



December 17, 2014

Mr. Nathan Hamburger, Assistant Executive Director
City of Agoura Hills
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Dear Mr. Hamburger:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated October 17, 2014. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Agoura Hills Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 14-15B) to Finance on September 12, 2014, for the period of January through June 2015. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on October 17, 2014. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more of the items denied by Finance. The Meet and Confer session was held on October 27, 2014.

Based on a review of additional information and documentation provided to Finance during the Meet and Confer process, Finance has completed its review of the specific items being disputed.

- Item No. 7 – Finance continues to maintain that the total outstanding balance for the City or Agoura Loan is overstated as it includes miscalculated interest. Finance has recalculated the total outstanding loan balance to be approximately \$17,200,000, and therefore has reduced the outstanding loan balance reported on the Agency's ROPS Detail Form by approximately \$11,900,000.

Based on our review of Resolution 11-55 and the attached Unsecured Promissory Note, the Agency recalculated the accumulated interest by using the historical Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) interest rate that was applicable for each year the loan has been outstanding. However, HSC section 34191.4 requires the recalculation of the accumulated interest at a rate not to exceed the interest rate earned by funds deposited in the LAIF at the time the Oversight Board finds that the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes and is deemed an enforceable obligation. As such, Finance has recalculated the interest using the LAIF interest rate at the time the Agency's Oversight Board made the finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes and has reflected the reduction to the loan's total outstanding balance in the ROPS14-15B.

Since the amount requested for ROPS 14-15B does not exceed the repayment formula outlined in HSC section 34191.4 (b) (2) (A), Finance is approving the amount requested.

The administrative costs claimed are within the fiscal year administrative cap pursuant to HSC section 34171 (b). However, Finance notes the oversight board has approved an amount that appears excessive, given the number and nature of the obligations listed on the ROPS. HSC section 34179 (i) requires the oversight board to exercise a fiduciary duty to the taxing entities. Therefore, Finance encourages the oversight board to apply adequate oversight when evaluating the administrative resources required to successfully wind-down the Agency.

During our review, which may have included obtaining financial records, Finance determined the Agency possesses funds that should be used prior to requesting Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (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 totaling \$49,354.

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

- Item No. 26 – Administrative Budget. The Agency requests \$125,000 of RPTTF; however, Finance is reclassifying \$49,354 to Other Funds. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 14-15B period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues. Therefore, Finance is approving RPTTF in the amount of \$75,646 and the use of Other Funds in the amount of \$49,354, totaling \$125,000.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 14-15B form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the January through June 2014 period. HSC section 34186 (a) also specifies 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 table below includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's audit of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Except for item that has been reclassified, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 14-15B. The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$644,636 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution Table on the following page:

Approved RPTTF Distribution	
For the period of January through June 2015	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	572,990
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS	\$ 697,990
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 572,990
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Cash Balances - Item reclassified to other funding sources	
Item No. 26	(49,354)
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 75,646
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 648,636
ROPS 13-14B prior period adjustment	(4,000)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 644,636

Please refer to the ROPS 14-15B schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS>

This is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for January 1 through June 30, 2015. This determination only applies 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 section 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 the 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 agency in the RPTTF.

Pursuant to HSC section 34177 (a) (3), only those payments listed on an approved ROPS may be made by the successor agency from the funds specified in the ROPS. However, if for whatever reason the Agency needs to make payments for approved obligations from another funding source, HSC section 34177 (a) (4) requires the Agency to first obtain oversight board approval.

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.

Mr. Nathan Hamburger
December 17, 2014
Page 4

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Danielle Brandon, Analyst, at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Acting Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Christy Pinuelas, Director of Finance, City of Agoura Hills
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County
California State Controller's Office