



October 12, 2015

Mr. Mark Evanoff, Interim Deputy City Manager
Union City
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road
Union City, CA 94587

Dear Mr. Evanoff:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the Union City 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 September 1, 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 determinations:

Item Nos. 73 and 76 – Amended and Restated Cooperative and Public Improvement Agreement (Reentered Agreement) in the amounts of \$16,060,378 and \$8,000,000, respectively, have been adjusted as requested by the Agency. Finance has determined the Reentered Agreement is an enforceable obligation, allowing for the use of Agency 2011 bond funds committed to projects listed in Exhibit A of the Reentered Agreement. Finance is approving the Agency's request to reduce requested bond funding amounts for the following items:

- Item No. 73 – Requested amount of \$16,060,378 is reduced to \$6,624,118.
- Item No. 76 – Requested amount of \$8,000,000 is reduced to \$0.

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

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$4,014,818 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of January through June 2016	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	3,901,142
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	117,034
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B	\$ 4,018,176
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	3,901,142
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 3,901,142
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	117,034
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 117,034
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 4,018,176
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	(3,358)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 4,014,818

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 (i). 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. Mark Evanoff
October 12, 2015
Page 3

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

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Tony Acosta, Interim City Manager/Successor Agency Executive Director, Union City
Ms. Carol S. Orth, Tax Analysis, Division Chief, Alameda County