DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

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

April 1, 2013

Ms. Linda Daniels, Assistant City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Dear Ms. Daniels:

Subject: Other Funds and Accounts Due Diligence Review

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34179.6 (c), the City of Rancho Cucamonga Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an oversight board approved Other Funds and Accounts (OFA) Due Diligence Review (DDR) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on January 14, 2013. The purpose of the review was to determine the amount of cash and cash equivalents available for distribution to the affected taxing entities. Pursuant to HSC section 34179.6 (d), 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 OFA available for distribution to the taxing entities. Based on our review of your DDR, the following adjustments were made:

- The request to restrict assets that are legally restricted for uses specified by debt covenants or other legal restrictions, in the amount of $63,606,199, has been adjusted by $8,518,776. Our review indicates the total amount of unspent bond proceeds held as of June 30, 2012 should be $34,773,480. Finance calculated the adjustment as follows:

General Ledger Balance as of December 31, 2011	$ 48,126,348
Less: January through June 2012 payments approved on the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule	$ 13,352,868
Balance as of June 30, 2012	$ 34,773,480
Less: Balance as of June 30, 2012 on DDR	$ 43,292,256
Adjustment amount	**$ 8,518,776**

- The request to restrict assets that are not cash or cash equivalents in the amount of $73,189,211 has been adjusted by $3,248,604 ($3,953,624 - $705,020). The Agency reported the value of non-cash assets as of June 30, 2012 at $72,484,191; yet the list specifying the value of non-cash assets totaled $73,189,211; we have adjusted the amount available for remittance to the taxing entities by $705,020.

Additionally, it is our understanding that the loan agreement for the advance to the City is payable on demand, therefore, we have adjusted the amount available for remittance to the taxing entities by $3,953,624.

- The request to retain balances in the amount of $66,535,170 for the funding of enforceable obligations has been adjusted by $59,942,306, as follows:

    - Pass-through payments totaling $47,987,823. It is our understanding that payment for these obligations have not been made; pursuant to HSC section 34183.5(a)(1), the county auditor controller is now required to make these pass-through payments to the appropriate taxing entities. As such, the retention for pass-through payments is not allowed.

    - Various payables and the request for administrative costs totaling $11,954,483. A review of the supporting documentation provided by the Agency indicates administrative costs in the amount of $871,465 were paid during the period January through June 2012.

      Additionally, the request to retain funding for various payables in the amount of $11,083,018 is not allowed; the Agency has not adequately proven there will be insufficient property tax revenues to pay for these obligations. HSC section 34179.5 (c) (5) (D) requires an extensive analysis before retention of current unencumbered balances can be contemplated. This includes but is not limited to, providing a detail of the projected property tax revenues and other general purpose revenues to be received by the Agency, together with both the amount and timing of the bond debt service payments, for the period in which the oversight board anticipates the Agency will have insufficient property tax revenue to pay the specified obligations.

      It is not evident the thorough analysis required by HSC section 34179.5 (c) (5) (D) was conducted. Further, it is not evident that future property tax revenue will be insufficient or that there is an immediate need to retain these balances.

      Should a deficit occur in the future, HSC provides successor agencies with various methods to address short term cash flow issues. These may include requesting a loan from the city pursuant to HSC section 34173 (h), or subordinating pass-through payments pursuant to HSC section 34183 (b). The Agency should seek counsel from their oversight board to determine the solution most appropriate for their situation if a deficiency were to occur.

If you disagree with Finance's adjusted amount of OFA 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 OFA balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities is $235,192,157 (see table below).

OFA Balances Available For Distribution To Taxing Entities	
Available Balance per DDR:	$ 162,072,431
Finance Adjustments	
Add:	
Request to restrict balances not supported	$ 13,177,420
Request to retain balances not supported	59,942,306
Total OFA available to be distributed:	$ 235,192,157

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. Upon submission of payment, it is requested you provide proof of payment to Finance within five business 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 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 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. Flavio Nunez, Management Analyst I, City of Rancho Cucamonga
Ms. Vanessa Doyle, Auditor Controller Manager, San Bernardino County
California State Controller's Office