



April 12, 2016

Ms. Melissa Hagan, Financial Analyst
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Dear Ms. Hagan:

Subject: 2016-17 Annual Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (o) (1), the City of Roseville Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the period July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 (ROPS 16-17) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on January 28, 2016. Finance has completed its review of the ROPS 16-17.

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

- Item No 7 – 2002 City loan repayment in the total outstanding amount of \$4,090,841 is not allowed. The Agency contends the loan qualifies for repayment pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (b) (2) (C), which states that an agreement between the former redevelopment agency (RDA) and the city that created the RDA, under which the city contracted with a third party on behalf of the former RDA for the development of infrastructure in connection with a redevelopment project plan, and the former RDA was obligated to reimburse the city for payments made by the City to the third party.

The 2002 Agreement for Advance of Funds (Agreement) between the RDA and the City of Roseville (City) does not provide that the City would contract with third parties on behalf of the former RDA. It is our understanding the Agreement was entered into after the flood control project was completed by the City. According to the Agency, the Agreement seeks reimbursement for costs incurred by the City. Therefore, the Agreement does not meet the definition of a "loan agreement" under HSC section 34191.4 (b) (2) (A) or (C) since there was no transfer of money from the City to the RDA and the Agreement did not provide that the City would subsequently enter into third party contracts under the Agreement. This item is not an enforceable obligation in accordance with Senate Bill 107 changes and the requested amount of \$930,010 in Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding for the January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017 (ROPS B period) is not allowed.

- Item No. 16 – 2006AT Tax Allocation Bonds in the amount of \$190,638. This amount was approved during ROPS 15-16B as a reserve for use during the ROPS 16-17 period. As such, RPTTF funding is not necessary. Therefore, Finance has reclassified the requested \$190,638 from RPTTF to Reserve Balances for the July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 period (ROPS A period).

- Item No. 17 – 2006HT Tax Allocation Bonds in the amount of \$276,333. The Agency requested \$105,000 from Reserve Balances and \$171,333 from RPTTF funding. This amount was approved during ROPS 15-16B as a reserve for use during the ROPS 16-17 period. As such, RPTTF funding is not necessary. Therefore, Finance has reclassified the requested \$171,333 from RPTTF to Reserve Balances for the ROPS A period.
- Item No. 23 – Reserve Tax Allocation Bonds 2006HT in the amount of \$278,236. The Agency is requesting for bond reserves for use during the next annual ROPS period. However, the amount was incorrectly listed to be funded from Reserve Balances funding. Therefore, Finance has reclassified the requested \$629,619 from Reserve Balances to RPTTF funding for the January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017 period (ROPS B period).
- Item No. 54 – 2014 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds in the amount of \$629,619. This amount was approved during ROPS 15-16B as a reserve for use during the ROPS 16-17 period. As such, RPTTF funding is not necessary. Therefore, Finance has reclassified the requested \$629,619 from RPTTF to Reserve Balances for the ROPS A period.

Furthermore, the Agency incorrectly requested for \$633,094 in bond reserves for use during the next annual ROPS period. However, the amount was incorrectly listed to be funded from Reserve Balances and should actually be listed under Item No. 55 payable from RPTTF. Therefore, the requested \$633,094 from Reserve Balances for the ROPS B period for this item has been adjusted to zero and an adjustment has been made to Item No. 55 as discussed below.

Per discussion with the Agency, Finance has made the following adjustments to ROPS 16-17 requested funding:

- Item No. 15 – 2006A Tax Allocation Bonds. The Agency received \$320,313 in RPTTF during the ROPS 15-16B period to make the ROPS A period debt service payment. Finance has updated the ROPS A period to reflect the use of Reserve Balance in the amount of \$320,313. Furthermore, Finance is also approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$320,313 for payment due March 2017.
- Item No. 16 – 2006AT Tax Allocation Bonds. Finance is approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$61,950 for payment due March 2017.
- Item No. 17 – 2006HT Tax Allocation Bonds. Finance is approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$168,236 for payment due March 2017.
- Item No. 21 – 2006A Tax Allocation Bonds Reserve. Finance is approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$320,313 for payment due September 2017.

