



October 12, 2012

Mr. Dave White, Deputy City Manager
City of Fairfield
1000 Webster Street
Fairfield, CA 94530

Dear Mr. White:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Fairfield Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS III) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on August 29, 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:

- Item 27, 31, and 32 – Office Space Lease and Roseburg Townhome obligations in the amount of \$59,189. HSC section 34176 (a) (2) states if a city, county, or city and county elects to retain the authority to perform housing functions previously performed by a RDA, all rights, powers, duties, obligations, and housing assets shall be transferred to the city, county, or city and county. Since the City assumed the housing functions, the operating and administrative costs associated with these functions are the responsibility of the housing successor. Therefore, these items are not enforceable obligations and not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding.
- Item No. 14 and 15 – Interagency loans between the City and Agency totaling \$83 million. HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city that created the RDA and the former RDA are not enforceable, unless issued within two years of the RDA's creation date or for issuance of indebtedness to third-party investors or bondholders. Therefore, these items are not enforceable obligations at this time. Upon receiving a Finding of Completion from Finance, HSC section 34191.4 (b) may cause these items to be enforceable in future ROPS periods.

Except for item(s) denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligation(s) 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 RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is: \$1,425,155 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount	
For the period of January through June 2013	
Total RPTTF funding requested for obligations	\$ 1,454,914
Less: Six-month total for item(s) denied or reclassified as administrative cost	
Item 14	0
Item 15	0
Item 27	22,259
Item 31	1,500
Item 32	6,000
Total approved RPTTF for enforceable obligations	<u>\$ 1,425,155</u>
Plus: Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS III	<u>0</u>
Total RPTTF approved:	\$ 1,425,155

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/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS%20III%20Forms%20by%20Successor%20Agency/).

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.

Please direct inquiries to Robert Scott, Supervisor or Derk Symons, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Sean P. Quinn, City Manager, City of Fairfield
Mr. Jun Adéva, Deputy Auditor Controller, County of Solano