

Cost Allocation Plan. In doing so he failed to protect the fiscal integrity of the County”.

Finding 3 (The Auditor/Controller delays or refuses to make payments for reason of personal and political motivation)

My Response to Joe Harn’s Response

The Auditor Controller is aware and the Board of Supervisor’s have been made aware of the Auditor’s refusal to make payment for personal, political and vengeful reasons.

Finding 5 – (The Auditor/Controller willfully fails to comply with Ordinance Code sections 3.16.130 and 3.16.140).

My Response to Joe Harn’s Response

I do not believe Joe Harn answered the question. See Ordinance Code below.

Sec. 3.16.130. Allowance by Board.

Before delivering the warrants in payment of claims, the County Auditor shall prepare a list of the claims approved by him or her each calendar week, and present it to the Board of Supervisors at its next regular meeting, for allowance by the Board, together with such of the claims and supporting documents as the Board may request. The claims list shall be submitted in duplicate, shall show as to each claim the name of the claimant, the amount allowed and the date of allowance, and shall be certified to the Board by the County Auditor or his or her deputy or assistant as a true list of claims properly and regularly coming before the Board. Upon allowance of the claims contained in the claims list, the claims list shall be amended, if necessary, to conform to the allowance made by the Board, and the Clerk of the Board shall sign a certificate on each copy of the claims list, as amended, certifying that the list is a correct list of claims allowed by the Board and specifying the date of the allowance. One copy of the claims list, so allowed and certified, shall be filed in the office of the County Auditor and shall constitute the allowance book. The other copy of the claims list, so allowed and certified, shall be filed in the office of the Clerk of the Board and shall constitute the warrant book.

(Prior Code, § 5213; Code 1997, § 3.16.130)

Sec. 3.16.140. Rejection.

If the County Auditor finds that any claim filed in his or her office is not a proper charge against the County, he or she shall reject the claim and endorse his or her rejection thereon. Each month, the County Auditor shall transmit to the Board of Supervisors a report of all claims

August 31, 2015

Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, Ca 95667
Attn: Clerk of Board James Mitrison

Re: Former Supervisor Briggs comments on **Legistar 15-1032**; Board Response to Grand Jury

Mr. Mitrison

Please add to the two following comments to public file specifically to the Grand Jury report on: Auditor Controller "Putting Political Gain Above What's Right for the County" and District One Supervisor Mikulaco "Sign of Times".

For the record I served two four year terms for a total of eight years statutorily ending January 2015. During this time I concentrated on understanding the internal government structure of El Dorado County which is locked into the culture of fear circulating around the Auditor Controller.

I've read the Grand Jury reports and both Auditor Controller Joe Harns and District One Supervisor Mikulaco individual responses. It is from my personal firsthand experiences do I make the following comments.

Auditor Controller Joe Harn -

It's simple to agree wholeheartedly with the Grand Jury findings on Auditor Harn (AH), in fact, it is a very accurate portrayal of how he wields the county checkbook and claim procedures (for reasons known only to himself) imposing a petulant will, costing great expense to: taxpayers and vendors.

AH responses to the Grand Jury revolve around the very blame game the Grand Jury reports on. He agrees he is ultimately responsible for the "Cost Applied's" yet he blames the former interim IT Director.

How does one with "ultimate responsibility" blame anyone?

AH in his response to finding 3 says he'd be happy with responding to specifics, let me offer a few:

- 1) LAFCo Grassy Run Service District dissolution. Several years ago Grassy Run members asked to formally dissolve their district. State statute mandates such dissolutions must move through the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) then to Board of Supervisors for ratification.

LAFCo commissioners and the Board of Supervisors agreed to use as much of the money in Grassy Run account for road improvements within their sphere and any residual money in Grassy Run account be delivered to LAFCo upon presentation to county of claim to pay the cost of dissolution. The residual amount was approximately \$5,000. LAFCo submitted the claim, nothing. AH sat on it. Many communications occur from LAFCo, CAO, AH and my office as at the time I sat as LAFCo Chairman. Finally, months after the claim was submitted I walked down to AH office and ask him when the \$5,000 would be sent. He produced a copy of the Board

Resolution directing the \$5,000 to LAFCo and said "the Board "directed" me. You (board) didn't "authorize" me".

This money still remains unpaid in the General Fund today years later.

I believe AH was more peeved at LAFCo as he and Supervisor Mikulaco publically grilled LAFCo Executive Director for a \$10,000 mathematical error as it related to a PERS contribution for LAFCo employees who were formerly county employees until 2007. A statutory separation was mandated by legislature requiring a PERS recalculation and the argument was about "who" County or LAFCo, was going to pick up the tab.

