



May 31, 2012

John Leonard, Project Development Administrator
City of West Hollywood
8300 Santa Monica Blvd.
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Dear Mr. Leonard:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule Approval Letter

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (l) (2) (C), the City of West Hollywood Successor Agency submitted Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on May 21, 2012 for the periods of January to June 2012 and July to December 2012. Finance is assuming oversight board approval. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS which may have included obtaining clarification for various items. Based on our review, we are approving all of the items listed on your ROPS at this time.

This is our determination with respect to any items funded from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) for the June 1, 2012 property tax allocations. In addition, items not questioned during this review are subject to subsequent review if they are included on a future ROPS. If an item included on a future ROPS is not an enforceable obligation, Finance reserves the right to remove that item from the future ROPS, even if it was not removed from the preceding ROPS.

Please refer to Exhibit 12 at http://www.dof.ca.gov/assembly_bills_26-27/view.php for the amount of RPTTF that was approved by Finance.

As you are aware the amount of available RPTTF is the same as the property tax increment that was available prior to ABx1 26. 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 in the RPTTF.

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Supervisor or Michael Barr, Lead Analyst at (916) 322-2985.

Sincerely,

MARK HILL
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Kristina Burns, Program Specialist III, Los Angeles County Auditor Controller's Office



September 5, 2012

Mr. John Leonard, Project Development Administrator
City of West Hollywood
8300 Santa Monica Blvd.
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Dear Mr. Leonard:

Subject: Housing Assets Transfer Form

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34176 (a) (2), the City of West Hollywood submitted a Housing Assets Transfer Form (Form) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on July 31, 2012 for the period February 1, 2012 through July 31, 2012.

Finance has completed its review of your Form, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items. Based on a sample of line items reviewed and the application of law, Finance is not objecting to any assets or transfers of assets identified on your Form.

Please direct inquiries to Kylie Le, Supervisor or Michael Barr, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. Roderick Burnley, Project Development Administrator, City of West Hollywood
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Community Redevelopment Administration Section,
Property Tax Division, Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller's Office
California State Controller's Office



December 15, 2012

Mr. David Wilson, Finance Officer
City of West Hollywood
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Subject: Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund Due Diligence Review

This letter supersedes Finance's original Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund (LMIHF) Due Diligence Review (DDR) determination letter dated November 9, 2012. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34179.6 (c), the City of West Hollywood Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an oversight board approved LMIHF DDR to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on October 15, 2012. Finance issued a LMIHF DDR determination letter on November 9, 2012. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more items adjusted by Finance. The Meet and Confer Session was held on November 27, 2012.

Based on a review of additional or clarifying information provided to Finance during the Meet and Confer process, Finance is revising some of the adjustments made in our previous DDR determination letter. Specifically, we are revising the following adjustment:

- Finance originally denied the retention of \$8 million because the Agency has not adequately proven there will be insufficient property tax revenues to pay for the \$8 million in obligations. Also, \$5.6 million of the requested obligations was denied in our ROPS determination letter dated October 15, 2012.

During the DDR Meet and Confer process, the Agency contends the \$8 million is restricted bond proceeds not eligible for distribution to the affected taxing entities. Our review of the bond indenture identified \$8 million as restricted for low and moderate housing purposes. Therefore, these balances are restricted and the LMIHF balances available for distribution to the taxing entities will be revised by \$8 million.

Although, \$5.6 million continues to be denied as a result of the ROPS III Meet and Confer process, it does not affect the LMIHF liquid asset balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities. Pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (c), successor agencies that have been issued a Finding of Completion by Finance will be allowed to use excess proceeds from bonds issued prior to December 31, 2010 for the purposes for which the bonds were issued. Successor Agencies are required to defease or repurchase on the open market for cancellation any bonds that cannot be used for the

purpose they were issued or if they were issued after December 31, 2010. It is our understanding the bond proceeds requested for use were issued in March 2011.

