



County of Fresno

Hall of Records, Rm. 301
2281 Tulare Street
Fresno, California
93721-2198

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 16-1165 **Name:** Amendment to ACTTC MSF

On agenda: 9/13/2016 **In control:** Board of Supervisors
Final action: 9/13/2016

Enactment date: **Enactment #:**

Title: Conduct the first hearing on an ordinance to amend the Fresno County Master Schedule of Fees, Charges and Recovered Cost (MSF) Ordinances by amending Section 300 relating to the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector Fees, and waive reading of the ordinance in its entirety and set second hearing for September 27, 2016

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. Agenda Item, 2. Attachment A, 3. Ordinance, 4. Proof of Publication

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
9/13/2016	1	Board of Supervisors	Conducted Hearings	Pass

DATE: September 13, 2016

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBMITTED BY: Vicki Crow, C.P.A., Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector

SUBJECT: Amendment to Fresno County, California Code of Ordinance

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

1. Conduct the first hearing on an ordinance to amend the Fresno County Master Schedule of Fees, Charges and Recovered Cost (MSF) Ordinances by amending Section 300 relating to the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector Fees.

2. Waive reading of the ordinance in its entirety and set second hearing for September 27, 2016

On June 7, 2016 your Board approved the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector (A-C/T-TC) Master Schedule of Fees (MSF) Ordinance (Ordinance Number 16-010). Part of the Ordinance should have included a decrease in Section 300 of the A-C/T-TC MSF in the following subsections: Special Assessment Collection Fee Cost Component: Put Non-County Special Assessment on Tax Roll (subsection 306), Deposit Via Admin (subsection 311), Travel AP Voucher (subsection 313), and Contract AP Voucher (subsection 314). These proposed decreases were presented to your Board as attachments to the Agenda Item at the June 7, 2016 Board date; however, due to a clerical error, the decreases did not get reflected on the Ordinance. Approval of the recommended action will amend the MSF to reflect the decrease in fees for the four subsections of Section 300 in the MSF.

ALTERNATIVE ACTION(S):

Your Board can choose not to approve the recommended ordinance, and then the A-C/T-TC would not be able to implement the proposed fee reductions presented on the June 7, 2016 Board date (Item #18) and charges will be higher than actual cost.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no additional net County cost as a result of approving the recommended rates on Exhibit A. These rates will be used by the A-C/T-TC Department to fully recover direct and indirect costs of services performed for other departments and outside agencies.

DISCUSSION:

In early August, A-C/T-TC staff discovered four subsections in Section 300 of the approved A-C/T-TC MSF Ordinance 16-010 that did not get updated to the proposed fee amount and instead, still contained the then current MSF rates. Special Assessment Collection Fee Cost Component: Put Non-County Special Assessment on Tax Roll (subsection 306), did not get updated to the proposed \$0.16 per parcel, a decrease from \$0.17 per parcel. Additionally, the following three internal fees charged to Departments did not get updated as well: Deposit via Treasury (subsection 311) was proposed at \$28 per deposit, a decrease from \$40 per deposit; Travel AP Voucher (subsection 313) was proposed at \$9 a voucher, a decrease from \$10 a voucher; and Contract AP Voucher (subsection 314) was proposed at \$6 a voucher, a decrease from \$7 per voucher. The special assessment collection fee (subsection 306) will not be charged until December of this year.

Approval of the recommended actions will correct the clerical errors in the ordinance approved on the June 7, 2016 Board date. The items presented to your Board on that date included attachments to the agenda item that accurately reflected the proposed changes in fees. Due to a clerical error, however, the exhibit to the ordinance did not accurately reflect the same proposed changes and instead reflected the approved fees from the last approved ordinance. The attachment to this item and exhibit to the proposed ordinance presented with this item both accurately reflect the changes that were shown on the attachments with the previous item.

REFERENCE MATERIAL:

BAI #18, June 7, 2016
BAI #10, May 24, 2016

ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED AND/OR ON FILE:

Attachment A
Ordinance

CAO ANALYST:

Debbie Paolinelli