This LAFCo PERS matter was stupid and inane. I'd guess the county spent \$15,000 in legal fees and staff time while LAFCo spent \$5,000 in legal fees and staff time simply to adjust the mistake that if everybody met, as the board asked AH to many times, it probably would have taken a couple hours to resolve. But it's a prime example of how the Auditor chooses conflict to interact with everyone.

Instead of picking up the phone and saying "Hey Executive Director Henriquez, I got a question about the PERS actuarial and when you get a minute let's talk" he prefers to issue a press release to belittle LAFCo as incompetent, then, sends a letter to County Taxpayers to engage them, then, Mt Democrat writes editorials and so on and so on.

As you read on keep this in mind and think of the many former directors and professionals who are now separated from our county after being recipients of this routine. I would guess 75% of them received this public berating.

- 2) Ryan White Federal Aids Program – since the inception of this federal program the County has chosen to partner with Sacramento County who acts as the program lead. There has been a standard annual contract in the amount of \$75,000 in place for many years. Annually the contract comes to the Board for approval and we remit to Sacramento County for services.

At the time, AH had been combative with Health Services Director Neilson and in my opinion, chose to sit on this contract in an effort to make Director Neilson uncomfortable. (Director Neilson left the county after doing so much good elevating the delivery of health and social services because of the abuse levied by AH, my opinion) The county's payment had become so delinquent and after many pleas by Sacramento County staff, they finally had their Board of Supervisors, by resolution, send a letter with an attached unfiled lawsuit to my office to collect the \$75,000. The entire Board of Supervisors in Sacramento County had to become involved and threaten litigation before AH would send a check.

The flow chart for contracts such as this, go to: Risk Department; County Counsel; the Department Head and finally the Chief Administrative Office for placement on agenda for Board action.

Despite all these highly paid hands this \$75,000 AIDS contract which is substantial in our county delivering services to individuals who live with AIDS, it took about seven months from board approval for the AH to pay. Without any reason or rationale for withholding payment on a board approved contract.

3) Serrano Mello Roos – Parker Development request for refund of overpayment

Thinking it perfunctory, Parker Development submitted calculations along with a request for return of Mello Roos taxes paid in Serrano Development approximating \$1,200,000.

Before anyone else in the county could act AH wrote a letter to Parker stating adamantly he didn't agree and he would not be making any refund.

I am trying to condense a very long arduous process that ensued. But, if can think back to the PERS calculation then the reader may have a better idea of the costly affair about to unfold.

Parkers attorneys responded as attorneys are to be expected to. AH asked county counsel to respond in equal force without any courtesy toward the Board as an "fyi".

By the time it evolved to a mini war of words between AH through county counsel and the Parker Company once the Board was made aware it acted swiftly some weeks after AH rejection. The Board hired a lawyer specializing in accounting forensics to evaluate Parkers numbers. This is happening over a course of months.

The board wanted an explanation from AH who offered this in response "I don't like anything Kirk Bone has to say".

Meanwhile as the attorney fees are racking up on both sides AH sends Parker a check for about \$250,000 within a couple months into this morass. Then a couple months later sends Parker another \$500,000 or so. Before long, AH disclosed to the board he had hired a personal attorney using county funds to protect himself. From what remains a mystery to me.

In the end, the County forensic attorney findings basically affirmed Parker as correct all along. The county paid upwards of \$100,000 for attorney fees and staff time, not including AH personal attorney who identity remains a secret today, my guess Parker paid much more in attorney fees.

And so the basic question: Why?

What good of the people purpose did this near one year long ordeal serve when, while during the morass AH disbursed nearly three quarters of a million dollars BEFORE the county forensic attorney completed his review. Ultimately Parker received all their overpayments requested. I asked AH why he didn't work with Parker, his response "I do not like Kirk Bone".

Another example of putting political gain above what's right for the county.

4) Cost Applied's – Grand Jury finding number 1

There is a reason why District Attorney Pierson was asked to be the IT Director and that sole reason is AH. The board was about to embark on a \$6 million upgrade to the county's circa 1987 DOS accounting program. And we, the board, greatly feared the auditor would frustrate this upgrade because once in place everyone would be able to see the entirety of the county financial books. I think the concept of open books and government frightens AH.

District Attorney Pierson had long championed the upgrade and the board felt his perceived strong relationship with AH would encourage AH to work diligently and positively through the upgrade.

The board then sent Chief Administrative Analyst Webb to assist DA Pierson helping him with the day to day activities. Both relied on AH and his office who long ago became the defacto administer of cost applied.