However, Finance continues to believe some of the adjustments made to the DDR's stated balance of LMIHF available for distribution to the taxing entities is appropriate. HSC section 34179.6 (d) authorizes Finance to make these adjustments. We maintain the adjustment continues to be necessary for the following reason:

- Obligations totaling \$630,975 needed for the 2012-13 fiscal year is not necessary. Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funding was approved for these obligations for the ROPS period July through December 2012 and January through June 2013. Therefore, the LMIHF available for distribution to the taxing entities will be adjusted by \$630,975. During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency concurred with Finance's adjustment.

It has come to our attention during the Meet and Confer process, \$468,899 of LMIHF unencumbered cash is available for distribution to the taxing entities per the Agency's re-review of its DDR and segregation of the bond proceeds and cash reserves. It is our understanding; the licensed accountant validated the recalculation. Therefore, the LMIHF available for distribution to the taxing entities will be adjusted by \$468,899.

The Agency's LMIHF balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities has been revised to \$342,514 (see table below).

LMIHF Balances Available For Distribution To Taxing Entities	
Available Balance per DDR:	\$ (757,360)
Finance Adjustments	
Add:	
Cash reserve	\$ 468,899
Requested retained balance not supported:	630,975
Total LMIHF available to be distributed:	\$ 342,514

This is Finance's final determination of the LMIHF balances available for distribution to the taxing entities. HSC section 34179.6 (f) requires successor agencies to transmit to the county auditor-controller the amount of funds identified in the above table within five working days, plus any interest those sums accumulated while in the possession of the recipient.

If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of the successor agency, and if the successor agency is operated by the city or county that created the former redevelopment agency, then failure to transmit the identified funds may result in offsets to the city's or the county's sales and use tax allocation, as well as its property tax allocation. If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of another taxing entity, the successor agency is required to take diligent efforts to recover such funds. A failure to recover and remit those funds may result in offsets to the other taxing entity's sales and use tax allocation or to its property tax allocation. If funds identified for transmission are in the possession of a private entity, HSC 34179.6 (h) (1) (B) states that any remittance related to unallowable transfers to a private party may also be subject to a 10 percent penalty if not remitted within 60 days.

Failure to transmit the identified funds will also prevent the Agency from being able to receive a finding of completion from Finance. Without a finding of completion, the Agency will be unable

to take advantage of the provisions detailed in HSC section 34191.4. Specifically, these provisions allow certain loan agreements between the former redevelopment agency (RDA) and the city, county, or city and county that created the RDA to be considered enforceable obligations. These provisions also allow certain bond proceeds to be used for the purposes in which they were sold and allows for the transfer of real property and interests into the Community Redevelopment Property Trust Fund once Finance approves the Agency's long-range property management plan.

In addition to the consequences above, willful failure to return assets that were deemed an unallowable transfer or failure to remit the funds identified above could expose certain individuals to criminal penalties under existing law.

Pursuant to HSC section 34167.5 and 34178.8, the California State Controller's Office (Controller) has the authority to claw back assets that were inappropriately transferred to the city, county, or any other public agency. Determinations outlined in this letter and Finance's Housing Assets Transfer letter dated September 5, 2012 do not in any way eliminate the Controller's authority.

Please direct inquiries to Kylie Le, Supervisor or Brian Dunham, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. John Leonard, Project Development Administrator, City of West Hollywood
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller
California State Controller's Office



December 18, 2012

Mr. David Wilson, Finance Officer
City of West Hollywood
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes Finance's Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated October 15, 2012. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of West Hollywood Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS III) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on August 31, 2012 for the period of January 1 through June 30, 2013. Finance issued its determination related to those enforceable obligations on October 15, 2012. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more of the items denied by Finance. The Meet and Confer session was held on November 15, 2012.

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 item being disputed.

