



REVISED

May 27, 2015

Ms. Cheryl Dyas, Director of Administrative Services  
City of Mission Viejo  
200 Civic Center  
Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Dear Ms. Dyas:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated April 12, 2015. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Mission Viejo Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16A) to Finance on February 27, 2015, for the period of July through December 2015. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on April 12, 2015. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more of the determinations made by Finance. The Meet and Confer session was held on April 23, 2015.

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 determinations being disputed.

- Item No. 24 – Kaleidoscope Owner Participation Agreement in the amount of \$35,000. Finance continues to reclassify this obligation to the Agency's Administrative Cost Allowance. HSC section 34171 (b) allows litigation expenses related to assets or obligations to be funded with property tax outside the administrative cap. However, Finance reclassified this item to the administrative cost allowance because it relates to general legal representation and not specifically to bringing or contesting a legal action in court. During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency contended that this item is a project related expense. However, the legal services provided a third party do not fall into any of the following categories that are specifically excluded from the administrative cap as defined by HSC section 34171 (b):
  - Any litigation expenses related to assets or obligations.
  - Settlements and judgments.
  - The costs of maintaining assets prior to disposition.
  - Employee costs associated with work on specific project implementation activities, including, but not limited to, construction inspection, project management, or actual construction, shall be considered project-specific costs.

Although enforceable, the types of services requested are considered general administrative costs and continue to be reclassified.

- Item Nos. 53 and 55 – Legal costs provided by Stradling, Yocca, Carlson, & Rauth related to incorrect Supplemental Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (SERAF) and Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Funds (RPTTF) calculations totaling \$20,000. Finance no longer denies these items; however, Finance reclassifies these items to the administrative cost allowance. It was our understanding the Agency retained the services of Lozano Smith, LLP for SERAF and RPTTF calculations. HSC section 34171 (d) (1) (F) states that contracts and agreements necessary for the administration or operation of the Agency, including contracts concerning litigation, are enforceable obligations; however, Finance initially denied these items because the legal services from two separate firms for the same issue appears duplicative and unnecessary.

During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency contended that these items are project related expenses. However, the legal services provided a third party does not fall into any of the following categories that are specifically excluded from the administrative cap as defined by HSC section 34171 (b):

- Any litigation expenses related to assets or obligations.
- Settlements and judgments.
- The costs of maintaining assets prior to disposition.
- Employee costs associated with work on specific project implementation activities, including, but not limited to, construction inspection, project management, or actual construction, shall be considered project-specific costs.

Although enforceable, the types of services requested are considered general administrative costs and are being reclassified.

- Item Nos. 54 and 56 – Legal costs provided by Lozano Smith, LLP totaling \$40,000. Finance continues to reclassify Item No. 56 as an administrative cost; however, Finance no longer reclassifies Item No. 54 as an administrative cost, but instead denies Item No. 54. Finance initially determined that the types of services requested are considered general administrative costs and were reclassified. During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency contended that these items are related to litigation services.

For Item No. 54, the Agency provided an invoice for actual costs incurred by the City under the City's agreement with Lozano Smith, LLP. Based on the invoice provided, all of the costs already incurred were billed to the City, not the Agency. As such, the costs related to the litigation that were billed to the City under the City agreement are not an obligation of the Agency. Therefore, Item No. 54 is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for funding.

For Item No. 56, based on the description of work to be completed, this item does not appear to be related to litigation services. General legal services provided by a third party do not fall into any of the following categories that are specifically excluded from the administrative cap as defined by HSC section 34171 (b):

- Any litigation expenses related to assets or obligations.
- Settlements and judgments.
- The costs of maintaining assets prior to disposition.

- Employee costs associated with work on specific project implementation activities, including, but not limited to, construction inspection, project management, or actual construction, shall be considered project-specific costs.

Although enforceable, the types of services requested for Item No. 56 are considered general administrative costs and continue to be reclassified.

- Item No. 57 – Legal services provided by Lozano Smith, LLP to properly manage preexisting 1999 Variable Rate Demand Bond contracts in the amount of \$60,000. Finance no longer denies this item; however, Finance reclassifies this item to the administrative cost allowance. Finance initially denied this item because no documentation was provided to support the need for these additional compliance services. During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency contended that this item is a project related expense. However, the legal services provided a third party do not fall into any of the following categories that are specifically excluded from the administrative cap as defined by HSC section 34171 (b):
  - Any litigation expenses related to assets or obligations.
  - Settlements and judgments.
  - The costs of maintaining assets prior to disposition.
  - Employee costs associated with work on specific project implementation activities, including, but not limited to, construction inspection, project management, or actual construction, shall be considered project-specific costs.

Although enforceable, the types of services requested are considered general administrative costs and are being reclassified.

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. The amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's review of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Except for the items denied in whole or in part or the items that have been reclassified, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16A. The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$1,450,452 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution</b>	
<b>For the period of July through December 2015</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,346,263
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS</b>	<b>\$ 1,471,263</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>1,346,263</b>
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 54	(20,000)
<u>Reclassified Items</u>	
Item No. 24	(1,000)
Item No. 53	(10,000)
Item No. 55	(10,000)
Item No. 56	(20,000)
Item No. 57	(30,000)
	(71,000)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,255,263</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations</b>	<b>125,000</b>
<u>Reclassified Items</u>	
Item No. 24	1,000
Item No. 53	10,000
Item No. 55	10,000
Item No. 56	20,000
Item No. 57	30,000
	71,000
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 196,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,451,263</b>
ROPS 14-15A prior period adjustment	(811)
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 1,450,452</b>

Please refer to the ROPS 15-16A 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 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 (j). 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 Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Mary Halterman, Analyst, at (916) 445-3274.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Josephine Julian, Treasury Manager, City of Mission Viejo  
Mr. Frank Davies, Property Tax Manager, Orange County  
California State Controller's Office