Neither, IT Director Pierson nor CAO analyst Webb are/were responsible for the cost applied.

Ultimate responsibility means just that.

- 5) Since the adoption of County Ordinance Chapter 2.57, Section 2.57.030 the Board of Supervisors has authorized four separate Salary and Benefit resolutions increasing salaries and benefits of the "Elected Department Heads". County Counsel issued an opinion in September 2013 advising the Board Sec 2.57.030 clearly links the Board of Supervisors directly to each of those S&B Resolutions. Meaning, the Board of Supervisors should have enjoyed the same increases at the time the elected department heads received theirs.

AH states in his response number 5 regarding a 1978 Board of Supervisors action "I have followed the intent of the Board of Supervisors"

Here, he ignored not one, not two, but three Board resolutions. His paycheck didn't suffer as he chose to personally accept and pay the three salary increases to the elected department heads including his own paycheck failing or choosing not to increase in a like amount to the Board members as mandated in ordinance 2.57.

In 2006 he did however credit Board members \$6,000 benefit for health cost approved through resolution to elected department heads. One out of four.

With the 3-2 December 2014 action affirmatively reinstating pay differentials the Board of Supervisors also reinstated a 5% increase to their personal salaries beginning January 2013. My guess none of the board is receiving this or the three other S& B resolutions which is amounts to a 13% raise from current salary level, compounded. Now, today, there are four Board resolutions authorizing an increase to Board member's salaries that are not being paid.

Yet, every elected department head enjoys these raises while AH ignores 2.57.030 that, according to County Counsel, clearly links Board member's salaries. Another example of AH doing what he pleases.

The Board did in fact sever its link to 2.57 in November 2013.

However, on the last meeting In December 2014, months after every elected department head was safely re-elected the Board voted 3-2 to restore the link and pay schemes increasing AH personal paycheck about \$45,000 extra annually.

So Board members, here are a few examples AH asked for and I haven't even discussed the cultural assessment which the county has over two hundred thousand taxpayers dollars sunk into. I'll touch on it now.

The three people who braved the system to speak publically about the culture of Auditor Harn are now all detached from county service. Mike Appelgarth was a good county kid. He lived here and probably would have made a great CAO someday. CAO Daly and CAO analyst Webb's only crime was to effect Board policy.

The Board told the staff "we have your backs!" and as the assessment got a little rough what did the Board do? It sat by and allowed those we said we have their backs to be fired or detach. Then, the Board rewarded Auditor Harn with a pay raise. So much for public trust.

The Grand Jury recommendation for a criminal investigation and removal from office of Auditor Harn deserves more than what is being is being offered by this Board in their draft response.

District one Supervisor Mikulaco –

Everything the Grand Jury says is true. This man uses the color of his office as a shield for poor and disgraceful behavior. He walked off the dais one morning after a presentation to raise the horrors of sex trafficking and solicited a "date or hook up" with a victim of sex trafficking. I can see him and hear him as clear as the sun is bright. I can attest to personally reading complaints from staff members or outside agency staff of Mr. Mikulaco's sexual marauding of women and can relate a couple instances from Mr. Mikulaco bragged to me about.

There are female employees today who fear his retribution as he has had good tutelage by the rewards the county offers for bad behavior. *See cultural assessment and Auditor Harn.

When does it end? The Board of Supervisors are the county's citizens. You were elected to do right and good for your constituents and the county as a whole. Rewarding or ignoring poor behavior just stacks up the claims and dampens staff innovation.

Specifically to Mr. Mikulaco the Board should censure and strip him from all committee appointments and title other than Supervisor immediately.

Regarding both the Auditor Harn and Mr. Mikulaco, the Board needs to publically assure us citizens through resolution or letter stating they will cooperate with any investigation openly and free from obstructions like forcing a Public Records Act for simple information. This letter does not need to indict or promote any particular outcome and needs to be sent to District Attorney; State Attorney General; Grand Jury; Judge Kingsbury as a matter of public record.

Doing so, places the Board of Supervisors in a position of putting themselves ahead of political games and doing what is right for the county.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ rb
Ron Briggs
Former District IV Supervisor

Placerville, Ca 95667

K. Webber #25 BOS 9/1/15

September 1, 2015

Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Grand Jury Responses

The Board is often faced with many difficult decisions. As a Board you are asked to hear information from both sides. I'm sure it's a difficult position to be in to be pulled between your constituents and the elected management at the County. But, that comes with being elected.

The topic of the IT Cost Applied has been bantered around a lot over the past year or so. Since I was the Interim IT Director referenced in the reports and in the draft responses, I felt the need to provide some additional information.