- Item Nos. 5b and 6c – Housing Successor Employee Obligations totaling \$180,085. Finance continues to deny the items. Finance denied the items as HSC section 34176 (a) (1) states if a city, county, or city and county elects to retain the authority to perform housing functions previously performed by a redevelopment agency, all rights, powers, duties, obligations and housing assets shall be transferred to the city, county, or city and county. The administrative costs associated with the housing functions are the responsibility of the housing successor. The Agency contends the items are enforceable obligations because the former RDA entered into loan agreements to provide affordable housing development and the RDA is responsible for monitoring the project to ensure the project is developed and operated as affordable housing. However, obligations associated with the former RDA's previous statutory housing obligations are not enforceable obligations of the successor agency. Upon the transfer of the former RDA's housing functions to the new housing entity, HSC section 34176 requires that "all rights, powers, duties, obligations and housing assets...shall be transferred" to the new housing entity. This transfer of "duties and obligations" necessarily includes the transfer of statutory obligations; to the extent any continue to be applicable. To conclude that such costs should be on-going enforceable obligations of the successor agency could require a transfer of tax increment for life – directly contrary to the wind down directive in ABx1-26/AB1484. Therefore, the items are not enforceable obligations. To the extent the employee costs were to be paid with bond proceeds, we note that pursuant to HSC

section 34191.4 (c), successor agencies that have been issued a Finding of Completion by Finance will be allowed to use excess proceeds from bonds issued prior to December 31, 2010 for the purposes for which the bonds were issued. Successor Agencies are required to defease or repurchase on the open market for cancellation any bonds that cannot be used for the purpose they were issued or if they were issued after December 31, 2010. The bond proceeds requested for use were issued in March 2011. Therefore, the items are not enforceable obligations.

- Item Nos. 6b and 7 – Bond funded projects totaling \$5.3 million. Finance continues to deny the items. Finance denied the items as it is our understanding no contracts are in place for these line items. HSC section 34163 (b) prohibits a redevelopment agency from entering into a contract with any entity after June 27, 2011. The Agency contends the items are enforceable obligations because the 2010 loan agreement between the RDA and West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation represents an enforceable obligation and the permanent loan was financed with 2011 Tax Allocation Housing Bonds Series B. Additionally, on January 18, 2011, the City and RDA entered into a Cooperation Agreement, whereby the former RDA agreed to fund certain projects and the City agreed to plan, construct, and otherwise cooperate in implementing the identified projects. We note that pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (c), successor agencies that have been issued a Finding of Completion by Finance will be allowed to use excess proceeds from bonds issued prior to December 31, 2010 for the purposes for which the bonds were issued. Successor Agencies are required to defease or repurchase on the open market for cancellation any bonds that cannot be used for the purpose they were issued or if they were issued after December 31, 2010. The bond proceeds requested for use were issued in March 2011. Therefore, the items are not enforceable obligations.
- Item Nos. 8a and 8b – Plummer Park Master Plan totaling \$25.5 million. Finance continues to deny the items. Finance denied the items as it is our understanding this is an agreement between the City and a third-party and the Agency is not a party to the agreement. Therefore this item is not an enforceable obligation and not eligible for bond funding. The Agency contends the items are enforceable obligations because the former RDA adopted Resolution No. CDC 09-045 on March 16, 2009 declaring its intent to issue bonds for the Plummer Park project. We note that pursuant to HSC section 34191.4 (c), successor agencies that have been issued a Finding of Completion by Finance will be allowed to use excess proceeds from bonds issued prior to December 31, 2010 for the purposes for which the bonds were issued. Successor Agencies are required to defease or repurchase on the open market for cancellation any bonds that cannot be used for the purpose they were issued or if they were issued after December 31, 2010. The bond proceeds requested for use were issued in March 2011. Therefore, the items are not enforceable obligations.

The Agency's maximum approved Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) distribution for the reporting period is: \$1,863,188 as summarized below:

Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount	
For the period of January through June 2013	
Total RPTTF funding requested for obligations	\$ 1,738,188
Less: Six-month total for item(s) denied or reclassified as administrative cost	0
Total approved RPTTF for enforceable obligations	\$ 1,738,188
Plus: Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS III	125,000
Total RPTTF approved:	\$ 1,863,188

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.

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.

Except for items disallowed as noted above, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed in your ROPS III. Obligations deemed not to be enforceable shall be removed from your ROPS. This is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for January 1 through June 30, 2013. 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 questioned on this ROPS or a preceding ROPS.

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Mary Halterman, Analyst, at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Mr. John Leonard, Project Development Administrator, City of West Hollywood
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller
California State Controller's Office