



Implementation of State Auditor's Recommendations

Audits Released in January 2007 Through December 2008

Special Report to
*Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #5—Revenues and
the Economy*

February 2009 Report 2009-406 S5



CALIFORNIA
STATE AUDITOR

The first five copies of each California State Auditor report are free. Additional copies are \$3 each, payable by check or money order. You can obtain reports by contacting the Bureau of State Audits at the following address:

California State Auditor
Bureau of State Audits
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814
916.445.0255 or TTY 916.445.0033

OR

This report is also available on the World Wide Web <http://www.bsa.ca.gov>

The California State Auditor is pleased to announce the availability of an on-line subscription service. For information on how to subscribe, please contact the Information Technology Unit at 916.445.0255, ext. 456, or visit our Web site at www.bsa.ca.gov.

Alternate format reports available upon request.

Permission is granted to reproduce reports.

For questions regarding the contents of this report, please contact Margarita Fernández, Chief of Public Affairs, at 916.445.0255.

Elaine M. Howle
State Auditor
Doug Cordiner
Chief Deputy

CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR

Bureau of State Audits

555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300

Sacramento, CA 95814

916.445.0255

916.327.0019 fax

www.bsa.ca.gov

February 24, 2009

2009-406 S5

The Governor of California
Members of the Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Governor and Legislative Leaders:

The Bureau of State Audits presents its special report for the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 5—Revenues and the Economy. This report summarizes the audits we issued during the previous two years that are within this subcommittee's purview. This report includes the major findings and recommendations, along with the corrective actions auditees reportedly have taken to implement our recommendations. To facilitate the use of the report we have included a table that summarizes the status of each agency's implementation efforts based on its most recent response.

This information is also available in a special report that is organized by policy areas that generally correspond to the Assembly and Senate standing committees. This special policy area report includes an appendix that identifies monetary benefits that auditees could realize if they implemented our recommendations, and is available on our Web site at www.bsa.ca.gov. Finally, we notify auditees of the release of these special reports.


Our audit efforts bring the greatest returns when the auditee acts upon our findings and recommendations. This report is one vehicle to ensure that the State's policy makers and managers are aware of the status of corrective action agencies and departments report they have taken. Further, we believe the State's budget process is a good opportunity for the Legislature to explore these issues and, to the extent necessary, reinforce the need for corrective action.

Respectfully submitted,



Elaine M. Howle

ELAINE M. HOWLE, CPA
State Auditor



Contents

Introduction	1
Employment Development Department	
Report Number 2008-112, Electronic Waste: Some State Agencies Have Discarded Their Electronic Waste Improperly, While State and Local Oversight Is Limited	3
Equalization, Board of	
Report Number 2007-107, Nonprofit Hospitals: Inconsistent Data Obscure the Economic Value of Their Benefit to Communities, and the Franchise Tax Board Could More Closely Monitor Their Tax-Exempt Status	9
Franchise Tax Board	
Report Number 2007-107, Nonprofit Hospitals: Inconsistent Data Obscure the Economic Value of Their Benefit to Communities, and the Franchise Tax Board Could More Closely Monitor Their Tax-Exempt Status (see summary on page 9)	
Gambling Control Commission	
Report Number 2006-036, Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund: Local Governments Do Not Always Use It to Mitigate the Impacts of Casinos, and Its Viability Will Be Adversely Affected by Compact Amendments	13

Introduction

This report summarizes the major findings and recommendations from audit reports we issued from January 2007 through December 2008, that relate to agencies and departments under the purview of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 5—Revenues and the Economy. The purpose of this report is to identify what actions, if any, these auditees have taken in response to our findings and recommendations. We have placed this symbol ● in the margin of the auditee action to identify areas of concern or issues that we believe an auditee has not adequately addressed.

For this report, we have relied upon periodic written responses prepared by auditees to determine whether corrective action has been taken. The Bureau of State Audits' (bureau) policy requests that the auditee provides a written response to the audit findings and recommendations before the audit report is initially issued publicly. As a follow-up, state law requires the auditee to respond at least three times subsequently: at 60 days, six months, and one year after the public release of the audit report. However, we may request an auditee to provide a response beyond one year or we may initiate a follow-up audit if deemed necessary.

Unless otherwise noted, we have not performed any type of review or validation of the corrective actions reported by the auditees. All corrective actions noted in this report were based on responses received by our office as of January 2009. The table below summarizes the number of recommendations along with the status of each agency's implementation efforts based on its most recent response related to audit reports the office issued from January 2007 through December 2008. Because an audit report and subsequent recommendations may crossover several departments, they may be accounted for on this table more than one time. For instance, the Nonprofit Hospitals Report, 2007-107, is reflected under the Board of Equalization and the Franchise Tax Board.

	INITIAL RESPONSE	FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE			STATUS OF RECOMMENDATION				PAGE NUMBERS
		60-DAY	SIX-MONTH	ONE-YEAR	FULLY IMPLEMENTED	PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	PENDING	NO ACTION TAKEN	
Revenues and the Economy									
Employment Development Department									
E-Waste Report 2008-112	●				0	0	2	0	3
Board of Equalization									
Nonprofit Hospitals Report 2007-107				●	1	0	0	0	9
Franchise Tax Board									
Nonprofit Hospitals Report 2007-107				●	1	1	0	0	9
Gambling Commission									
Indian Gaming Report 2006-036				●	0	0	0	1	13

To obtain copies of the complete audit reports, access the bureau's Web site at www.bsa.ca.gov or contact the bureau at (916) 445-0255 or TTY (916) 445-0033.

Electronic Waste

Some State Agencies Have Discarded Their Electronic Waste Improperly, While State and Local Oversight Is Limited

REPORT NUMBER 2008-112, NOVEMBER 2008

Responses from eight audited state agencies as of November 2008

The Joint Legislative Audit Committee asked the Bureau of State Audits to review state agencies' compliance with laws and regulations governing the recycling and disposal of electronic waste (e-waste). The improper disposal of e-waste in the State may present health problems for its citizens. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), computer monitors and older television picture tubes each contain an average of four pounds of lead and require special handling at the end of their useful lives. The USEPA states that human exposure to lead can present health problems ranging from developmental issues in unborn children to brain and kidney damage in adults. In addition to containing lead, electronic devices can contain other toxic materials such as chromium, cadmium, and mercury. Humans may be exposed to toxic materials from e-waste if its disposal results in the contamination of soil or drinking water.

Finding #1: State agencies appear to have improperly discarded some electronic devices.