- Item No. 54 – 2014 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds. Finance is approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$188,094 for payment due March 2017.
- Item No. 55 – 2014 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds Reserve. Finance is approving the Agency's request to increase RPTTF funding for the ROPS B period from zero to \$633,094 as reserve for future bond payment due in the next annual ROPS period.
- On the ROPS 16-17 form, the Agency reported cash balances and activity for the period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Pursuant to HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E), agencies are required to use all available funding sources prior to RPTTF for payment of enforceable obligations. During our review, which may have included obtaining financial records, Finance determined the Agency possesses funds that should be used prior to requesting RPTTF. Therefore, the funding source for the following item has been reclassified to Other Funds and in the amount specified below:
 - Item No. 8 – City loan repayment in the amount of \$100,000 in RPTTF funding has been reclassified. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 16-17 period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues and the Agency has \$100,000 in available Other Funds. Therefore, Finance has reclassified the requested \$100,000 from RPTTF to Other Funds for the ROPS B period.
 - Item No. 15 – 2006A Tax Allocation Bond payment in the amount of \$320,313. Finance is reclassifying \$53,988 to Other Funds. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 16-17 period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues and the Agency has \$53,988 in available Other Funds. Therefore, Finance is approving RPTTF in the amount of \$266,325 and the use of Other Funds in the amount of \$53,988, totaling \$320,313 for the ROPS B period.

Except for the items denied in whole or in part or the items that have been adjusted, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 16-17. If you disagree with Finance's determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 16-17, 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/

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$2,385,698 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution Table on Page 5 (See Attachment).

ROPS distributions will occur twice annually, one distribution for the ROPS A period, and one distribution for the ROPS B period based on Finance's approved amounts. Since Finance's determination is for the entire ROPS 16-17 period, the Agency is authorized to receive up to the maximum approved RPTTF through the combined ROPS A and B period distributions.

On the ROPS 16-17 form, the Agency was not required to report the estimated obligations versus actual payments (prior period adjustment) associated with the July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015 period (ROPS 15-16A). The Agency will report actual payments for ROPS 15-16A and ROPS 15-16B on the ROPS 18-19 form pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a) (1). A prior period adjustment will be applied to the Agency's future RPTTF distribution. Therefore, the Agency should retain any difference in unexpended RPTTF.

Please refer to the ROPS 16-17 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 determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for the period July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. This determination only applies to items when funding was requested for the 12-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.

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

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Bill Aiken, Development Analyst, City of Roseville
Ms. Roxanne Nored, Managing Accountant Auditor, Placer County

Attachment

Approved RPTTF Distribution			
For the period of July 2016 through June 2017			
	<u>ROPS A Period</u>	<u>ROPS B Period</u>	<u>Total</u>
Requested RPTTF (excluding administrative obligations)	\$ 1,202,540	\$ 1,038,510	\$ 2,241,050
Requested Administrative RPTTF	125,000	125,000	250,000
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 16-17	1,327,540	1,163,510	\$ 2,491,050
Adjustment to Agency Requested RPTTF			
Item No. 15	0	320,313	320,313
Item No. 16	0	61,950	61,950
Item No. 17	0	168,236	168,236
Item No. 21	0	320,313	320,313
Item No. 54	0	188,094	188,094
Item No. 55	0	633,094	633,094
Total RPTTF adjustments	0	1,692,000	1,692,000
Total RPTTF requested	1,202,540	2,730,510	3,933,050
<u>Denied Item</u>			
Item No. 7	0	(930,010)	(930,010)
	0	(930,010)	(930,010)
<u>Reclassified Items</u>			
Item No. 8	0	(100,000)	(100,000)
Item No. 15	0	(53,988)	(53,988)
Item No. 16	(190,638)	0	(190,638)
Item No. 17	(171,333)	0	(171,333)
Item No. 23	0	278,236	278,236
Item No. 54	(629,619)	0	(629,619)
	(991,590)	124,248	(867,342)
Total RPTTF authorized	210,950	1,924,748	\$ 2,135,698
Total Administrative RPTTF authorized	125,000	125,000	\$ 250,000
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	335,950	2,049,748	\$ 2,385,698