DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

EDMUND G. BROWN JR. • GOVERNOR
915 L STREET ■ SACRAMENTO CA ■ 95814-3706 ■ WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

March 4, 2013

Mr. Orlando Acevedo, Economic Development Manager
Town of Apple Valley
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, CA 92307

Dear Mr. Acevedo:

Subject: Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund Due Diligence Review

The Town of Apple Valley Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an oversight board approved Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund Due Diligence Review (DDR) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on February 6, 2013. The purpose of the review was to determine the amount of cash and cash equivalents available for distribution to the affected taxing entities. Since the Agency did not meet the October 15, 2012 submittal deadline pursuant to HSC section 34179.6 (c), Finance is not bound to completing its review and making a determination by the November 9, 2012 deadline pursuant to HSC section 34179.6 (d). However, Finance has completed its review of your DDR, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

HSC section 34179.6 (d) authorizes Finance to adjust the DDR's stated balance of Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund (LMIHF) available for distribution to the taxing entities. Based on our review of your DDR, the following adjustments were made:

- Our review indicates the total amount of assets held as of June 30, 2012 should be $16,804,224. As such, the amount has been adjusted by $4,647,107 to include cash balances attributable to the Redevelopment Agency Project Area #2 Fund available as of June 30, 2012.

- The transfer for the 2007 Tax Allocation Bond debt service payment in the amount of $189,589 is disallowed. The Agency requested bond proceeds to fund this obligation, and not LMIHF.

- The request to retain funds in the amount of $1,575,000 is disallowed. The AMCAL Agreement was denied as an enforceable obligation by Finance as an inclusion to its Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule reviews, and again during the Meet and Confer process in our letter dated December 18, 2012.

- The request to retain funds in the amount of $23,286 to fund the separation agreement for the former employee is disallowed. The Agency requested Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund funding for this obligation, and not LMIHF.

If you disagree with Finance's adjusted amount of LMIHF balances available for distribution to the taxing entities, you may request a Meet and Confer within five business days of the date of this letter. The Meet and Confer process and guidelines are available at Finance's website below:

http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/meet_and_confer/

The Agency's LMIHF balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities is $11,838,648 (see table below).

LMIHF Balances Available For Distribution To Taxing Entities		
Available Balance per DDR:	$	5,403,666
Finance Adjustments		
Add:		
Adjustment to the June 30, 2012 balance		4,647,107
Disallowed transfers		189,589
Requested retained balances not supported		1,598,286
Total LMIHF available to be distributed:	$	11,838,648

Absent a Meet and Confer request, HSC section 34179.6 (f) requires successor agencies to transmit to the county auditor-controller the amount of funds identified in the above table within five working days, plus any interest those sums accumulated while in the possession of the recipient.

Pursuant to HSC 34179.6 (h) (1) (B), any remittance related to unallowable transfers to a private party may also be subject to a 10 percent penalty if not remitted within 60 days.

If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of the successor agency, and if the successor agency is operated by the city or county that created the former redevelopment agency, then failure to transmit the identified funds may result in offsets to the city's or the county's sales and use tax allocation, as well as its property tax allocation. If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of another taxing entity, the Agency's failure to recover and remit those funds may result in offsets to its sales and use tax allocation or to its property tax allocation.

Failure to transmit the identified funds will also prevent the Agency from being able to receive a finding of completion from Finance. Without a finding of completion, the Agency will be unable to take advantage of the provisions detailed in HSC section 34191.4. Specifically, these provisions allow certain loan agreements between the former redevelopment agency (RDA) and the city, county, or city and county that created the RDA to be considered enforceable obligations. These provisions also allow certain bond proceeds to be used for the purposes in which they were sold and allows for the transfer of real property and interests into the Community Redevelopment Property Trust Fund once Finance approves the Agency's long-range property management plan.

In addition to the consequences above, willful failure to return assets that were deemed an unallowable transfer or failure to remit the funds identified above could expose certain individuals to criminal penalties under existing law.

Pursuant to HSC section 34167.5 and 34178.8, the California State Controller's Office (Controller) has the authority to claw back assets that were inappropriately transferred to the city, county, or any other public agency. Determinations outlined in this letter and Finance's Housing Assets Transfer letter dated August 29, 2012 do not in any way eliminate the Controller's authority.

Please direct inquiries to Nichelle Thomas, Supervisor or Susana Medina Jackson, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,

STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Marc Puckett, Finance Director, Town of Apple Valley
Mr. Kofi Antobam, Assistant Finance Director, Town of Apple Valley
Ms. Vanessa Doyle, Auditor Controller Manager, San Bernardino County
California State Controller's Office