First, the methodologies for the IT charges for the Network and Mainframe had been done the same way for many years. Once they were calculated, they were billed to departments. The information was provided to departments and included in the budget each year. Network charges were based on connected devices in each department. Mainframe charges were based on CPU (Central Processing Unit) minutes for each application and then charged to each department that used the application.

I am not sure at what point the question came up, or even how it came up, about the validity of the methodologies for the Network and Mainframe. What I do know is that on July 25, 2013 I received an e-mail from the Auditor's office requesting me to meet with the State Controller representatives regarding the IT methodologies. I will read you the contents of the e-mail and provide it to you for the record.

At the point in time that the State Controller's office requested a meeting IT no longer did fiscal work in the IT Department. The fiscal work for IT had been moved to the central fiscal unit in the CAO's office. As stated in the e-mail IT and the CAO's office were working cooperatively on the fiscal year 12-13 cost applieds.

For both of these IT charges, the biggest change was that the charges would now run through the cost plan rather than being direct billed to departments. It was also determined that there was no valid basis for spreading FAMIS and BPREP so the the methodology for the Mainframe was changed to accommodate that. The Network methodology was not significantly changed. Charges at that time were still going to be based on connected devices.

As noted in the e-mail. I asked if I should do anything to prepare for this last minute meeting. I received no response from the Auditor's office. Laura Schwartz provided working papers for the Network. Other than that, there was no advance notice of this meeting, what the issues were with

1 of 7

the methodology, or what the final expectations were for correction. When I attended this meeting, it was obvious that the State Controller representatives had already been briefed and were prepared to ask questions to which I could hardly respond since I was not informed of the meeting with enough advance time to gather documentation.

With regard to the May 13, 2014 Board meeting, I was one of the individuals who spoke publically. I am providing a copy of what I had to say that day. Of the County employees who spoke out that day, I believe all are no longer working for the County. I believe the County swept the cultural assessment under the rug to avoid liability. On May 13, I urged the Board to work towards either clearing perceptions or correcting the issues. Neither has happened. The perceptions and the problems still exist.

Thank you,



Kelly Webb
Former County Employee
Resident of Cameron Park

2 of 7

May 13, 2014

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Kelly Webb, Interim IT Director

Kelly Webb

I have been with the County 29 years. I have dedicated my career and life to serving the public and the citizens of El Dorado County. I have had the opportunity to move up within the organization and have always been proud to serve the citizens of this County. I am a graduate of El Dorado High School. I have raised my 4 children here. I live here and work here along with most of my family. This is the place we call home.

As you know, a little over three years ago, I voluntarily stepped into the position of Acting Information Technology Director when the Director at the time resigned with no lead time for the County to make plans. Almost immediately the County embarked upon significant technology changes.

The last three years have been challenging. I made a commitment to help bring the County's technology infrastructure forward from old, outdated systems to new systems that will create efficiency and achieve overall savings in a number of ways that are of benefit to everyone. I've worked closely with the Chief Administrative Office and the Chief Technology Officer, who was appointed to that role in July, 2011, to make these much needed improvements. Over the last three years I believe we have made steady progress in creating positive change in this vital area in the County.

I remained in an acting capacity until July 2013. I always said I never wanted to be an "Any Given Tuesday" department head. I have been around long enough to see the revolving door of appointed department heads come and go in the County. The IT Department and the HR Department have been hit especially hard over the years. However, I had a belief that improving the technology infrastructure in the County would ultimately be of benefit, so I quieted the voice in my head, put my fears aside and took the leap forward. I accepted the appointment to IT Director and was later informed that the position would be an interim status. Despite being in an interim position, I have worked hard to achieve the goals and objectives requested of me by the Board of Supervisors that appointed me.

Of particular concern to me is that I have recently been warned by other County department heads that we need to find a new place for me to work in the County. I have been asked on a couple of occasions about my retirement plans and when that wasn't in the immediate future, it was implied that I would not be safe in my current position once the election was over. I would like to believe that the people warning me have my best interests at heart. Maybe they do, but I feel that my position is being threatened by powerful internal forces that have significant influence inside and outside the County. I have no idea what I have done to warrant such treatment. One one hand I appreciate the warnings, on the other hand I am angry that this is happening. On

3 of 7

Friday, May 9, 2014, my fears were put into writing by Michael Raffety of the Mountain Democrat wherein he takes shots at my position and suggest that I may not be the best person to do the job the Board appointed me to, despite the fact that I have been doing the job for over three years. I feel that this attack jeopardizes me professionally, it has the potential to negatively affect my long term career at the County, and could also negatively affect my future retirement. I am not willing to become collateral damage in someone else's power game and I am looking to the Board of Supervisor's that appointed me to carefully consider the recommendations of the Consultant in this continuing effort to improve working conditions at the County.

