



September 28, 2012

Mr. John Raymond, Director of Community & Economic Development
City of Palm Springs
3200 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Dear Mr. Raymond:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule Approval Letter

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Palm Springs Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS III) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on August 16, 2012 for the period of January through June 2013. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS III, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

HSC section 34171 (d) defines enforceable obligations. Based on a sample of line items reviewed and application of the law, the following do not qualify as enforceable obligations:

Administrative costs claimed for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) exceed the allowance by \$151,824 as summarized in the table below. HSC section 34171 (b) limits the fiscal year 2012-13 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax allocated to the Agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater. Additionally, Items 25 through 30 totaling \$49,312 were reclassified as administrative costs.

Allowable administrative costs for fiscal year 2012-13	\$250,000
Administrative costs claimed for July through December 2012	227,512
Administrative costs claimed for January through June 2013*	174,312
Overage	\$151,824

*Includes amounts for reclassified items

Except for items denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligations as noted above, Finance is approving the remaining items listed in your ROPS III. If you disagree with the determination with respect to any items on your ROPS III, 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 Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) distribution for the reporting period is \$4,881,034 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount For the period of January through June 2013	
Total RPTTF funding requested for obligations	\$ 4,837,858
Less: Six-month total for items reclassified as administrative cost	
Item No. 25	6,000
Item No. 26	15,000
Item No. 27	3,000
Item No. 28	4,489
Item No. 29	7,500
Item No. 30	13,323
Total approved RPTTF for enforceable obligations	<u>\$ 4,788,546</u>
Plus: Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS III	<u>22,488</u>
Total RPTTF approved:	\$ 4,811,034
Administrative Cost Calculation	
Total RPTTF for the period July through December 2012	\$ 2,124,891
Total RPTTF for the period January through June 2013	4,788,546
Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2012-13:	\$ 6,913,437
Allowable administrative cost for fiscal year 2012-13 (Greater of 3% or \$250,000)	250,000
Administrative allowance for the period of July through December 2012	227,512
Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS III:	\$ 22,488

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS III form the estimated obligations and actual payments associated with the January through June 2012 period. The amount of RPTTF approved in the above table will be adjusted by the county auditor-controller to account for differences between actual payments and past estimated obligations. Additionally, these estimates and accounts are subject to audit by the county auditor-controller and the State Controller.

Please refer to the ROPS III schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS III Forms by Successor Agency/>.

All items listed on a future ROPS are subject to a subsequent review. An item included on a future ROPS may be denied even if it was not questioned from the preceding ROPS.

The amount available from the RPTTF is the same as the property tax increment that was available prior to 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 successor agency in the RPTTF.

Mr. John Raymond
September 28, 2012
Page 3

Please direct inquiries to Beliz Chappuie, Supervisor or Mindy Patterson, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Geoffrey Kiehl, Director of Finance, City of Palm Springs
Ms. Pam Elias, Chief Accountant, Property Tax Division, County of Riverside
Auditor Controller