



November 8, 2013

Mr. Jim DellaLonga, Senior Project Manager
City of Garden Grove
11222 Acacia Parkway
Garden Grove, CA 92840

Dear Mr. DellaLonga:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Garden Grove Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14B) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on September 26, 2013 for the period of January through June 2014. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS 13-14B, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

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 for the reasons specified:

- Item No. 1 – 2003 Tax Allocation Bonds in the amount of \$1,074,860. The Agency requested \$2,168,872, however, the total amount due during ROPS 13-14B is \$1,094,012. HSC section 34171 (d) (1) (A) allows agencies to hold a reserve for debt service payments when required by the bond indenture, or when the next property tax allocation will be insufficient to pay all obligations due for the next payment due in the following half of the calendar year. Based on our review of the bond indentures, we did not note any requirement to create such reserves. Additionally, based on the history of the Agency's RPTTF distributions, it is our understating the next property tax allocation will be sufficient to make debt service payments due for this item. Therefore, the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding for this item has been adjusted by \$1,074,860 (\$2,168,872-\$1,094,012) from the original requested amount of \$2,168,872 to \$1,094,012.
- Item Nos. 2 through 4, and 7 – Various obligations totaling \$3,623,890. According to the Agency's notes, the amounts requested are reserves for obligations due during July through December 2014 (ROPS 14-15A). HSC section 34177 (b) allows reserves required for indentures, trust indentures, or similar documents governing the issuance of outstanding redevelopment bonds. The statute does not currently recognize all anticipated obligations for the next ROPS period, thus, the creation of reserves for such items are not permissible. Additionally, Finance denied the Oversight Board's action related to project costs for the Kam Sang Agreement in our letter dated August 9, 2013. Therefore, these items are not eligible for RPTTF funding.

- The Agency's claimed administrative costs exceed the allowance by \$143,836. HSC section 34171 (b) limits the fiscal year 2013-14 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax allocated to the Agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater. The Orange County Auditor-Controller's Office distributed \$250,000 in administrative costs for the July through December 2013 period, thus leaving a balance of \$276,089 available for the January through June 2014 period. Although \$419,925 is claimed for administrative costs, only \$276,089 is available pursuant to the cap. Therefore, \$143,836 in excess administrative cost is not allowed.

During our review, which may have included obtaining financial records, Finance determined the Agency possesses funds that are required to be used prior to requesting RPTTF. Pursuant to HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E), RPTTF may be used as a funding source, but only to the extent no other funding source is available or when payment from property tax revenues is required by an enforceable obligation. The Agency provided financial records that displayed available Other Funds balances totaling \$358,964.

Therefore, the funding source for the following item has been reclassified to Other Funds and in the amount specified below:

- Item No. 27 – Agency Property Maintenance/Management in the amount of \$36,000. The Agency requested \$125,000 from Other Funds and \$36,000 from RPTTF; however Finance is reclassifying \$36,000 to Other Funds. According to information provided by the Agency, the Agency collects revenues from various properties which are used for maintenance and management of the properties. Therefore, Finance is approving the use of Other Funds totaling \$161,000 for Item No. 27.

Pursuant to HSC Section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 13-14B form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the January through June 2013 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 below table includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's audit of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Except for items denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligations or for items that have been reclassified, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 13-14B. If you disagree with the determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 13-14B, 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 RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$8,131,012 as summarized below:

| Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount For the period of January through June 2014 | |
|--|----------------------|
| Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations | 13,997,492 |
| Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations | 419,925 |
| Total RPTTF requested for obligations | \$ 14,417,417 |
| Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations | 13,997,492 |
| <u>Denied Items</u> | |
| Item No. 1 | (1,074,860) |
| Item No. 2 | (2,000,000) |
| Item No. 3 | (1,300,000) |
| Item No. 4 | (200,000) |
| Item No. 7 | (123,890) |
| | <u>(4,698,750)</u> |
| Total RPTTF before reclassification | 9,298,742 |
| <u>Reclassified Items</u> | |
| Item No. 27 | (36,000) |
| | <u>(36,000)</u> |
| Total RPTTF approved for non-administrative obligations | 9,262,742 |
| Total RPTTF allowable for administrative obligations (see Admin Cost Cap table below) | 276,089 |
| Total RPTTF approved for obligations | 9,538,831 |
| ROPS III prior period adjustment | (1,407,819) |
| Total RPTTF approved for distribution | \$ 8,131,012 |
| Administrative Cost Cap Calculation | |
| Total RPTTF for 13-14A (July through December 2013) | 8,237,546 |
| Total RPTTF for 13-14B (January through June 2014) | 9,298,742 |
| Less approved unfunded obligations from prior periods | - |
| Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2013-14 | 17,536,288 |
| Allowable administrative cost for fiscal year 2013-14 (Greater of 3% or \$250,000) | 526,089 |
| Administrative allowance for 13-14A (July through December 2013) | 250,000 |
| Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS 13-14B | 276,089 |

P0ursuant to HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E), agencies are required to use all available funding sources prior to RPTTF for payment of enforceable obligations. Beginning with the ROPS 13-14B period, Finance required successor agencies to identify fund balances for various types of funds in its possession. During our ROPS 13-14B review, Finance requested financial records to support the fund balances reported by the Agency; however, Finance was unable to reconcile the financial records to the amounts reported. As a result, Finance will continue to work with the Agency after the ROPS 13-14B review period to properly identify the Agency's fund balances. If it is determined the Agency possesses fund balances that are available to pay approved obligations, the Agency should request the use of these fund balances prior to requesting RPTTF in ROPS 14-15A.

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

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

Absent a Meet and Confer, this is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for January 1 through June 30, 2014. This determination applies only to items where funding was requested for the six month period. 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 HSC section 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 Nichelle Thomas, Supervisor or Alex Watt, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Assistant Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Matthew J Fertal, City Manager, City of Garden Grove
Mr. Frank Davies, Property Tax Manager, Orange County
California State Controller's Office