In a sample of property survey reports we reviewed, two of the five state agencies in our audit sample—the Department of Motor Vehicles (Motor Vehicles) and the Employment Development Department (Employment Development)—collectively reported discarding 26 electronic devices in the trash. These 26 electronic devices included such items as fax machines, tape recorders, calculators, speakers, and a videocassette recorder that we believe could be considered e-waste. The property survey reports for the other three state agencies in our sample—the California Highway Patrol (CHP), the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Department of Justice (Justice)—do not clearly identify how the agencies disposed of their electronic devices; however, all three indicated that their practices included placing a total of more than 350 of these items in the trash.

State regulations require waste generators to determine whether their waste, including e-waste, is hazardous before disposing of it. However, none of the five state agencies in our sample could demonstrate that they took steps to assess whether their e-waste was hazardous before placing that waste in the trash. Further the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Waste Management Board) has advised consumers, "Unless you are sure [the electronic device] is not hazardous, you should presume [that] these types of devices need to be recycled or disposed of as hazardous waste and that they may not be thrown in the trash."

Audit Highlights . . .

Our review of five state agencies' practices for handling electronic waste (e-waste) revealed that:

- » *The Department of Motor Vehicles and the Employment Development Department improperly disposed of electronic devices in the trash between January 2007 and July 2008.*
- » *The California Highway Patrol, Department of Transportation, and Department of Justice did not clearly indicate how they disposed of some of their e-waste; however, all indicated that they too have discarded some e-waste in the trash.*
- » *The lack of clear communication from oversight agencies, coupled with some state employees' lack of knowledge about e-waste, contributed to these instances of improper disposal.*
- » *State agencies do not consistently report the amount of e-waste they divert from municipal landfills. Further, reporting such information on e-waste is not required.*
- » *State and local oversight of e-waste generators is infrequent, and their reviews may not always identify instances when state agencies have improperly discarded e-waste.*

To avoid contaminating the environment through the inappropriate discarding of electronic devices, we recommended that state agencies ascertain whether the electronic devices that require disposal can go into the trash. Alternatively, state agencies could treat all electronic devices they wish to discard as universal waste and recycle them.

State Agencies' Actions: Pending.

According to their responses to our audit report, the five state agencies we sampled—CHP, Motor Vehicles, Caltrans, Employment Development, and Justice—indicated that they were taking steps to implement our recommendation. CHP stated that it will establish internal policies and procedures to ensure future compliance with e-waste standards. Motor Vehicles stated that as of August 1, 2008, its property and equipment control unit does not allow any electronic equipment to be disposed of in a landfill; it donates this equipment to public schools or, if in bad condition, disposes of it through a recycler that will properly dispose of the equipment. Caltrans stated that it will issue a memorandum to staff responsible for e-waste disposal, clarifying responsibilities and providing direction on implementation of new electronic disposal procedures to include managing all electronic equipment as if it contains hazardous waste. Employment Development stated that it will evaluate the opportunity to dispose of all its electronic devices as universal waste. Finally, Justice stated that it concurs with the report's recommendations and will continue to dispose of surplus equipment through recycling.

Finding #2: Opportunities exist to efficiently and effectively inform state agencies about the e-waste responsibilities.

Because all five state agencies in our sample had either discarded some of their e-waste in the trash or staff asserted that the agencies had done so, we concluded that some staff members at these agencies may lack sufficient knowledge about how to dispose of this waste properly. We therefore examined what information oversight agencies, such as the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Toxic Substances Control), the Waste Management Board, and the Department of General Services (General Services) provided to state agencies and what steps state agencies took to learn about proper e-waste disposal. Staff members at the five state agencies we reviewed—including those in charge of e-waste disposal, recycling coordinators, and property survey board members who approve e-waste disposal—stated that they had received no information from Toxic Substances Control, the Waste Management Board, or General Services related to the recycling or disposal of e-waste.

Further, based on our review of these three oversight agencies, it appears they have not issued instructions specifically aimed at state agencies describing the process they must follow when disposing of their e-waste. At most, we saw evidence that General Services and the Waste Management Board collaborated to issue guidelines in 2003. These guidelines state: "For all damaged or nonworking electronic equipment, find a recycler who can handle that type of equipment." However, the Waste Management Board indicated that state agencies are not required to adhere to these guidelines; General Services deferred to the Waste Management Board's opinion.

Alternatively, some state agencies we spoke with learned about e-waste requirements through their own research. For example, the recycling coordinator at Justice conducted her own on-line research to identify legally acceptable methods for disposing of e-waste. Through her research of various Web sites at the federal, state, and local government levels, she determined which electronic devices Justice would manage as e-waste and located e-waste collectors who would pick up or allow Justice to drop off its e-waste at no charge.

While Justice's initiative is laudable, we believe that it is neither effective nor efficient to expect staff at all state agencies to identify e-waste requirements on their own. Some state agencies may not be aware that it is illegal to discard certain types of electronic devices in the trash, and it may never occur to them to perform such research before throwing these devices away. Further, having staff at each of the more than 200 state agencies perform the same type of research is duplicative.

The State could use any of at least five approaches to convey to state agencies more efficiently and effectively the agencies' e-waste management responsibilities. One approach would be to have Toxic Substances Control, the Waste Management Board, or General Services, either alone or in collaboration with one or more of the others, directly contact by mail, e-mail, or other method the director or other appropriate official, such as the recycling coordinator or chief information officer, at each state agency conveying how each agency should dispose of its e-waste. Other approaches include:

- Having the Waste Management Board implement a recycling program for electronic devices owned by state agencies.
- Including e-waste as part of the training related to recycling provided by the Waste Management Board.
- Having General Services, Toxic Substances Control, and the Waste Management Board work together to amend applicable sections of the State Administrative Manual that pertain to recycling to specifically include electronic devices.
- Modifying an existing executive order or issuing a new one related to e-waste recycling that incorporates requirements aimed at e-waste disposal.

To help state agencies' efforts to prevent their e-waste from entering landfills, we recommended that Toxic Substances Control, the Waste Management Board, and General Services work together to identify and implement methods that will communicate clearly to state agencies their responsibilities for handling and disposing of e-waste properly and that will inform the agencies about the resources available to assist them.

State Agencies' Actions: Pending.

The three oversight agencies included in our audit concurred with our recommendation and agreed to work collaboratively with each other to implement solutions for ensuring that e-waste from state agencies is managed legally and safely. Further, General Services stated that after consulting with other entities, it will amend applicable sections of the State Administrative Manual to ensure that they clearly require the recycling or disposal of e-waste in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

Finding #3: State agencies report inconsistently their data on e-waste diverted from municipal landfills.

