

Letter: Auditor asks EDC supes to resolve issues

Publisher's note: *This letter was given to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on June 2, with a copy given to CAO Pamela Knorr.*

Ladies and Gentlemen:

For the past couple of years, I have been asking for the county staff and sometimes your board to fix certain county ordinances, policies, and fee collection programs. Your board and your staff have not adequately prioritized resolving these issues. Because of the significant time that has passed, I am going to document some of these significant unresolved issues now.

Outdated Claims Procedures Ordinance

The county's claims procedures ordinance was adopted in 1958. This outdated ordinance violates state law in some instances and states that I am only to do payroll once per month. If I were to adhere to this ordinance, the county would be at significant legal peril. I wrote the former CAO and former county counsel about this problem in 2013. I was assured that this matter would be resolved. In June 2014, I informed the Executive Management Advisory Committee about this problem and was assured that county staff would work quickly to resolve this matter. This matter has not been resolved.

Board Adopted Tuition Reimbursement Policy Different than MOUs

The County's Tuition Reimbursement policy adopted by your board and on your board's website is materially different than the requirements in the MOUs with organized labor. As an example, the MOU with Local 1 that was adopted in November 2013 is more restrictive than board policy. This inconsistency

wastes a lot of time, frustrates our employees, and is extremely unfair to our employees. In June 2014, I informed the Executive Management Advisory Committee about this problem and was assured that county staff would work quickly to resolve this matter. This matter has not been resolved.

Special District Developer Impact Fees

The county levies Developer Impact Fees for Special Districts pursuant to Government Code Section 66000 and our local ordinance. The county continues to levy these fees even though we are not in compliance with state law or our local ordinance. Nexus studies that are required by state law are long overdue in most cases. I informed the former CAO, the former County Counsel, and the entire Board of Supervisors about this significant problem in March 2013. I was assured that the County staff would take corrective action. In June 2014, I informed the Executive Management Advisory Committee about this problem and was assured that county staff would work quickly to resolve this matter. This matter has not been resolved.

EDH Sheriff's Substation Developer Impact Fees

The county levies a Developer Fee for an El Dorado Hills sheriff's substation pursuant to Government Code Section 66000. The county continues to levy this fee even though the county has no plans to build this substation. The county has not updated its Nexus study as required by state law. On April 2, 2015, I informed the County Counsel and CAO about this issue. This issue has not been resolved.

I am hoping that your board directs staff to resolve these problems as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Joe Harn, CPA and auditor-controller

