



REVISED

April 17, 2013

Ms. Melissa Hagan, Financial Analyst
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Dear Ms. Hagan:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Roseville Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14A) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on February 27, 2013 for the period of July through December 2013. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS 13-14A, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

After further review, it was determined that the approved amount of Redevelopment Property Tax Trust (RPTTF) funding was incorrectly calculated. The correct amount of RPTTF funding approved is \$807,777 which is presented in the table below. Pursuant to HSC section 34186, the county auditor-controller would adjust the RPTTF distribution amount on our behalf in the absence of our correction.

HSC section 34171 (d) defines enforceable obligations. Based on a sample of line items reviewed and application of the law, the following do not qualify as enforceable obligations:

- Item No. 44 – United States Postal Service (USPS) Relocation Costs in the amount of \$130,000. The lease agreement executed between the former Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and USPS state that the RDA is required to pay for relocation costs to move the USPS only if the RDA were to proceed with the redevelopment of the premises during the term of the lease. There have been no contracts or agreements executed prior to the dissolution of the RDA to redevelop the premises currently occupied by the USPS. Furthermore, HSC section 34177.3 (a) states that Successor agencies shall lack the authority to begin new redevelopment work, except in compliance with an enforceable obligation that existed prior to June 28, 2011. The Agency has not provided documentation to demonstrate that there is redevelopment work at these premises and USPS is not required to relocate; therefore, this item is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for funding from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) on this ROPS.
- Item No. 46 – Town Square Capital Improvement Project in the amount of \$350,661. The contract was executed between the City of Roseville (City) and Carducci & Associates. The former RDA is neither a party to the contract nor responsible for

payment of the contract. Therefore, this item is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for RPTTF funding on this ROPS.

Except for items denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligations, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 13-14A. This determination applies only to items where funding was requested for the six month period. If you disagree with the determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 13-14A, 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 maximum approved Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) distribution for the reporting period is: \$807,777 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount	
For the period of July through December 2013	
Total RPTTF funding requested for obligations	\$ 1,168,546
Minus: Six-month total for items denied or reclassified as administrative cost	
Item 44	52,000
Item 46	350,661
Total approved RPTTF for enforceable obligations	\$ 765,885
Plus: Allowable RPTTF distribution for ROPS 13-14A administrative cost	125,000
Minus: ROPS II prior period adjustment	(83,108)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution:	\$ 807,777

Pursuant to HSC Section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 13-14A form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the July through December 2012 period. HSC Section 34186 (a) also specifies that the prior period adjustments self-reported by successor agencies are subject to audit by the county auditor-controller (CAC) and the State Controller. The amount of RPTTF approved in the above table includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's audit of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Please refer to the ROPS 13-14A schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

[http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS 13-14A Forms by Successor Agency/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS%2013-14A%20Forms%20by%20Successor%20Agency/).

This is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for July 1 through December 31, 2013. Finance's determination is effective for this time period only and should not be conclusively relied upon for future periods. All items listed on a future ROPS are subject to a subsequent review and may be denied even if it was or was not denied on this ROPS or a preceding ROPS. The only exception is for those items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination from Finance pursuant to HSC 34177.5 (i). Finance's review of items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination is limited to confirming the scheduled payments as required by the obligation.

The amount available from the RPTTF is the same as the amount of property tax increment that was available prior to enactment of ABx1 26 and AB 1484. This amount is not and never was

an unlimited funding source. Therefore, as a practical matter, the ability to fund the items on the ROPS with property tax is limited to the amount of funding available to the successor agency in the RPTTF.

To the extent proceeds from bonds issued after December 31, 2010 exist and are not encumbered by an enforceable obligation pursuant to 34171 (d), HSC section 34191.4 (c)(2)(B) requires these proceeds be used to defease the bonds or to purchase those same outstanding bonds on the open market for cancellation.

Please direct inquiries to Beliz Chappuie, Supervisor or Todd Vermillion, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Kevin Payne, Revitalization Manager, City of Roseville
Ms. Jayne Goulding, Managing Accountant Auditor, Placer County
California State Controller's Office