



April 3, 2015

Ms. Lani Ha, Finance Manager
City of Danville
510 La Gonda Way
Danville, CA 94526

Dear Ms. Ha:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Danville Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16A) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on February 26, 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 determination:

Item No. 6 – Cooperation Agreement between the Agency and the Town of Danville in the amount of \$9,263,478 is not allowed. Finance continues to deny this item. Pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (b), loan agreements between the former redevelopment agency and sponsoring entity may be placed on the ROPS if the following requirements are met: (1) the Agency has received a Finding of Completion (FOC); and (2) the Agency's Oversight Board (OB) approves the loan as an enforceable obligation by finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes.

The Agency received a FOC on May 24, 2013. However, the OB has not approved the loan or made a finding that the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes. Therefore, this ROPS item is not eligible for funding at this time. Once the OB approves the loan as an enforceable obligation by finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes and the corresponding OB action is approved by Finance, the Agency may request funding for this item on future ROPS.

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 Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Funds (RPTTF) approved in the table below only reflects the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency.

Except for the item denied in whole or in part, 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 \$695,977 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	1,014,777
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	81,200
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS	\$ 1,095,977
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,014,777
<u>Denied Item</u>	
Item No. 6	(400,000)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 614,777
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	81,200
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 81,200
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 695,977
ROPS 14-15A prior period adjustment	0
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 695,977

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 Nichelle Thomas, Supervisor or Medy Lamorena, Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Robert Ewing, City Attorney, City of Danville
Mr. Bob Campbell, Auditor-Controller, Contra Costa County
California State Controller's Office