



April 3, 2014

Ms. Hannah Chung, Finance Director
City of Tehachapi
115 South Robinson Street
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Dear Ms. Chung:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Tehachapi Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 14-15A) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on February 24, 2014 for the period of July through December 2014. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS 14-15A, 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 does not qualify as enforceable obligation for the reason specified:

- Item No. 7 – Cooperative Agreement between the Agency and City of Tehachapi in the amount of \$214,194 is partially denied. It is our understanding; the amount requested includes a \$320 Prior Period Adjustment. Therefore, the \$320 is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for RPTTF funding.

The administrative costs claimed are within the fiscal year administrative cap pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d). However, Finance notes the oversight board has approved an amount that appears excessive, given the number and nature of the other obligations listed in the ROPS. HSC section 34179 (i) requires the oversight board to exercise a fiduciary duty to the taxing entities. Therefore, Finance encourages the oversight board to apply adequate oversight when evaluating the administrative resources required to successfully wind-down the Agency.

In addition, Finance noted the following:

- Item Nos. 8 and 9 – The Agency requested \$771,493 to replenish its bond reserves held with the fiscal agent. Our review indicates the Agency used its bond reserves held with the fiscal agent to make debt service payments during the ROPS 13-14A period. Our review also indicates that the Agency used its RPTTF distribution to pay administrative costs and \$344,155 to the City related to Item No. 7. As a reminder, HSC section 34183 (a) (2) explicitly requires that RPTTF be used to make debt service payments first, followed by all other obligations and that bond reserves held with the

fiscal agent can only be drawn down for debt service payments to the extent no other funding is available.

While the replenishment of reserves held with the fiscal agent is not denied for the current ROPS, the additional \$771,493 requested to be held in reserve along with the amounts required for the current ROPS period should be transferred upon receipt to the bond trustee(s). The amounts approved for debt service payments on this ROPS are restricted for that purpose and are not authorized to be used for other ROPS items. Any requests to fund these debt service items again in the ROPS 14-15B period will be denied unless insufficient RPTTF was received to satisfy the approved debt service obligations.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 14-15A form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the July through December 2013 period. The amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency. 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. Any proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter. Therefore, the amount of RPTTF approved in the table below only includes the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency.

Except for the items denied in whole or in part as enforceable obligations, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 14-15A. If you disagree with the determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 14-15A, 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 \$1,351,654 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution	
For the period of July through December 2014	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,226,974
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
Total RPTTF requested for obligations	\$ 1,351,974
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,226,974
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 8	(320)
	(320)
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 1,226,654
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 125,000
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 1,351,654
ROPS 13-14A prior period adjustment	0
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 1,351,654

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 the ROPS 14-15A review, Finance requested financial records to support the fund balances reported by the Agency; however, Finance was unable to reconcile the financial records to the amounts reported. As a result, Finance will continue to work with the Agency after the ROPS 14-15A review period to properly identify the Agency's fund balances. If it is determined the Agency possesses fund balances that are available to pay approved obligations, the Agency should request the use of these fund balances prior to requesting RPTTF in ROPS 14-15B.

Please refer to the ROPS 14-15A schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

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

Absent a Meet and Confer, this is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for July 1 through December 31, 2014. 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 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.

Ms. Hannah Chung

April 3, 2014

Page 4

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 Kylie Oltmann, Supervisor or Veronica Green, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD
Assistant Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Daisy Wee, Accounting Officer, City of Tehachapi
Ms. Mary B Bedard, Auditor-Controller, Kern County
California State Controller's Office