Most of the five state agencies in our sample reported diverting e-waste from municipal landfills. Waste diversion includes activities such as source reduction or recycling waste. In 1999 the State enacted legislation requiring state agencies to divert at least 50 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal by January 1, 2004. State agencies annually describe their status on meeting this goal by submitting reports indicating the tons of various types of waste diverted. A component of the report pertains specifically to e-waste. Between 2004 and 2007, four of the five state agencies in our sample reported diverting a combined total of more than 250 tons of e-waste. The fifth state agency, Caltrans, explained that it reported its e-waste diversion statistics in other categories of its reports that were not specific to e-waste.

Several factors cause us to have concerns about the reliability and accuracy of the amounts that these state agencies reported as diverted e-waste. First, these state agencies were not always consistent in the way they calculated the amount of e-waste to report or in the way they reported it. For example, Employment Development's amount for 2007 include data only from its Northern California warehouse; the amount did not include information from its Southern California warehouse. Also for 2007, the CHP included its diverted e-waste in other categories, while Caltrans did so for all years reported. Further, although instructions call for reporting quantities in tons, for 2007 Justice reported 3,951 e-waste items diverted. Moreover, diversion of e-waste does not count toward compliance with

the solid waste diversion mandate, so state agencies may not include it. The Waste Management Board explained that e-waste is not solid waste, and thus state agencies are not required to report how much they divert from municipal landfills.

The Waste Management Board also allows state agencies to use various methods to calculate the amounts that they report as diverted. For instance, rather than conduct on-site disposal and waste reduction audits to assess waste management practices at every facility, a state agency can estimate its diversion amounts from various sampling methods approved by the Waste Management Board.

If the Legislature believes that state agencies should track more accurately the amounts of e-waste they generate, recycle, and discard, we recommended it consider imposing a requirement that agencies do so.

Legislative Action: Unknown.

We are not aware of any legislative action at this time.

Finding #4: State agencies' compliance with e-waste requirements receives infrequent assessments that are simply components of other reviews.

A state agency's decision regarding how to dispose of e-waste is subject to review by local entities, such as cities and counties, as well as by General Services. We found that the Sacramento County program agency and General Services perform reviews infrequently, and these reviews may not always identify instances in which state agencies have disposed of e-waste improperly.

Local agencies certified by the California Environmental Protection Agency are given responsibility under state law to implement and enforce the State's hazardous waste laws and regulations, which include requirements pertaining to universal waste. These local agencies, referred to as program agencies, perform periodic inspections of hazardous waste generators. The inspections performed by the program agency for Sacramento County are infrequent and may fail to include certain state agencies that generate e-waste. According to this program agency, which has the responsibility to inspect state agencies within its jurisdiction, its policy is to inspect hazardous waste generators once every three years. For the five state agencies in our sample, we asked the Sacramento County program agency to provide us with the inspection reports that it completed under its hazardous waste generator program. The inspection reports we received were dated between 2005 and 2008. We focused on the hazardous waste generator program because Sacramento County's inspectors evaluate a generator's compliance with the State's universal waste requirements under this program (universal waste is a subset of hazardous waste, and it may include e-waste). In its response to our request, the Sacramento County program agency provided seven inspection reports that covered four of the five state agencies in our sample. The Sacramento County program agency provided three inspection reports for Caltrans, one report for Justice, one for the CHP, and two inspection reports for Motor Vehicles. The program agency did not provide us with an inspection report for Employment Development, indicating that this department is not being regulated under the program agency's hazardous waste generator program. The Sacramento County program agency explained that it targets its inspections specifically toward hazardous waste generators and not generators that have universal waste only, although the program agency will inspect for violations related to universal waste during its inspections. As a result, the Sacramento County program agency may never inspect Employment Development if it generates only universal waste.

The State Administrative Manual establishes a state policy requiring state agencies to obtain General Services' approval before disposing of any state-owned surplus property, which could include obsolete or broken electronic devices. In addition to reviewing and approving these disposal requests, General Services periodically audits state agencies to ensure they are complying with the State Administrative Manual and other requirements. General Services' reviews of state agencies are infrequent and it is unclear whether these reviews would identify state agencies that have inappropriately disposed of their e-waste. According to its audit plan for January 2007 through June 2008, General Services conducts "external compliance audits" of other state agencies to determine whether they comply with requirements that are under the purview of certain divisions or offices within General Services.

One such office is General Services' Office of Surplus Property and Reutilization, which reviews and approves the property survey reports that state agencies must submit before disposing of surplus property. According to its audit plan, General Services' auditors perform reviews to assess whether state agencies completed these reports properly and disposed of the surplus equipment promptly. General Services' audit plan indicates that it audited each of the five state agencies in our sample between 1999 through 2004, and that it plans to perform another review of these agencies within the next seven to eight years.

When General Services does perform its reviews, it is unclear whether General Services would identify instances in which state agencies improperly discarded e-waste by placing it in the trash. General Services' auditors focus on whether state agencies properly complete the property survey reports and not on how the agencies actually dispose of the surplus property. For example, according to its audit procedures, General Services' auditors will review property survey reports to ensure that they contain the proper signatures and that the state agencies disposed of the property "without unreasonable delay." After the end of our fieldwork, General Services revised its audit procedures to ensure that its auditors evaluate how state agencies are disposing of their e-waste. General Services provided us with its final revised audit guide and survey demonstrating that its auditors will now "verify that disposal of e-waste is [sent] to a local recycler/salvage company and not sent to a landfill."

If the Legislature believes that more targeted, frequent, or extensive oversight related to state agencies' recycling and disposal of e-waste is necessary, we recommended that the Legislature consider assigning this responsibility to a specific agency.

Legislative Action: Unknown.

We are not aware of any legislative action at this time.

Finding #5: Some state agencies use best practices to manage e-waste.

During our review we identified some state agencies that engage in activities that we consider best practices for managing e-waste. These practices went beyond the requirements found in state law and regulations, and they appeared to help ensure that e-waste does not end up in landfills. One best practice we observed was Justice's establishment of very thorough duty requirements for its recycling coordinator. These requirements provide clear guidelines and expectations, listing such duties as providing advice and direction to various managers about recycling requirements, legal mandates, goals, and objectives. The duties also include providing training to department staff regarding their duties and responsibilities as they pertain to recycling. In addition, the recycling coordinator maintains current knowledge of recycling laws and works with the Waste Management Board and other external agencies in meeting state and departmental recycling goals and objectives. Three of the remaining four state agencies in our sample did not have detailed duty statements specifically for their recycling coordinators. These three state agencies—the CHP, Motor Vehicles, and Employment Development—briefly addressed recycling coordination in the duty statement for the respective individual's position. Caltrans, the remaining state agency in our sample, indicated that it did not have a duty statement for its recycling coordinator. The creation of a detailed duty statement similar to the one used by Justice would help state agencies ensure that they comply with mandated recycling requirements, that they maintain and distribute up-to-date information, and that agencies continue to divert e-waste from municipal landfills.

