



March 12, 2013

Ms. Linda Hollinsworth, Finance Director
City of Arvin
200 Campus Drive
Arvin, CA 93203

Dear Ms. Hollinsworth:

Subject: Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund Due Diligence Review

This letter supersedes Finance's original LMIHF DDR determination letter dated February 6, 2013. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34179.6 (c), the City of Arvin successor agency (Agency) submitted an oversight board approved Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund (LMIHF) Due Diligence Review (DDR) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on January 11, 2013. Finance issued a LMIHF DDR determination letter on February 6, 2013. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more items adjusted by Finance. The Meet and Confer Session was held on March 5, 2013.

Based on a review of additional or clarifying information provided to Finance during the Meet and Confer process, Finance continues to believe the adjustments made to the DDR's stated balance of LMIHF available for distribution to the taxing entities is appropriate. HSC section 34179.6 (d) authorizes Finance to make these adjustments. We maintain the adjustment continues to be necessary for the following reason:

- Retention of LMIHF in the amount of \$129,200 continues to be denied as no LMIHF obligations were included on the fiscal year 2012-13 Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS II and III). The Agency contends the assets were divided with a 20/80 split between LMIHF and all other funds for the purposes of preparing the LMIHF and Other Funds DDRs; therefore, the approved obligations on the ROPS should be treated the same. However, the total approved obligation amount for ROPS II was claimed for retention in the Other Funds DDR. Therefore, there is no need to request funding for ROPS II through the LMIHF DDR. Additionally, since the County Auditor Controller distributed RPTTF for approved ROPS III obligations on January 2, 2013, after the June 30, 2012 LMIHF balances delineated in the DDR, it is inappropriate for the Agency to retain current LMIHF balances for obligations that have already been funded through a separate process. Therefore, the LMIHF balances available for distribution to the taxing entities continues to be adjusted by \$129,200.

The Agency's LMIHF balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities continues to be \$4,657 (see table at the next page).

LMIHF Balances Available For Distribution To Taxing Entities	
Available Balance per DDR:	\$ (124,543)
Finance Adjustments	
Add:	
Requested retained balance not supported:	129,200
Total LMIHF available to be distributed:	\$ 4,657

This is Finance's final determination of the LMIHF balances available for distribution to the taxing entities. 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.

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 successor agency is required to take diligent efforts to recover such funds. A failure to recover and remit those funds may result in offsets to the other taxing entity's sales and use tax allocation or to its property tax allocation. If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of a private entity, HSC 34179.6 (h) (1) (B) states that 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.

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 30, 2012 do not in any way eliminate the Controller's authority.

Ms. Hollinsworth
March 12, 2013
Page 3

Please direct inquiries to Kylie Le, Supervisor or Brian Dunham, Lead Analyst at
(916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Steve Szalay', with a stylized flourish extending to the left.

STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Tim Chapa, City Manager, City of Arvin
Ms. Mary B. Bedard, Auditor Controller, Kern County
California State Controller's Office