



May 15, 2015

Ms. Genie Wilson, City Finance Director
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Dear Ms. Wilson:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated March 25, 2015. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Goleta Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16A) to Finance on February 19, 2015, for the period of July through December 2015. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on March 25, 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 April 8, 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. 22 – Post dissolution expenses totaling \$50,000. Finance continues to deny this item. Finance initially denied this item because it was our understanding that the agreement entered into on May 1, 2013, is between the City of Goleta (City) and Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, and the Agency was not a party to the contract. During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency provided an amended agreement dated March 26, 2015, to include Agency as a party to the agreement. The Agency also provided an updated time and cost estimate indicating that 100 hours of services would cost \$72,000 for the ROPS 15-16A period. Since the services are being provided to both the City and the Agency and both parties are named in the lawsuit, the costs should be split between the two entities. However, the Agency has not provided the methodology used to split costs between the entities. Therefore, this item is currently not an enforceable obligation and is not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding on this ROPS.

In addition, per Finance's letter dated March 25, 2015, we continue to make the following determinations not contested by the Agency during the Meet and Confer:

During our review, which may have included obtaining financial records, Finance determined the Agency possesses funds that should be used prior to requesting RPTTF. Pursuant to

HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E), RPTTF may be used as a funding source, but only to the extent no other funding source is available or when payment from property tax revenues is required by an enforceable obligation. The Agency provided financial records that displayed available revenue relating to Other Funds totaling \$2,275.

Therefore, with the Agency's concurrence, the funding source for the following item has been reclassified to Other Funds and in the amount specified below:

- Item No. 2 – Debt Service in the amount of \$2,275. The Agency requests \$745,694 of RPTTF; however, Finance is reclassifying \$2,275 to Other Funds. This item is an enforceable obligation for the ROPS 15-16A period. However, the obligation does not require payment from property tax revenues and the Agency has \$2,225 in available Other Funds. Therefore, Finance is approving RPTTF in the amount of \$743,469 and the use of Other Funds in the amount of \$2,225, totaling \$745,694.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 15-16A form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the July through December 2014 period. HSC section 34186 (a) also specifies prior period adjustments self-reported by successor agencies are subject to audit by the county auditor-controller (CAC) and the State Controller. Proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter; therefore, the amount of RPTTF approved in the table below only reflects the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency.

Except for the item denied in part, or that has been reclassified, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16A. The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$827,126 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution Table below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution	
For the period of July through December 2015	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	795,694
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	83,800
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS	\$ 879,494
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	795,694
<u>Denied Item</u>	
Item No. 22	(50,000)
	\$ 745,694
<u>Cash Balances - Item reclassified to Other Funds</u>	
Item No. 2	(2,225)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 743,469
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	83,800
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 83,800
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 827,269
ROPS 14-15A prior period adjustment	(143)
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 827,126

Please refer to the ROPS 15-16A schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS>

This is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for July 1 through December 31, 2015. This determination only applies to items where 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 periods. All items listed on a future ROPS are subject to a subsequent review and may be denied even if it was or was not denied on this ROPS or a preceding ROPS. The only exception is for those items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination from Finance pursuant to HSC section 34177.5 (i). Finance's review of items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination 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 that was available prior to the 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 agency in the RPTTF.

Pursuant to HSC section 34177 (a) (3), only those payments listed on an approved ROPS may be made by the successor agency from the funds specified in the ROPS. However, if the Agency needs to make payments for approved obligations from another funding source, HSC section 34177 (a) (4) requires the Agency to first obtain oversight board approval.

To the extent proceeds from bonds issued after December 31, 2010 exist and are not encumbered by an enforceable obligation pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d), HSC section 34191.4 (c) (2) (B) requires these proceeds be used to defease the bonds or to purchase those same outstanding bonds on the open market for cancellation.

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

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Jaime Valdez, Economic Development Coordinator, City of Goleta
Mr. Ed Price, Division Chief Property Tax Division, Santa Barbara County
California State Controller's Office