A second best practice we noted was state agencies' use of recycling vendors from General Services' master services agreement. General Services established this agreement to provide state agencies with the opportunity to obtain competitive prices from prequalified contractors that have the expertise to handle their e-waste. For a contractor to be listed on General Services' master services agreement, it must possess three years of experience in providing recycling services to universal waste generators, be registered with Toxic Substances Control as a hazardous waste handler, and ensure that all activities resulting in the disposition of e-waste are consistent with the Electronic Waste Recycling Act of 2003.

The master services agreement also lists recycling vendors by geographic region, allowing state agencies to select vendors that will cover their area. Many recycling vendors under the agreement offer to pick up e-waste at no cost, although most require that state agencies meet minimum weight requirements. Based on a review of their property survey reports, we saw evidence that the CHP, Caltrans, Justice, and Employment Development all used vendors from this agreement to recycle some of their e-waste.

We recommended that state agencies consider implementing the two best practices we identified.

State Agencies' Actions: Pending.

Regarding a thorough duty statement for a recycling coordinator, as we mentioned in our audit report, Justice already follows this best practice. In their responses to our audit report, Motor Vehicles, Caltrans, and Employment Development stated that they would take steps to implement this best practice; CHP thanked us for suggesting it.

Regarding the use of recyclers from the master services agreement, we noted in our audit report that CHP, Caltrans, Justice, and Employment Development all used vendors from the master services agreement. Motor Vehicles stated that in the future, its property and equipment control unit will make an effort to use the master services agreement when disposing of obsolete equipment and that its asset management section will adopt the recommendation and develop guidelines on the use of the master services agreement. Motor Vehicles stated that the guidelines will be disseminated to all divisions by February 2009.

Nonprofit Hospitals

Inconsistent Data Obscure the Economic Value of Their Benefit to Communities, and the Franchise Tax Board Could More Closely Monitor Their Tax-Exempt Status

REPORT NUMBER 2007-107, DECEMBER 2007

Board of Equalization's, Franchise Tax Board's, and Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development's responses as of December 2008

The Joint Legislative Audit Committee (audit committee) requested the Bureau of State Audits to conduct an audit to ascertain whether the activities performed by hospitals that are exempt from paying taxes because of their nonprofit status truly qualify as allowable activities consistent with their exempt purpose. Specifically, the audit committee requested that we determine the roles of the entities involved in determining tax exemptions and the extent of oversight they exercise over nonprofit hospitals to ensure that they comply with requirements for tax exemption and community benefit reporting. It also asked us to examine the financial reports and any community benefit documents prepared during the last five years by a sample of both nonprofit hospitals and hospitals that operate on a for-profit basis and determine the value and type of community benefits and uncompensated care provided. In addition, the audit committee asked us to compare the community benefits provided by nonprofit and for-profit hospitals, and compare the types of care that both types of hospitals provide without receiving compensation (uncompensated care). Further, the audit committee asked us to review the financial information and the claims submitted to the State Board of Equalization (Equalization) or other agencies by nonprofit hospitals to determine whether they meet income requirements to qualify for tax-exempt status and to assess how tax-exempt nonprofit hospitals use excess income, to ensure that the uses are permissible and reasonable in terms of expansion of plant and facilities, additions to operating reserve, and the timing of debt retirement. The audit committee also asked us to determine the most current estimated total annual value of the taxation exemptions of both state corporation income taxes (income taxes) and local property taxes for nonprofit hospitals.

Finally, the audit committee asked us to determine whether the community benefits and uncompensated care provided by nonprofit hospitals meet the requirements for exemption from local property and state income tax. However, although state law outlines the requirements a nonprofit hospital must meet to receive an exemption from paying taxes, it does not specify community benefits and uncompensated-care costs as requirements. Additionally, although state law requires most tax-exempt hospitals to annually submit to the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (Health Planning) a community benefits plan (plan), which may include an uncompensated-care element, the law also clearly states that the information included in the plan a nonprofit hospital submits cannot be used to justify its tax-exempt status.

Audit Highlights . . .

Our review of tax-exempt hospitals revealed the following:

- » *About 223 of California's 344 hospitals are eligible for income and property tax exemptions because they are organized and operated for nonprofit purposes.*
- » *Comparing financial data reported by nonprofit and for-profit hospitals indicated the uncompensated care provided by the two types of hospitals was not significantly different.*
- » *Benefits provided to the community, which only nonprofit hospitals are required to report, differentiate nonprofit hospitals from for-profit hospitals, but the categories of services and the associated economic value are not consistently reported among nonprofit hospitals.*
- » *The values of tax-exempt buildings and contents owned by nonprofit hospitals are frequently misreported by county assessors.*
- » *Lacking more reliable data, we used the reported economic values of community benefits and tax-exempt property to estimate that reported community benefits of \$656 million for 2005 were roughly 2.7 times the estimated \$242 million in state corporation income taxes and property taxes not collected from nonprofit hospitals.*
- » *The Franchise Tax Board, which administers state income tax exemptions, could better use available tools, such as annual filings and audits, to monitor the continuing eligibility of nonprofit hospitals for their tax exemption.*

Finding #1: Lack of specific guidance regarding the content of community benefit plans precludes any meaningful comparison of the plans.

Although state law requires that tax-exempt hospitals submit plans to Health Planning, it does not require Health Planning to review the plans to ensure that hospitals report the same types of data consistently, nor does Health Planning do so. Further, the law provides only limited guidance regarding the content of the plan and does not mandate a uniform reporting standard. Thus, in reviewing the plans that eight tax-exempt hospitals submitted from 2002 through 2006, we found significant variations in the plans that precluded us from performing any meaningful comparison of the economic values the hospitals reported. Although the guidance provided in the law does not require uniform reporting, two hospital associations offer hospitals some guidelines. Additionally, the Internal Revenue Services (IRS) is proposing a new schedule for hospitals to prepare to be included with the informational return that all income-tax-exempt organizations must file. If adopted, the IRS anticipates using the new schedule for the 2008 tax year. The new schedule will require tax-exempt hospitals to report their community benefits and uncompensated-care costs and could influence hospitals to pattern their plans after the schedule's methodologies and format.

We recommended that if the Legislature expects plans to contain comparable and consistent data, it consider enacting statutory requirements that prescribe a mandatory format and methodology for tax-exempt nonprofit hospitals to follow when presenting community benefits in their plans. We also recommended that if the Legislature intends that the exemptions from income and property taxes granted to nonprofit hospitals should be based on hospitals providing a certain level of community benefits, it consider amending state law to include such requirements.

