



October 29, 2013

Mr. James Purtee, Interim Assistant City Manager  
City of Simi Valley  
2929 Tapo Canyon Road  
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Dear Mr. Purtee:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Simi Valley 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 does not qualify as an enforceable obligation for the reasons specified:

- Item No. 25 – City loan repayment in the amount of \$192,745. The Agency received a Finding of Completion on April 26, 2013 and will be permitted to request funds for the repayment of loan agreements between the former redevelopment agency and sponsoring entity on the ROPS, provided the oversight board makes a finding that the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes per HSC section 34191.4 (b) (1). However, repayment of the loan is subject to the formula outlined in HSC section 34191.4 (b) (2) (A). Specifically, HSC section 34191.4 (b) (2) (A) states the maximum repayment amount in each fiscal year shall be equal to one-half of the increase between the ROPS residual amounts distributed to the taxing entities in that fiscal year and the ROPS residual amounts distributed to the taxing entities in the 2012-13 base year. Since the formula does not allow for estimates, the Agency is required to wait until the ROPS residual pass-through distributions are known for fiscal year 2013-14 before requesting funding for this obligation. Therefore, this item is not eligible for funding at this time.

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 received a refund of \$70,000 that was paid to K & J Auto Exchange for the Façade Renovation Grant.

Therefore, the funding source for the following item is being partially reclassified to the other funding source as specified below:

- Item No. 23 – Façade Renovation Grant in the amount of (\$70,000). Finance is reclassifying the total refund to reserve funding in order to apply it towards the payment of Item No. 17, 2003 Tax Allocation Bonds. Therefore, Finance is approving \$1,447,891 of RPTTF and \$70,000 of reserve funding totaling \$1,517,891 for Item No. 17.

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 item denied in whole as an enforceable obligation 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/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/meet_and_confer/)

The Agency’s maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$1,724,065 as summarized below:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount For the period of January through June 2014</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,792,391
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,917,391</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>1,792,391</b>
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 25	(192,745)
<u>Reclassified items</u>	
Item No.17	(7,000)
Item No.23	7,000
<b>Total RPTTF approved for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>1,599,646</b>
<b>Total RPTTF approved for administrative obligations</b>	<b>125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF approved for obligations</b>	<b>1,724,646</b>
ROPS III prior period adjustment	(581)
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 1,724,065</b>

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 Beliz Chappuie, Supervisor or Anna Kyumba, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Assistant Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Brian P. Gabler, Assistant City Manager, City of Simi Valley  
Ms. Sandra Bickford, Chief Deputy, Ventura County Auditor-Controller  
California State Controller's Office