

April 2, 2015

Mr. David A. Klug, Redevelopment Manager
City of Pasadena
100 North Garfield Avenue, Room S116
Pasadena, CA 91103

Dear Mr. Klug:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Pasadena Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16A) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on March 2, 2015 for the period of July 1, 2015 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. 1 – Pension obligation bond pursuant to Senate Bill 481 in the amount of \$39,665,103 continues to be denied. This item has previously been denied in ROPS III, 13-14A, 13-14B, 14-15A, and 14-15B determination letters. The Agency requested \$39,665,103 on this ROPS and previously provided an order granting preliminary injunction in favor of the City, however a final judgment on the merits has not been made. To reiterate Finance's position, we note the following:
 - The bonds were entered into by the City of Pasadena (City) to fund police and fire pensions and not entered into by the redevelopment agency (RDA) to fund redevelopment projects, as required by HSC section 34171 (e).
 - The original and amended reimbursement agreements are between the RDA and the City, and therefore not enforceable pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d) (2). HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the RDA and the sponsoring entity are not enforceable obligations unless they meet a limited exception which states, in part, that agreements entered into solely for the purpose of securing or repaying the sponsoring entity's debt may be enforceable. This exception does not apply here. The original reimbursement agreements and their amendments are separate and were not entered into for the security or repayments of the City's bonds or concurrent with the bond issuances. Therefore, they do not qualify as an exception to HSC section 34171 (d) (2).

- SB 481 passed in 1987 and added HSC section 33608, authorizing the RDA to enter into an agreement allowing the revenues from the reimbursement agreement to fund the police and fire retirement fund of the City. In 1999, the City sold bonds to replenish its Fire and Pension Retirement Fund (Fund). While the bond documents state that the City expected to use reimbursement agreement revenues to repay the bonds, the City specifically did not pledge the revenues to bond holders. Instead, the City pledged its general fund for the repayment of the bonds. The City then obtained a validation action declaring that the City had the authority to reassign the SB 481 receipts to pay the principal and interest of the bonds. This validation agreement did not validate the reimbursement agreements, but instead the Fund's assignment of SB 481 receipts back to the City to pay for the bonds. Therefore, the reimbursement agreements were not validated and still not enforceable pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d) (2).

The Agency contends the item is an enforceable obligation because the 1986 Reimbursement Agreement, which among other things obligates the former RDA to make annual payments of former tax increment to the City for debt service on the Pension Bonds, has been validated by the Legislature through Senate Bill 481 and was also validated by a 1999 court judgment. However, for the reasons stated above, the item continues to be denied and not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding.

- Item No. 14 – Housing set aside in the amount of \$1,600,000 continues to be denied. This item was previously denied in ROPS III, ROPS III Meet and Confer, and ROPS 14-15B determination letters. The requirement to set aside 20 percent of RDA tax increment for low and moderate income housing purposes ended with the passing of the redevelopment dissolution legislation, making the set aside aspect of the reimbursement agreement dated July 7, 1986 no longer operational. Further, the reimbursement agreement is between the RDA and the City, making it unenforceable pursuant to HSC section 34178 (a). Even if the reimbursement agreement were operative, the funds repaid would be unencumbered. HSC section 34177 (d) requires unencumbered funds to be remitted to the county auditor-controller for distribution to the taxing entities. This was accomplished through the due diligence review process pursuant to HSC section 34179.5 and 34179.6. Therefore, this line item is not an enforceable obligation and will not be eligible for RPTTF funding.

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.

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.

In addition, Finance noted the following during our review:

- On the ROPS 14-15A Prior Period Adjustment worksheet, the Agency's expenditures exceeded Finance's authorization for the following items:
 - Bond Proceeds totaling \$2,564 – Item Nos. 4 and 7
 - Other Funds totaling \$79,215 – Item No. 21

Per HSC section 34177 (a) (3), only those payments listed on ROPS may be made by the Agency from the funds specified on the ROPS. However, these items were determined to be enforceable obligations for the ROPS 14-15A period. Therefore, Finance is increasing the Agency's authorization for the ROPS 15-16A period to ensure that authorization is consistent with expenditures for the approved enforceable obligations. As these Other Funds were previously expended, the increase in authorization should not result in increased expenditures, but should merely allow the Agency to reconcile actual expenditures to the authorization.

HSC sections 34177 (a) (4) and 34173 (h) provide mechanisms when Agency payments must exceed the amounts authorized by Finance. Please ensure the proper expenditure authority is received from your Oversight Board and Finance prior to making payments on enforceable obligations.

Except for the items 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 \$611,511 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	42,038,343
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS	\$ 42,163,343
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	42,038,343
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 1	(39,665,103)
Item No. 14	(1,600,000)
	(41,265,103)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 773,240
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 125,000
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 898,240
ROPS 14-15A prior period adjustment	(286,729)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 611,511

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.

Mr. David A. Klug
April 2, 2015
Page 5

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 Kylie Oltmann, Supervisor or Nicole Prisakar, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Robert Ridley, Controller, City of Pasadena
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County
California State Controller's Office