Legislative Action: Legislation proposed.

Assembly Bill 2942 was introduced to require a standardized format and methodology to be used when presenting community benefit information. The bill did not pass during the 2007—08 Regular Session.

Finding #2: Errors in reported property values reduce the reliability of estimated property taxes not paid by tax-exempt hospitals.

We attempted to estimate the amount of property taxes not collected from tax-exempt hospitals, using the values of the buildings and contents owned by tax-exempt hospitals that county assessors submitted on statistical reports to Equalization. Although we found numerous errors in the values that prevented us from ensuring the reliability of our calculation, this methodology resulted in an estimated \$184 million in uncollected property taxes in 2005. More specifically, we found errors in the reported values for four of the 12 hospitals we reviewed, representing a total error of about \$204 million. The errors for the remaining 211 nonprofit hospitals in the State that are eligible for tax exemption are unknown. Equalization performs surveys of county assessors to determine the adequacy of the procedures and practices they apply in valuing property for the purpose of taxation and for administering property tax exemptions.

To ensure that it provides accurate information regarding the value that is tax exempt, we recommended that Equalization consider including in its surveys of the county tax assessors a process for verifying the accuracy of the values reported on the annual statistical reports submitted by the county assessors.

Equalization's Action: Corrective action taken.

Equalization indicated that its survey of county assessors now includes a review of the exemption values contained in the county assessors' annual statistical reports. It also stated that it uses a survey review worksheet to examine individual exemption claim records for proper classification by the county assessors and to ask questions of assessors personnel on their practices and procedures. Finally, Equalization issued a letter to all county assessors informing them of our finding and that it was incorporating these verification steps into its survey of the county assessors.

Finding #3: Recent legislation affects the Franchise Tax Board's responsibilities for granting income tax exemptions.

We found minor weaknesses in the process the Franchise Tax Board (tax board) used in the past to determine the eligibility of nonprofit hospitals for state income tax exemptions. However, legislation effective January 1, 2008, will allow the tax board to rely on the federal income tax exemptions determined by the IRS. Although it was unable to obtain IRS reports and other information on the federal review process and thus could not gain a full understanding of the method the IRS uses to determine eligibility for tax exemptions, the tax board contended that its research of the IRS web site, publications, and tax law enabled it to conclude that the IRS process is sufficient to ensure proper determination of state exemption status. The tax board also stated that because state and federal laws on tax exemption are essentially identical, the additional audits it plans to perform—made possible by the workload reduction resulting from its use of IRS eligibility determinations—will compensate for any differences in quality between the state and federal review processes. The tax board indicated, however, that until it identifies the actual savings in workload that may occur when the new law is implemented, it cannot evaluate the opportunities for performing audits of nonprofit hospitals or plan for the number or frequency of such audits.

We recommended that, after it identifies the staff resources that are no longer required for reviewing tax exemption applications, the tax board implement its plan to use those resources for performing audits of tax-exempt entities, including hospitals.

Tax Board's Action: Corrective action taken.

The tax board indicated that it has begun to realize staff resource savings from the new exemption application process and is redirecting those resources to perform compliance audits. The tax board also reported that for calendar year 2008 to date, it opened 55 audits and completed 24 compared to this same time last year, when it opened 10 audits and completed four.

Finding #4: The tax board has limited assurance that nonprofit hospitals remain eligible for state income tax exemptions.

The tax board does not use the tools available to it, such as annual filings and audits, to monitor the continuing eligibility of nonprofit hospitals for income tax exemption. According to management staff at the tax board, annual filings, which contain information such as financial data and changes in business activities, offer the tax board's Exempt Organizations Unit (unit) a useful tool for reviewing ongoing compliance with the requirements for maintaining tax-exempt status. However, the unit does not review the information in the annual filings. Management at the tax board stated that the large volume of initial applications for income tax exemptions and limited personnel prevent unit staff from reviewing the annual filings. In the absence of monitoring by the tax board, hospitals exempt from income taxes sometimes submit annual filings that do not contain all the information required by the form or its instructions or information required under the California Code of Regulations (regulations).

Regular auditing is another tool the tax board could use to monitor the tax-exempt status of nonprofit hospitals. However, the tax board does not regularly conduct audits of tax-exempt hospitals, even though, based on data provided by the tax board, the revenues of these hospitals represent 17 percent of the total revenue of all tax-exempt organizations. According to the tax board, an audit can originate when members of the public express concern that a tax-exempt organization may be functioning in a manner requiring revocation of its tax-exempt status. The tax board indicated, however, that it could not identify any complaints that might have prompted audits of tax-exempt hospitals, because it does not maintain a central record of the receipt or disposition of those complaints. Rather, complaints against tax-exempt organizations are stored in the tax board's files and cannot be easily retrieved.

The tax board stated that the revenue information from annual filings entered into its automated record-keeping system could be used to identify income-tax-exempt nonprofit hospitals to be considered for audit. However, because the tax board has not ensured that all tax-exempt nonprofit

hospitals are distinctly identified in its electronic data system, it is unable to efficiently generate a list of the hospitals that might require audits. According to the tax board, creating such a list would necessitate manually reviewing the hard-copy files of the approximately 72,000 tax-exempt organizations operating in the State to determine which are tax-exempt hospitals.

Finally, the tax board told us that the IRS expects to perform an audit within three to five years after each organization receives a federal tax exemption, and it would notify the tax board of any revocations. However, the tax board does not currently coordinate with the IRS to identify audits of California tax-exempt hospitals in a manner that would allow the tax board to adequately rely on IRS audits for assurance of continuing eligibility.

We recommended that the tax board consider developing methodologies to monitor nonprofit hospitals' continuing eligibility for income tax exemption. These methodologies should include the following activities:

- Review the financial and other information from the annual filing submitted by hospitals exempt from income taxes.
- Ensure that the annual filing contains all the information the tax board's regulations specify as necessary for determining eligibility for an income tax exemption.
- Track complaints in a manner that enable the tax board to identify potential trends in noncompliance by income-tax-exempt hospitals and initiate audits of those hospitals.
- Adequately identify tax-exempt hospitals in its automated database, enabling it to use the information in the database to profile those hospitals and identify any potential noncompliance with the law.

The tax board should also gain an understanding of the frequency and depth of IRS audits of tax-exempt hospitals to identify the extent to which it can rely on IRS audits and factor that reliance into its monitoring efforts.

Tax Board's Action: Partial corrective action taken.

