DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

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

November 8, 2013

Ms. Tina Rodriguez, Successor Agency Administrator
City of Santa Monica
1901 Main Street, Suite B
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Santa Monica Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14B) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on September 27, 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. 33 – Construction Project Management Costs in the amount of $231,822 is partially denied. According to the documentation provided by the Agency, $29,990 of the $231,832 in project management costs is for Item No. 19. The remaining project management costs of $201,832 ($231,832 - $29,990) are related to Item Nos. 36 through 38 which were previously denied in our letter dated October 12, 2012. Our determination was further confirmed in our letters dated December 18, 2012, April 14, 2013, and May 17, 2013. Therefore, $201,832 is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for RPTTF funding.

- Item Nos. 36 through 38 – Affordable housing projects totaling $11,311,008 in bond proceeds and reserve balances. These items were previously denied in our letter dated October 12, 2012. Our determination was further confirmed in our letters dated December 18, 2012, April 14, 2013, and May 17, 2013. Finance continues to deny these items. Therefore, these items are not enforceable obligations and not eligible for funding on the ROPS. To the extent bond proceeds are available for these projects, they may become enforceable pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (c) upon receiving a Finding of Completion from Finance.

- Claimed administrative costs exceed the allowance by $6,055. HSC section 34171 (b) limits fiscal year 2013-2014 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax allocated to the successor agency or $250,000, whichever is greater. As a result, the Agency is eligible for $981,220 in administrative expenses. The Los Angeles Auditor-

Controller's Office distributed $860,070 for the July through December 13-14A period, thus leaving a balance of $121,150 available for the January through June 13-14B period. Although $127,205 is claimed for administrative cost, only $121,150 is available pursuant to the cap. Therefore, $6,055 of excess administrative cost is not allowed.

Pursuant to HSC Section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the January through June 2013 period. The amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes the prior period adjustment that was self-reported by the Agency. 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. Any proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter. Therefore, the amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes only the prior period adjustment that was self-reported by the Agency.

Except for the items denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligations or for the item that has 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 $2,377,807 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount For the period of January through June 2014		
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations		4,240,153
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations		127,205
Total RPTTF requested for obligations	**$**	**4,367,358**
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations		**4,240,153**
Denied Items		
Item No. 33		(201,832)
Total RPTTF approved for non-administrative obligations		**4,038,321**
Total RPTTF allowable for administrative obligations (see Admin Cost Cap table below)		**121,150**
Total RPTTF approved for obligations		**4,159,471**
ROPS III prior period adjustment		(1,781,664)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	**$**	**2,377,807**

Administrative Cost Cap Calculation	
Total RPTTF for 13-14A (July through December 2013)	28,668,999
Total RPTTF for 13-14B (January through June 2014)	4,038,321
Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2013-14	**32,707,320**
Allowable administrative cost for fiscal year 2013-14 (Greater of 3% or $250,000)	981,220
Administrative allowance for 13-14A (July through December 2013)	860,070
Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS 13-14B	**121,150**

Pursuant 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/.

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

Sincerely,

JUSTYN HOWARD
Assistant Program Budget Manager

cc: on following page

cc: Ms. Sarah Johnson, Principal Administrative Analyst, City of Santa Monica
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller
California State Controller's Office