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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

Board of Commissioners
Los Angeles County Children and Families
First – Proposition 10 Commission
Los Angeles, California

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities and the general fund of the Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission (the Commission), a component unit of the County of Los Angeles, California, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2010, which collectively comprise the Commission’s basic financial statements and have issued our report thereon dated October 1, 2010. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission’s internal control over financial reporting.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity’s financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Commission’s financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.
We noted certain other matters that we reported to management of the Commission in a separate letter dated October 1, 2010.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, the County Board of Supervisors, Board of Commissioners, Commission management, California Children and Families Commission, the State Controller’s Office, federal awarding agencies, and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

Rancho Cucamonga, California
October 1, 2010
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS
THAT COULD HAVE A DIRECT AND MATERIAL EFFECT ON EACH MAJOR PROGRAM,
INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE AND THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF
FEDERAL AWARDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133

Board of Commissioners
Los Angeles County Children and Families
First – Proposition 10 Commission
Los Angeles, California

Compliance

We have audited the Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission’s (the Commission) compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement that could have a direct and material effect on each of the Commission’s major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2010. The Commission’s major federal programs are identified in the summary of auditors’ results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to each of its major federal programs is the responsibility of the Commission’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Commission’s compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the Commission’s compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of the Commission’s compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, the Commission complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2010. However, the results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance with those requirements, which are required to be reported in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs noted as items 2010-1 and 2010-2.

Internal Control Over Compliance

Management of the Commission is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to federal programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Commission’s internal control over compliance with the requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission’s internal control over compliance.
A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities and the general fund of the Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission (the Commission), a component unit of the County of Los Angeles, California, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2010, and have issued our report thereon dated October 1, 2010. Our audit was performed for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Commission’s basic financial statements. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required OMB Circular A-133 and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the financial statements as a whole.

The Commission’s responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. We did not audit the Commission’s responses and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, Board of Commissioners, Commission management, federal awarding agencies, and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Rancho Cucamonga California
October 1, 2010
# SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

For the Year Ended June 30, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Grantor/Program Title</th>
<th>Federal CFDA Number</th>
<th>Pass-Through Entity Identifying Number</th>
<th>Federal Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 740,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed through the County of Los Angeles:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 740,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal Administrative Activities [1]</td>
<td>93.778</td>
<td>75714</td>
<td>$ 740,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditures of Federal Awards

[1] Denotes a major Federal Financial Assistance Program

See accompanying notes to Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards.
NOTE TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS
For the Year Ended June 30, 2010

NOTE 1 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

A. General

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards presents the expenditures of federal awards of the Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission (Commission). The Commission's reporting entity is defined in Note 1 of the Commission's basic financial statements. All federal awards received directly from federal agencies as well as federal awards passed through from other government agencies are included on the Schedule.

B. Basis of Accounting

The Single Audit Act defines major federal award programs based upon total federal expenditures of the grantee during the period reported and risk of the programs audited. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards includes expenditures incurred for Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (CFDA No. 93.778) in the fiscal year 2008-2009, which were approved for reimbursement by the grantor agency in the fiscal year 2009-2010.

C. Relationship to Basic Financial Statements

Federal awards revenues are generally reported within the Commission's financial statements under the financial statement caption "Federal Operating Grants" for the Governmental Fund.

D. Pass-Through Awards to Subrecipients

Included in the total expenditures of federal awards, the amount of $636,114 has been passed through to subrecipients under CFDA # 93.778.