The tax board stated that it is developing an audit program to review the annual filings from the hospitals to gain a better understanding of compliance issues and materiality thresholds for ongoing reviews. In addition, the tax board indicated that it is finalizing business requirements for enhancements to its case management system that will provide data collection, modeling, and audit selection capabilities. It plans to implement these enhancements in November 2009. The tax board also reported that it has implemented a new procedure to log all complaints into a computer database that documents the organization name, type, issue, and action taken. Additionally, the tax board stated that it has updated the codes in its business entities accounting system to separately identify tax-exempt hospitals from other types of charitable organizations. Finally, the tax board indicated that a Memorandum of Understanding with the IRS was signed September 2008, authorizing the tax board to receive federal information about exempt organizations including proposed and final revocations, audit adjustments, and reports.

Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund

Local Governments Do Not Always Use It to Mitigate the Impacts of Casinos, and Its Viability Will Be Adversely Affected by Compact Amendments

REPORT NUMBER 2006-036, JULY 2007

California Gambling Control Commission's and Six County Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committees' responses as of September 2008

California Government Code, Section 12717, requires the Bureau of State Audits to conduct an audit every three years regarding the allocation and uses of moneys from the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund (distribution fund) by the recipients of the grant money and report its findings to the Legislature and all other appropriate entities. We evaluated the use and administration of distribution fund grants at six counties: Fresno, Placer, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Sonoma.

We also compared fiscal year 2005–06 distribution fund contributions to estimated future contributions based on changes in compact provisions in new and amended pending compacts to determine the ability of the distribution fund to continue to fund the programs that depend on it. We then compared estimated contributions to current year expenditures from the distribution fund. Because we are unable to project how fast casinos will expand or forecast the changes to their profitability, we made a conservative estimate based on fiscal year 2005–06 gaming device counts and net win figures.

Finding #1: Local governments did not always use the distribution fund to pay for mitigation projects.

The legislation establishing the distribution fund declares the intent of the Legislature that tribal governments participate in identifying and funding mitigation of the impacts of tribal gaming through the grant process. The legislation also states that the grants are for distribution to local governments impacted by casinos. Finally, the senate floor analysis describes the legislation creating the distribution fund and grant process as establishing “priorities and procedures . . . for the purpose of mitigating impacts from tribal casinos.” However, the legislation does not establish a clear requirement that the grants be used only for projects that actually mitigate the impacts from tribal casinos in all instances.

Based on our review of 30 grants, we determined that often a distribution fund grant financed a project that had the potential of offsetting the repercussions of a casino but was mainly used for activities that benefited the county as a whole. In 10 instances, the goods and services purchased with grant money had the potential for use in mitigating casinos’ impact, should the need arise. However the main beneficiaries were the counties as a whole. Even though the potential exists that some of the goods or services acquired with these grant funds could be used to mitigate the impact of a casino, it is unclear whether the Legislature intended distribution fund grants to be used in

Audit Highlights . . .

Our review of the allocation and uses of the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund (distribution fund) money revealed the following:

- » *Local governments did not always use distribution fund money to mitigate casino impacts.*
- » *The allocation of distribution fund money in some counties is based, in part, on the number of devices operated by tribes that did not pay into the fund because their compacts require them to negotiate directly with the county to pay for the mitigation of casino impacts. However, these counties continue to receive distribution fund dollars from the State.*
- » *In many instances local governments do not use interest earned on unspent distribution fund money for projects related to casino impacts.*
- » *Although all benefit committee members are required to file statements of economic interests, in our sample counties, 11 of the 13 tribal members that were required to file failed to do so.*
- » *The ratification of compacts in June 2007, along with one that is awaiting ratification, may threaten the future viability of the distribution fund and the programs that depend on it, as they eliminate \$92 million in payments to the fund beginning in fiscal year 2007–08. While we estimate that contributions to the State’s General Fund would also total at least \$174 million, almost \$40 million per year could be required to pay for the estimated shortfall in the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund.*

this manner. In other cases grant funds were used for projects totally unrelated to casinos. Specifically, in five instances the money was not used to offset the adverse effects of casinos. Although these and other purchases may be beneficial to the counties, when a distribution fund grant is used for purposes that have little or no relationship to a casino impact, the problems the community experiences because of a casino may not be adequately addressed. The remaining 15 grants we reviewed were used specifically to alleviate casino impacts.

We recommended that the California Gambling Control Commission (gambling commission) seek legislative changes to amend the government code to provide direction to local governments to ensure that they use distribution fund grants only to purchase goods and services that directly mitigate the adverse impacts of casinos on local governments and their citizens.

We also recommended that benefit committees require local governments to submit supporting documentation that clearly demonstrates how proposed projects will mitigate the effects of casinos.

Legislative Action: Legislation enacted.

Chapter 754, Statutes of 2008, amended the California Government Code to, among other things, require benefit committees to select only grant applications that mitigate impacts from casinos on local jurisdictions, and cause any grant for expenditures not related to Indian Gaming to terminate immediately and any money not yet spent to revert to the distribution fund. Chapter 754 also provided \$30 million in funding from the distribution fund for grants to local government agencies.

Fresno County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

The benefit committee states that it adopted new policies and procedures on November 30, 2007, that include codifying more comprehensive descriptions and procedures for the management of funds and for their award and distribution.

Placer County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: None.

➔ Placer County officials ignored our request to provide 60-day, six-month, and one-year responses to the audit.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee stated that through the application process, applicants must fully describe the casino or gaming impact they propose to mitigate and fully describe how they will use grant funds to mitigate the impact. The benefit committee also stated that, in response to our recommendation, during the next grant award cycle, benefit committee staff will review applications and provide an assessment to the committee on each application's apparent relevance to casino and gaming impacts.

San Bernardino County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

The benefit committee states that its current grant application process includes the requirement that proposed projects from the grant application contain detailed project descriptions and supporting documentation that clearly demonstrates how proposed projects will mitigate the effects of casinos.

San Diego County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee stated that, since fiscal year 2003–04, its grant application form requires applicants to include a discussion of the impacts on their jurisdiction associated with the particular casino(s) and how the project would be funded. Additionally, the benefit committee stated that, beginning in fiscal year 2006–07, applicants were also required to present their projects at a public meeting so the committee could ask questions about them. The benefit committee also indicated that for the next cycle of grants, the application form would be amended to add a requirement that, if a project proposes in part to mitigate impacts unrelated to casinos, funding for the portion of the project unrelated to the casinos must be found from another source. Finally, applicants will be reminded to fully describe the impacts on their jurisdiction from tribal casinos and explain how their project will mitigate those impacts.

Sonoma County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its 60-day response, the benefit committee stated that it has adopted an application form that requires grant applicants to describe how requested funds will be used to offset the impacts of tribal gaming. The application form requires applicants to provide a complete project description, describe impacts on their jurisdiction associated with the casino and include any data to support the request, and explain how the project will mitigate the impacts.

