DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

EDMUND G. BROWN JR. • GOVERNOR

915 L STREET ■ SACRAMENTO CA ■ 95814-3706 ■ WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

March 24, 2015

Ms. Rosanna B. Moore, City Manager
City of Brawley
383 Main Street
Brawley, CA 92227

Dear Ms. Moore:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Brawley Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16A) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on March 3, 2015 for the period of July 1 through December 31, 2015. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS 15-16A, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

Based on a sample of line items reviewed and application of the law, Finance made the following determinations:

- Item No. 6 – Consulting Services in the amount of $5,000. Although enforceable, the types of services requested are considered general administrative costs and have been reclassified.

- Item No. 11 – Successor Agency Administration in the amount of $125,000. This item is an enforceable obligation; however, the Agency requested the administrative cost allowance from Non-Administrative Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) instead of Administrative RPTTF. Therefore, $125,000 is being reclassified to administrative RPTTF.

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 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 $3,394.

Therefore, with the Agency's concurrence the funding source for the following items have been reclassified to Other Funds and in the amounts specified below:

- Item No. 2 – Securities Servicing in the amount of $1,244. The Agency requests $1,870 of RPTTF; however, Finance is reclassifying $1,244 to Other Funds. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 15-16A period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues and the Agency has $3,394 in available Other Funds. Therefore, Finance is approving RPTTF in the amount of $626 and the use of Other Funds in the amount of $1,244, totaling $1,870.

- Item No. 5 – Continuing Disclosure Services. The Agency requests $2,150 of RPTTF; however, Finance is reclassifying $2,150 to Other Funds. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 15-16A period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues and the Agency has $3,394 in available Other Funds. Therefore, Finance is approving RPTTF in the amount of $0 and the use of Other Funds in the amount of $2,150, totaling $2,150.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 15-16A form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the July through December 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. Proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter; therefore, the amount of RPTTF approved in the table below only reflects the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency.

Except for the items that have been reclassified, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16A. If you disagree with the determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 15-16A, 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 $384,172 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of July through December 2015		
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations		387,566
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations		0
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS	**$**	**387,566**
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations		**387,566**
Reclassified Items		
Item No. 6		(5,000)
Item No. 11		(125,000)
		(130,000)
	$	**257,566**
Cash Balances - Items reclassified to Other Funds/Reserve Balances		
Item No. 2		(1,244)
Item No. 5		(2,150)
		(3,394)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	**$**	**254,172**
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations		**0**
Reclassified Items		
Item No. 6		5,000
Item No. 11		125,000
		130,000
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	**$**	**130,000**
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	**$**	**384,172**
ROPS 14-15A prior period adjustment		0
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	**$**	**384,172**

Please refer to the ROPS 15-16A schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

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

Absent a Meet and Confer, this is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for July 1 through December 31, 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 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.

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

Sincerely,

JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Ruby Walla, Finance Director, City of Brawley
Ms. Ann McDonald, Property Tax Manager, Imperial County
California State Controller's Office