

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	16-1227		Name:	Second Hearing to amend Fresno County MSF for Section 300 relating to the ACTTC		
			In control:	Auditor - Controller		
On agenda:	9/27	//2016	Final action:	9/27/2016		
Enactment date	:		Enactment #:	Ordinance No. 16-014		
Title:	Sch to th	Conduct the second hearing on an ordinance to amend Section 300 of the Fresno County Master Schedule of Fees, Charges and Recovery Costs (MSF) Ordinances by amending Section 300 relating to the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector Fees; and waive reading of the ordinance in its entirety				
Sponsors:		-				
Indexes:						
Code sections:						
Attachments:	1. A	genda Item, 2. Ordinance	No. 16-014, 3. At	tachment A, 4. Proof of Publicatior	ı	
Date	Ver.	Action By	Act	ion	Result	
9/27/2016	1	Board of Supervisors	Co	nsent Agenda be approved	Pass	
DATE:		September 27, 2016	6			
TO:		Board of Supervisor	ſS			
SUBMITTED BY:		Vicki Crow, C.P.A, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector				
SUBJECT:		Amendment to Mas	Amendment to Master Schedule of Fees - Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector			

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

Conduct the second hearing on an ordinance to amend Section 300 of the Fresno County Master Schedule of Fees, Charges and Recovery Costs (MSF) relating to the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector Fees; and waive reading of the ordinance in its entirety.

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.

File #: 16-1227, Version: 1

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 #9, September 13, 2016 BAI #18, June 7, 2016 BAI #10, May 24, 2016

ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED AND/OR ON FILE:

Attachment A Ordinance

CAO ANALYST:

Debbie Paolinelli