



December 17, 2015

Mr. Ron Millard, Interim Finance Director
City of Vallejo
555 Santa Clara Street
Vallejo, CA 94590

Dear Mr. Millard:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated November 12, 2015. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Vallejo Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16B) to Finance on September 28, 2015, for the period of January 1 through June 30, 2016. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on November 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 December 3, 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. 43 – Housing Entity Admin Cost Allowance in the amount of \$64,700. Finance continues to deny this item. Finance denied this item because pursuant to HSC section 34171 (p), the housing entity administrative cost allowance is applicable only in cases where the city, county, or city and county that authorized the creation of the redevelopment agency (RDA) elected to not assume the housing functions. Because the housing entity to the former RDA of the City of Vallejo (City) is the City-formed Housing Authority (Authority), and the Authority operates under the control of the City, the Authority is considered the City under Dissolution Law (ABx1 26 and AB 1484).

The Agency contends that the City elected not to retain the housing functions, but the Authority, as a separate legal entity from the City, did retain the housing functions pursuant to HSC section 34176 (b) and should therefore be eligible for the housing entity administrative allowance. However, pursuant to HSC section 34167.10 (a), the definition of city includes, but is not limited to, any reporting entity of the city for purposes of its comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR), any component unit of the city, or any entity controlled by the city or for which the city is financially responsible or accountable. HSC section 34167.10 (a) defines city for purposes of all of Dissolution Law, which includes HSC section 34171, as amended by AB 471, and HSC section 34176. The Authority is included in the City's CAFR, which identifies the Authority as a

component unit of the City and states that the City is financially accountable for the component units.

Although the Authority is a separate legal entity from the City, HSC section 34167.10 (c) states that it shall not be relevant that the entity is formed as a separate legal entity. It should also be noted that HSC section 34167.10 (c) goes on to state that "the provisions of this section are declarative of existing law as the entities described herein are and were intended to be included within the requirements of this part [Part 1.8] and Part 1.85...and any attempt to determine otherwise would thwart the intent of these two parts." Therefore, based on our review, the City, by way of the Authority, elected to retain the housing functions pursuant to HSC section 34176 (a) and is not eligible for \$64,700 of housing entity administrative allowance.

In addition, per Finance's letter dated November 12, 2015, we continue to make the following determinations not contested by the Agency during the Meet and Confer:

- Item No. 1 – North Vallejo Community Center in the amount of \$1,755,100 is partially approved. During the review process, the Agency submitted Oversight Board (OB) Resolution No. 15-005 amending a 2002 Grant Agreement (2002 Agreement) between the former Vallejo Redevelopment Agency and the Greater Vallejo Recreation District (GVRD). The proposed amendment reduced the grant amount to \$1,250,000 and extended the grant period. Finance objected to this action in our November 9, 2015 OB Resolution No. 15-005 determination letter.

While Finance concluded the amendment was not authorized in statute, it is our understanding the 2002 Agreement does not terminate unless the Agency takes action by providing a notice of default to GVRD and giving GVRD the opportunity to cure the default. Finance's OB Resolution No. 15-005 determination letter notified the Agency's OB to consider whether terminating the 2002 Agreement would be in the best interest of the taxing entities since the agreement is over 13 years old and little has been accomplished. However, until the 2002 Agreement officially terminates, Finance believes this item constitutes an enforceable obligation eligible for funding on the ROPS.

As evidenced by the Agency's submittal of OB Resolution No. 15-005, only \$1,250,000 is needed under the 2002 Agreement. Therefore, the amount of \$505,100 (\$1,755,000 - 1,250,000) is not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding.

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). 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, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16B. The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$1,890,017 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table on the next page:

Approved RPTTF Distribution	
For the period of January through June 2016	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	2,339,023
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B	\$ 2,464,023
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	2,339,023
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 1	(505,100)
Item No. 43	(64,700)
	(569,800)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 1,769,223
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 125,000
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 1,894,223
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	(4,206)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 1,890,017

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>


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. Ron Millard
December 17, 2015
Page 4

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Danielle Brandon, Analyst, at (916) 445-3274.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Kathleen Diohep, Economic Development Manager, City of Vallejo
Ms. Rosemary Bettencourt, Deputy Auditor-Controller, Solano County