Finding #2: Compacts ratified since 1999 require tribes to directly fund efforts to mitigate casinos' impacts, but local governments continue to receive distribution fund money.

Post-1999 compacts require tribes to negotiate directly with local governments to pay for local mitigation projects in lieu of paying into the distribution fund. However, based on the allocation methodology established in state law in 2004, two counties where casinos under post-1999 compacts are located received roughly \$850,000 in distribution fund money in fiscal year 2005–06. Local governments in those counties received money for projects that, in accordance with the post-1999 compacts, should have been funded directly by the tribes. Consequently, less distribution fund grant money is available to other counties where tribes are not required to provide funding directly to local governments.

We recommended that the gambling commission seek changes to legislation to revise the allocation methodology outlined in the government code so that the allocation to counties is based only on the number of devices operated by tribes that do not negotiate directly with local governments to mitigate casino impacts.

Gambling Commission's Action: None.

The gambling commission states that because it does not have any oversight role related to local mitigation grants and its existing role is purely technical, it declines to seek the recommended legislative changes.

However, our recommendation did not address the gambling commission's oversight role related to local mitigation grants. Rather, it asked the gambling commission to seek a legislative change to the allocation methodology outlined in the California Government Code so that counties that were negotiating directly with Indian tribes to pay for local mitigation projects no longer receive grant funds from the distribution fund because these tribes are not contributing any money to the fund.

Finding #3: Interest that local governments earned on unspent distribution fund money has not always gone toward mitigation projects.

Some local governments have earned interest on distribution funds until the funds are needed for an intended project. In many instances, large amounts of grant money remained unspent for more than a year, and the local governments indicated to us that the interest earned was not always allocated back to the original project or used for similar future projects. In fact, several local governments we spoke to used the interest to pay for general county operational costs. In some cases local governments did not even earn interest, instead depositing the grant funds in accounts that generate no interest.

Our legal counsel advised us that although the law does not specifically require a local government to allocate interest earned on unspent funds to original or future mitigation projects, the government code section cited by local governments states that earned interest may be deposited in their general funds unless otherwise specified by law. The purposes for which distribution fund money may be spent are set forth in the compacts and state law. Accordingly, our counsel advised us that the interest on distribution fund money is subject to the common law rule that unless it is separated by statute from the principal, the interest should be used for the originally intended purpose. Thus, we believe the interest should be used to support mitigation projects. However, several local governments asserted that the government code grants them authority to use interest earned for general purposes. Further, local officials indicated

that a significant number of grants were maintained in accounts that earned no interest. Because the interest on distribution fund money is subject to the common law rule that unless it is separated by statute from the principal, the interest should be used for the originally intended purpose, we believe the interest should be used to support mitigation projects.

We recommended that the gambling commission seek changes to legislation to amend the government code to require that all funds be deposited into interest-bearing accounts, and that any interest earned is used on projects to mitigate casino impacts.

Further, we recommended that benefit committees ensure that local governments spend the interest earned on project funds only on the projects for which the grants were awarded or return the money to the county for allocation to future mitigation projects.

Legislative Action: Legislation enacted.

Chapter 754, Statutes of 2008, amended the California Government Code to require a local government jurisdiction that receives a local mitigation grant to deposit all funds received in an interest-bearing account and use the interest from those funds only for the purpose of mitigating an impact from a casino.

Placer County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: None.

➔ Placer County officials ignored our request to provide 60-day, six-month, and one-year responses to the audit.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee stated that it sent letters to all mitigation grant recipients clarifying the need to maintain mitigation grant funds in interest-bearing accounts and use the interest earned for casino/gaming mitigation measures.

San Bernardino County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

San Bernardino County states that it has changed contract language to ensure that interest earned on distribution funds for long-term projects will remain with the project. Material amounts of grant money for long-term projects that remain unspent will be required to be deposited into an interest-bearing account. All interest earned will be allocated back to the original project or used for future mitigation projects.

San Diego County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Pending.

In its six-month response, San Diego County officials stated that in the next cycle of grants, the benefit committee would be asked to include a directive to applicants, if state law allows their jurisdictions to do so, to either spend the interest earned on projects that mitigate impacts of tribal casinos or return the money to the county for allocation to future mitigation projects.

Sonoma County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its 60-day response, the benefit committee stated that if state law is amended to require interest earned on unspent grant funds to be used only for mitigation purposes, it will notify all grant recipients of this requirement. As stated above, legislation has since been enacted that requires a local government jurisdiction that receives a local mitigation grant to deposit all funds received in an interest-bearing account and use the interest from those funds only for the purpose of mitigating an impact from a casino.

Finding #4: Grant allocations have generally been properly calculated, but some local governments were not awarded the amounts they were allocated through the Nexus test.

State law requires a county receiving distribution fund money to allocate a portion of its funding to local governments based on the Nexus test criteria described in the text box. In Riverside County, we identified two instances where the Nexus test criteria were not consistently applied. County officials agreed with our assessment and stated that the county would revise its application of the Nexus criteria. Further, Riverside County did not even adhere to its inaccurate Nexus test calculation. We identified several instances where cities in Riverside County were awarded less money than they should have been allocated under the Nexus test.

We recommended that benefit committees correct the inconsistent application of Nexus test criteria and ensure that local governments receive at least the minimum amounts they are allocated under the government code requirements.

Nexus Test Criteria

1. The local government jurisdiction borders Indian lands on all sides.
2. The local government partially borders Indian land.
3. The local government maintains the highway, road, or predominant access route to a casino within four miles.
4. All or a portion of the local government is located within four miles of a casino.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the Riverside County benefit committee stated that it has updated the table identifying the percentages for which local government jurisdictions are eligible for 60 percent nexus grants. Additionally, the benefit committee stated that in an effort to ensure that local governments receive at least the minimum amounts they are allocated under the California Government Code requirements, the 60 percent nexus category of individual tribal casino account balances would be applied to the corrected percentages.

Finding #5: Some grantees were not eligible for funding.

Although state law defines the intended recipients of distribution fund money—cities, counties, and special districts—some benefit committees provided grant money to ineligible entities. In two cases benefit committees awarded grants to school districts, which state law specifically excludes from the definition of special districts. Because the Legislature has identified specific entities and purposes for distribution fund grant money, counties must ensure that they follow the statutory requirements.

We recommended that benefit committees grant distribution fund money only to eligible entities.

Legislative Action: Legislation enacted.

Chapter 754, Statutes of 2008, amended Section 12712 of the California Government Code to specifically exclude city and county school districts and community college districts from the definition of "special district."

