

April 15, 2019

Mr. Tom Weiner, Community Development Director City of Walnut P.O. Box 682 Walnut, CA 91788-0682

Dear Mr. Weiner:

Subject: 2019-20 Annual Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (o) (1), the City of Walnut Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an annual Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 (ROPS 19-20) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on February 1, 2019. Finance has completed its review of the ROPS 19-20. Based on a sample of line items reviewed and application of the law, Finance made the following determinations:

• Item No. 14 – City Reimbursement Loan in the total outstanding amount of \$442,129 is not allowed. Finance continues to deny this item. Pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (b), loan agreements between the former Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and sponsoring entity may be placed on the ROPS if the following requirements are met: (1) the Agency has received a Finding of Completion; and (2) the Agency's Oversight Board (OB) approves the loan as an enforceable obligation by finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes.

The Agency received a Finding of Completion on June 12, 2013. However, OB Resolution No. OB17-03, approving a Reimbursement Agreement between the City of Walnut and the former RDA in the amount of \$442,129 as an enforceable obligation and finding the loan was for legitimate redevelopment purposes, was denied in our determination letter dated March 13, 2017. An exchange of moneys between the City and the former RDA could not be substantiated. Therefore, the requested amount of \$442,129 is not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding.

• The administrative costs claimed are within the fiscal year administrative cap pursuant to HSC section 34171 (b) (3). However, Finance notes the OB has approved an amount that appears excessive, given the number and nature of the obligations listed on the ROPS. HSC section 34179 (i) requires the OB to exercise a fiduciary duty to the taxing entities. Therefore, Finance encourages the OB to apply adequate oversight when evaluating the administrative resources necessary to successfully wind-down the Agency.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186, successor agencies are required to report differences between actual payments and past estimated obligations. Reported differences in RPTTF are used to offset current RPTTF distributions. The amount of RPTTF approved in the table on Page 3

Mr. Tom Weiner April 15, 2019 Page 2

includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the County Auditor-Controller's review of the prior period adjustment form submitted by the Agency.

Except for the item adjusted, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on the ROPS 19-20. If the Agency disagrees with our determination with respect to any items on the ROPS 19-20, except items which are the subject of litigation disputing our previous or related determinations, the Agency 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 on our website:

## http://dof.ca.gov/Programs/Redevelopment/Meet And Confer/

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$154,264 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table on Page 3 (see Attachment).

RPTTF distributions occur biannually, one distribution for the July 1 through December 31 period (ROPS A period), and one distribution for the January 1 through June 30 period (ROPS B period) based on Finance approved amounts. Since this determination is for the entire ROPS 19-20 period, the Agency is authorized to receive up to the maximum approved RPTTF through the combined ROPS A and B period distributions.

Absent a Meet and Confer, this is our final determination regarding the obligations listed on the ROPS 19-20. This determination only applies to items when funding was requested for the 12-month period. If a denial by Finance in a previous ROPS is currently the subject of litigation, the item will continue to be denied until the matter is resolved.

The ROPS 19-20 form submitted by the Agency and this determination letter will be posted on our website:

## http://dof.ca.gov/Programs/Redevelopment/ROPS/

This determination is effective for the ROPS 19-20 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 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 RPTTF is the same as the amount of property tax increment available prior to the enactment of redevelopment dissolution law. Therefore, as a practical matter, the ability to fund the items on the ROPS with property tax increment is limited to the amount of funding available to the Agency in RPTTF.

Please direct inquiries to Kylie Oltmann, Supervisor, or Nicole Prisakar, Lead Analyst, at (916) 322-2985.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER WHITAKER
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Cheryl Murase, HdL-Fiscal Consultant, City of Walnut
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County

## **Attachment**

Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020						
	ROPS A Period		ROPS B Period		ROPS 19-20 Total	
RPTTF Requested	\$	475,263	\$	0	\$	475,263
Administrative RPTTF Requested		60,815		60,815		121,630
Total RPTTF Requested		536,078		60,815		596,893
RPTTF Requested		475,263		0		475,263
<u>Adjustment</u>						
Item No. 14		(442,129)		0		(442,129)
RPTTF Authorized		33,134		0		33,134
Administrative RPTTF Authorized		60,815		60,815		121,630
Total RPTTF Authorized for Obligations		93,949		60,815		154,764
Prior Period Adjustment		(500)		0		(500)
Total RPTTF Approved for Distribution	\$	93,449	\$	60,815	\$	154,264