E. Relationship to Federal Financial Reports

Amounts reported in the accompanying Schedule of Expenditures to Federal Awards agree with the amounts reported in the related federal financial reports. However, certain federal financial reports are filed based on cash expenditures. As such, certain timing differences may exist in the recognition of revenues and expenditures between the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and the federal financial reports.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES FIRST – PROPOSITION 10 COMMISSION
(a Component Unit of the County of Los Angeles, California)

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS
I. SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' RESULTS

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
Type of auditors' report issued: Unqualified
Internal control over financial reporting:
   Material weaknesses identified? No
   Significant deficiencies identified not considered to be material weaknesses? None reported
   Noncompliance material to financial statements noted? No

FEDERAL AWARDS
Internal control over major programs:
   Material weaknesses identified? No
   Significant deficiencies identified not considered to be material weaknesses? None reported
Type of auditors' report issued on compliance for major programs:
   Unqualified
Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with Circular A-133, Section .510(a) Yes

Identification of major programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA Number(s)</th>
<th>Name of Federal Program or Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93.778</td>
<td>Medi-Cal Administrative Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs: $300,000
Auditee qualified as low-risk auditee? No
None noted.
Finding 2010-1

Program: Medi-Cal Administrative Activities
CFDA No.: 93.778
Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Passed-through: County of Los Angeles
Award No.: 04-35096A01
Award Year: Fiscal year 2009-2010
Compliance Requirement: Subrecipient Monitoring

Criteria:

The June 2010 Office of Budget and Management (OMB) OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement requires that the Commission identify to the subrecipients the (1) Federal award information (i.e., CFDA title and number; award name and number) and (2) applicable OMB A-133 compliance requirements.

Condition Found:

Instance of Non-Compliance – The Commission’s contracts with its subrecipients did not identify the Federal award information and applicable OMB Circular A-133 compliance requirements.

Questioned Costs:

None noted.

Context:

The condition noted above was identified during our testwork of specific requirements related to subrecipient monitoring, it was noted that the Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) program agreements were in place but did not include Federal award identification or applicable OMB Circular A-133 compliance requirements.

Effect:

Federal award identification and applicable OMB Circular A-133 compliance requirements were not included in the subrecipient agreements, which could increase the risk of non-compliance with subrecipient monitoring requirements.

Cause:

The condition Commission did not ensure that the above described provisions were communicated to the subrecipient.
Recommendation:
We recommend that the Commission establish policies and procedures with regard to communicating Federal award identification and applicable OMB Circular A-133 compliance requirements to the subrecipients and ensure that such policies and procedures are formally documented and strictly adhered to by Commission personnel.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions:
The Commission will establish policies and procedures with regard to communicating Federal award identification and applicable OMB Circular A-133 compliance requirements to the subrecipients and ensure that such policies and procedures are formally documented and strictly adhered to by Commission personnel.

Finding 2010-2
Program: Medi-Cal Administrative Activities  
CFDA No.: 93.778  
Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Passed-through: County of Los Angeles  
Award No.: 04-35096A01  
Award Year: Fiscal year 2009-2010  
Compliance Requirement: Procurement and Suspension and Debarment

Criteria:
The June 2010 Office of Budget and Management (OMB) OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement states that when a non-federal entity enters into a covered transaction with an entity at a lower tier, the non-federal entity must verify that the entity is not suspended or debarred, or otherwise excluded. This verification may be accomplished by checking the Excluded Parties list System (EPLS), collecting a certification from the entity or adding a clause or condition to the covered transaction with that entity.

Condition Found:
Instance of Non-Compliance – The Commission did not verify suspension and debarment by reviewing the EPLS, obtaining a certification from the subrecipient or including a clause in the subrecipient agreement.

Questioned Costs:
None noted.

Context:
The condition noted above was identified during our testing of the procurement and suspension and debarment requirements of the program.
Effect:

The Commission increases its risk of contracting with a suspended and debarred vendor.

Cause:

The Commission did not maintain procedures requiring verification of the suspended and debarred status of its subrecipients.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the Commission implement procedures to ensure that procurements and subawards of federally funded projects are verified for suspension and debarment by review of the EPLS, collecting the appropriate certification or adding a clause/condition to the agreement.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions:

The Commission will implement procedures to ensure that procurements and subawards of federally funded projects are verified for suspension and debarment by review of the EPLS, collecting the appropriate certification or adding a clause/condition to the agreement.
None noted.