I would also like to briefly respond to the Mountain Democrat's comments about the 41% dissatisfaction rating in the IT Department. While I have not been provided any information as to the areas of concern, I can say that as the Interim Director, I am personally concerned about this information and plan to work with the consultant and the HR Director to the extent possible to see about making improvements. I responded to the survey and included several comments that reflected negatively on the working conditions at the County. It may be possible that my own responses to the survey are part of that 41%. I have no idea how many staff responded or if the 41% is illustrative of the entire department or a smaller group. The survey is confidential and I am respectful of that; however in order to fix the problem, it would be important going forward for me to receive some feedback as to the areas of employee concern. I believe the IT staff is a dedicated group of hardworking people who provide excellent service to the County departments we serve so it is important to me to see what we can do to improve their job satisfaction.

I have supported the Cultural Assessment despite to possibility that employees may not always be happy or satisfied. I believe it is important to understand what the issues and problems are whether perceived or real. If the problems are perceived, we need to clear the perception. If the problems are real, we need to take corrective action. Despite the negative rating in my department, I am still committed to making improvements. Change is hard and the County has been in the midst of change for the past three years. I urge you to continue to push the Cultural Assessment forward and either clear the perceptions or correct the issues.

4 of 7



Kelly Webb <kawebb0428@gmail.com>

Fwd: Cost Plan Auditors - want to meet w/ IT

Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>
To: Kelly Webb <kawebb0428@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 10, 2015 at 3:27 PM

Forwarded conversation

Subject: **Cost Plan Auditors - want to meet w/ IT**

From: **Kathy Sergeant** <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 11:31 AM
To: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>, Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

Would it be possible to set up a meeting for tomorrow, late this afternoon?

Thanks.

—
Kathy Sergeant, CPA
El Dorado County Auditor-Controller's Office
Phone: 530-621-5463
Fax: 530-295-2535

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system. Thank you.

From: **Laura Schwartz** <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 11:35 AM
To: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>
Cc: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

I'm sorry, but I will not be available. I am on vacation tomorrow, and have a dentist appointment at 3:30 today. As long as Kerri is available to attend, you probably don't need me. I would like a CAO representative there since we are working directly with IT on these issues.

Laura Schwartz
Chief Budget Officer
County of El Dorado
530-621-6541
laura.schwartz@edcgov.us

S of 7

From: **Kelly Webb** <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 11:44 AM

To: Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>

Cc: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

I can be available today from 2 - 5 or anytime tomorrow afternoon.

From: **Kathy Sergeant** <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 12:01 PM

To: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Cc: Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

can we make it 3:30 pm, Conference room A, or IT conference room if not available? As many that can attend on list the better.

Thanks.

From: **Kelly Webb** <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 12:05 PM

To: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>

Cc: Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

I can be available at 3:30. I'll check to see if the IT Conference Room is available in case Conf Room A is booked.

From: **Kerri Williams** <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 12:10 PM

To: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Cc: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>, Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

3:30 works for me.

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Kelly Webb** <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 1:03 PM

To: Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>

do we need to do anything to prepare that you are aware of?

From: **Kelly Webb** <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>

Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 1:09 PM

To: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>

Cc: Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>, Joe Ham <joe.ham@edcgov.us>

6 of 7

The IT Conference Room is not available. If there are only 6 or 7 people there is a small meeting room that can be used. Let me know where we will be meeting.

On Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 12:01 PM, Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us> wrote:

From: **Joe Harn** <joe.harn@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 1:39 PM
To: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>
Cc: Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>, Laura Schwartz <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>

Conf A

Joe Harn
Auditor-Controller
El Dorado County

From: **Laura Schwartz** <laura.schwartz@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 1:46 PM
To: Joe Harn <joe.harn@edcgov.us>
Cc: Kelly Webb <kelly.webb@edcgov.us>, Kathy Sergeant <kathy.sergeant@edcgov.us>, David Russell <David.Russell@edcgov.us>, Kerri Williams <kerri.williams@edcgov.us>

Here is a copy of the FY 12/13 Network cost applied working papers. We still have not billed for mainframe as we haven't been able to determine a basis for spreading FAMIS and BPREP.

Laura Schwartz
Chief Budget Officer
County of El Dorado
530-621-6541
laura.schwartz@edcgov.us

Kelly Webb
Principal Administrative Analyst
County of El Dorado
530-621-6565

 **JI-10-071813-JA Network.PDF**
329K

7 of 7