
Total program costs	\$ 48,316	38,561	\$ (9,755)	
Less amount paid by the State		-		
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		\$ 38,561		
<u>Summary: July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2012</u>				
Total increased direct costs, G1 through G7	\$ 126,390	\$ 106,518	\$ (19,872)	
Indirect costs	4,948	5,872	924	
Total program costs	\$ 131,338	112,390	\$ (18,948)	
Less amount paid by the State		-		
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		\$ 112,390		

¹ See Attachment 2, Review Results.

Attachment 2— Review Results July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2012

BACKGROUND—

In 1975, the State enacted the Rodda Act (Chapter 961, Statutes of 1975), requiring the employer and employee to meet and negotiate, thereby creating a collective bargaining atmosphere for public school employers. The legislation created the Public Employment Relations Board to issue formal interpretations and rulings regarding collective bargaining under the Rodda Act. In addition, the legislation established organizational rights of employees and representational rights of employee organizations, and recognized exclusive representatives related to collective bargaining.

On July 17, 1978, the Board of Control (now the Commission on State Mandates [Commission]) determined that the Rodda Act imposed a state mandate upon school districts, reimbursable under Government Code section 17561.

Chapter 1213, Statutes of 1991, added Government Code section 3547.5. This section requires school districts to publicly disclose major provisions of a collective bargaining effort before the agreement becomes binding. On August 20, 1998, the Commission determined that this legislation also imposed a state mandate upon school districts, reimbursable under Government Code section 17561.

Claimants are allowed to claim increased costs. For components G1 through G3, increased costs represent the difference between the current-year Rodda Act activities and the base-year Winton Act activities (generally, fiscal year [FY] 1974-75), as adjusted by the Implicit Price Deflator. For components G4 through G7, increased costs represent actual costs incurred.

The seven components are as follows:

- G1 – Determining bargaining units and exclusive representatives
- G2 – Election of unit representatives
- G3 – Cost of negotiations
- G4 – Impasse proceedings
- G5 – Collective bargaining agreement disclosure
- G6 – Contract administration
- G7 – Unfair labor practice charges

The program's parameters and guidelines establish the state mandate and define the reimbursement criteria. The Commission adopted the parameters and guidelines on October 22, 1980, and amended them ten times, most recently on January 29, 2010.

In compliance with Government Code section 17558, the State Controller's Office (SCO) issues claiming instructions to assist school districts in claiming mandated program reimbursable costs.

The current findings are the result of our review of the mandated cost claims filed for the legislatively mandated Collective Bargaining and Collective Bargaining Agreement Disclosure Program for the period of July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2012.

**FINDING 1—
Unreported Winton Act base-year direct costs and related indirect costs**

The district did not report the Winton Act direct costs on its mandated cost claims for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Specifically, the district did not offset the Winton Act base-year costs against the current-year Rodda Act costs for components G1 through G3, thus understating the Winton Act base-year costs by \$19,872 for the review period. Unallowable related indirect costs total \$1,107.

The following table summarizes the unreported Winton Act base-year cost adjustments by fiscal year:

	Fiscal Year		Total
	2010-11	2011-12	
Winton Act base-year costs, FY 1996-97	\$ (2,132)	\$ (2,132)	
Implicit Price Deflator (IPD)	× 4.583	× 4.738	
Winton Act base-year costs adjusted by the IPD	(9,771)	(10,101)	\$ (19,872)
Less reported Winton Act base-year costs	-	-	-
Unreported Winton Act base-year costs adjusted by the IPD	(9,771)	(10,101)	(19,872)
Related indirect cost adjustment	(528)	(579)	(1,107)
Review adjustment	\$ (10,299)	\$ (10,680)	\$ (20,979)

The parameters and guidelines (section H., Supporting Data for Claims – Report Format for Submission of Claim) state:

- a. For component activities G1, G2, and G3:
 - 1. Determination of the “increased costs” for each of these three components requires the costs of current year Rodda Act activities to be offset [reduced] by the cost of the base-year Winton Act activities. The Winton Act base-year is generally fiscal year 1974-75.

Winton Act base-year costs are adjusted by the Implicit Price Deflator prior to offset against the current year Rodda Act costs for these three components. The Implicit Price Deflator shall be listed in the annual claiming instructions of the State Controller.

The Winton Act base-year costs were obtained from the FY 1996-97 claim the district submitted to the SCO’s Division of Accounting and Reporting. The Implicit Price Deflator is reported in the SCO’s annual claiming instructions.

Recommendation

Commencing in FY 2012-13, the district elected to participate in a block grant program, pursuant to Government Code section 17581.6, in lieu of filing annual mandated cost claims. If the district chooses to opt out of the block grant program, we recommend that the district ensure that all Winton Act base-year costs are adjusted by the Implicit Price Deflator, as listed in the SCO’s annual claiming instructions, and are properly offset against the district’s current-year Rodda Act direct costs claimed.

**FINDING 2—
Unclaimed indirect
costs for contract
services**

The district did not claim indirect costs for contract services for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12, resulting in an understatement of \$2,031. We determined allowable indirect costs by multiplying allowable contract services by the indirect cost rate claimed by the district, which agreed to the indirect cost rate approved by the California Department of Education (CDE).

The parameters and guidelines allow indirect cost rates provisionally approved by the CDE. The CDE indirect cost rates are applied to total direct costs (salaries and benefits, materials and supplies, travel, and contract services).

The following table summarizes the calculation of unclaimed indirect costs on contract services by fiscal year:

	Fiscal Year		Total
	2010-11	2011-12	
Allowable contract services	\$ 20,487	\$ 16,133	
Claimed indirect cost rate	5.40%	5.73%	
Review adjustment	\$ 1,106	\$ 925	\$ 2,031

Recommendation

Commencing in FY 2012-13, the district elected to participate in a block grant program, pursuant to Government Code section 17581.6, in lieu of filing annual mandated cost claims. If the district chooses to opt out of the block grant program, we recommend that the district follow the SCO claiming instructions for calculating indirect costs.