Fresno County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

The benefit committee states that it adopted new policies and procedures on November 30, 2007, that include codifying more comprehensive descriptions and procedures for the management of funds and for their award and distribution.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee provided a listing of the special districts that are eligible to receive distribution grant money. The listing provided did not include any school districts.

Finding #6: Some benefit committee members fail to meet disclosure requirements.

The Political Reform Act of 1974 (political reform act) requires state and local officials and employees with decision-making authority to file statements of economic interests annually and on assuming or leaving a designated position. These statements are intended to identify conflicts of interest that an individual might have. However, the counties we visited could not provide 11 of the 13 statements of economic interests for tribal representatives on the benefit committees for fiscal year 2005–06.

Three of the six counties we visited informed us that the tribal members of their respective benefit committees asserted that they are exempt from the requirements to submit statements. However, the California Fair Political Practices Commission has issued an advice letter regarding this issue stating that any individual serving in a capacity as a member of a public agency, including tribal members of benefit committees, are subject to the provisions of the political reform act. The remaining three counties indicated that they do not know the reasons tribal members did not file the required statements. When designated individuals do not file statements of economic interests, benefit committees may be unaware of conflicts of interest. Further, the benefit committees cannot ensure that members are aware that they should remove themselves from making decisions that may pose conflicts of interest.

We recommend that benefit committees ensure that all benefit committee members follow the political reform act and file the required statements of economic interests, and inform the appropriate agency if they fail to do so.

Fresno County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

The benefit committee states that it adopted a conflict of interest policy on January 4, 2008, and statements of economic interests have been received from all members.

Placer County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: None.

➔ Placer County officials ignored our request to provide 60-day, six-month, and one-year responses to the audit.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Pending.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee stated that the county is working with tribal members and anticipated resolution of the issue by October 2007.

Riverside County Officials did not provide a one-year response to the audit.

San Bernardino County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

The benefit committee states that it will continue to inform members of the requirement to file their statements at intervals before and after the deadline, and will notify the appropriate state agency if they do not file within two weeks of the deadline.

San Diego County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the benefit committee stated that it will remind benefit committee members to submit required statements and will inform the State of any failure by a benefit committee member to do so.

Sonoma County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its 60-day response, the benefit committee stated that it would continue to ask all members to submit required statements of economic interests and will inform the appropriate state agency if they fail to do so.

Finding #7: Many counties did not properly report their use of distribution fund money.

State law requires each county that receives distribution fund grants to submit an annual report by October 1 detailing, among other information, the specific projects funded by the grants and how current-year grant money has been or will be spent. Nevertheless, many counties fail to submit the reports to all required entities, including two of the six counties we visited. In fact, according to the gambling commission and various legislative committees, in 2006 only nine counties reported to all required entities, which include the gambling commission, the chairs of the Senate and Assembly committees on governmental organization, and the chair of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. Furthermore, six of the 24 counties receiving funds did not report at all.

Additionally, our review found that at least one county did not include all required information in its most recent annual report. The law requires each county to submit an annual report on its current- and prior-year allocations and expenditures for distribution fund grants. However, in fiscal year 2005–06, Riverside County failed to report its current-year grant allocations and only provided expenditures of prior-year grants.

We recommended that benefit committees submit complete annual reports to all required legislative committees and the gambling commission.

Legislative Action: Legislation enacted.

Chapter 754, Statutes of 2008, amended the California Government Code to include language stating that any county that does not provide an annual report shall not be eligible for funding from the distribution fund for the following year.

Placer County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: None.

Placer County officials ignored our request to provide 60-day, six-month, and one-year responses to the audit.

Riverside County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its six-month response, the Riverside County benefit committee stated that it would provide all required information for grants funded in its annual report.

Sonoma County Indian Gaming Benefit Committee's Action: Corrective action taken.

In its 60-day response, the Sonoma County benefit committee stated that it would submit annual reports to all required legislative committees and the gambling commission by the deadline specified in state statute.

Sonoma County officials declined our request to provide a six-month and one-year response to the audit.

Finding #8: New compact provisions will change the amount of revenues in the distribution and trust funds.

In June 2007 the Legislature ratified one new compact and four of five amendments to existing compacts—the fifth compact amendment was ratified after our audit. From a review of current operating information and compact terms, we estimated that the one new compact and five amendments (pending compacts) to existing compacts would significantly decrease revenues in the distribution fund and, to a lesser extent, increase Revenue Sharing Trust Fund (trust fund) revenues. We conservatively estimated that annual contributions to the trust fund from these compacts would increase by about \$6.9 million, while annual contributions to the distribution fund would decrease by \$92 million. If the revenue and expenditure levels estimated for fiscal year 2007–08 continue into the future, without additional resources the distribution fund will be unable to meet its obligations by fiscal year 2010–11, approximately four years from now. In addition to the impact on the distribution and

trust funds, we estimated that contributions to the State's General Fund from these compacts would total between \$174.3 million and \$175.1 million for fiscal year 2007–08. Further, as casino operations expand, General Fund revenues will increase.

Finding #9: Post-1999 and pending compacts and amendments provide revenues to the General Fund.

Between 2003 and 2006, the Legislature ratified five new compacts and amendments to eight others (post-1999 compacts), which provided \$128 million in General Fund revenue in fiscal year 2005–06. However, that figure will increase because several casinos operating under post-1999 compacts only recently began operations or will begin operations this year. Overall, we estimated that General Fund revenues for fiscal year 2007–08 from the post-1999 and pending compacts discussed above will total between \$304 million and \$313.5 million. These amounts represent between 4.3 percent and 4.5 percent of the \$7 billion in revenue that Indian gaming in California generated during fiscal year 2004–05. Further, for fiscal year 2007–08, we estimated that trust fund and distribution fund revenue from tribal contributions will total \$39.4 million and \$47 million, respectively, representing 0.6 percent and 0.7 percent of total fiscal year 2004–05 gambling revenue, respectively.

Finding #10: General Fund revenues may be used for many purposes.

Future General Fund revenue contributions from Indian gaming may be used to help reduce the impact of the \$92 million decrease in distribution fund revenue. However, without further clarification in the government code by the Legislature, it is unclear if compact provisions that redirect a portion of their General Fund revenue contributions to the trust fund if there is an insufficient amount in the trust fund to distribute \$1.1 million to each eligible tribe take place before or after the government code requirement for the distribution fund to cover any such shortfalls in the trust fund. Furthermore, the General Fund contributions required by the compacts may also be obligated to repay a California Department of Transportation fund that made loans to the General Fund in prior fiscal years. As such, any increase in General Fund revenue from pending compacts may be obligated to repay the Transportation Congestion Relief Fund and thus would not be available for backfill distributions required by the trust fund or for other purposes.