



November 18, 2015

Mr. Albert Avila, Finance Director  
City of Oakdale  
280 North Third Avenue  
Oakdale, CA 95361

Dear Mr. Avila:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the City of Oakdale Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the period January 1 through June 30, 2016 (ROPS 15-16B) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on October 5, 2015. Finance has completed its review of the ROPS 15-16B.

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

Item Nos. 19 and 20 – Loans for Construction Projects totaling \$92,650 requested in ROPS 15-16B and the total outstanding amount of \$1,615,845 is not allowed. 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; and (2) the Agency's oversight board approves the loan as an enforceable obligation by finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes.

The Agency received a Finding of Completion on August 7, 2013. However, OB Resolution 2015-07 was denied in Finance's letter dated November 6, 2015. The OB Resolution relates to loans totaling \$1,700,946 between the City of Oakdale and the former Oakdale Redevelopment Agency. The Agency was unable to provide loan agreements with a repayment schedule and supporting evidence that obligates the Agency to repay the money. As such, this item is not an enforceable obligation and is not eligible for funding.

The administrative costs claimed are within the fiscal year administrative cap pursuant to HSC section 34171 (b) (2). 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 use adequate discretion when evaluating the administrative resources required to successfully wind-down the Agency.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a) (1), the Agency was required to report on the ROPS 15-16B form the estimated obligations versus actual payments (prior period adjustment) associated with the January through June 2015 period (ROPS 14-15B). HSC section 34186 (a) (1) also specifies the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency is subject to review by the county auditor-controller (CAC). Proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter; therefore, the amount of RPTTF approved in the table on the next page only reflects the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

In addition, Finance noted on the Agency's ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment worksheet, the Agency's expenditures exceeded Finance's authorization for the following items:

- Reserve Balance in the amount of \$32,705 – Item No. 1, \$32,705.
- Other Funds in the amount of \$4,908 – Item No. 1, \$4,908.

Per HSC section 34177 (a) (3), only those payments listed on a ROPS may be made by the Agency from the funds specified on the ROPS up to the amount authorized by Finance. HSC sections 34177 (a) (4) and 34173 (h) (1) 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, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16B. If you disagree with Finance's determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 15-16B, except for those items which are the subject of litigation disputing Finance's previous or related determinations, 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/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/meet_and_confer/)

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$1,237,202 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of January through June 2016</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,207,282
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>\$ 1,332,282</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>1,207,282</b>
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 19	(7,038)
Item No. 20	(85,612)
	(92,650)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,114,632</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations</b>	<b>125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,239,632</b>
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	(2,430)
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 1,237,202</b>

On the ROPS 15-16B form, the Agency reported cash balances and activity for the period January 1 through December 31, 2015. Finance will perform a review of the Agency's self-reported cash balances on an ongoing basis. Please be prepared to submit financial records and bridging documents to support the cash balances reported upon request. If it is determined the Agency possesses cash balances that are available to pay approved obligations, HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E) requires these balances be used prior to requesting RPTTF.

Please refer to the ROPS 15-16B schedule used to calculate the total RPTTF approved for distribution:

<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 January 1 through June 30, 2016. This determination only applies to items when 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 ROPS periods. All items listed on a future ROPS are subject to review and may be denied even if it was not denied on this ROPS or a preceding ROPS. The only exception is for items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination from Finance pursuant to HSC section 34177.5 (l). Finance's review of Final and Conclusive items 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 available prior to the enactment of the redevelopment dissolution statutes. 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.

Mr. Albert Avila  
November 18, 2015  
Page 4

Please direct inquiries to Wendy Griffe, Supervisor, or Jared Smith, Lead Analyst, at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Bryan Whitemyer, City Manager, City of Oakdale  
Ms. Lauren Klein, Auditor-Controller, Stanislaus County