



March 25, 2013

Ms. Cynthia A. Fortune, Finance Manager
City of Grand Terrace
22795 Barton Road
Grand Terrace, CA 92313-5295

Dear Cynthia A. Fortune:

Subject: Other Funds and Accounts Due Diligence Review

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34179.6 (c), the City of Grand Terrace Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an oversight board approved Other Funds and Accounts (OFA) Due Diligence Review (DDR) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on January 14, 2012. The purpose of the review was to determine the amount of cash and cash equivalents available for distribution to the affected taxing entities. Pursuant to HSC section 34179.6 (d), Finance has completed its review of your DDR, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

HSC section 34179.6 (d) authorizes Finance to adjust the DDR's stated balance of OFA available for distribution to the taxing entities. Based on our review of your DDR, the following adjustments were made:

- Transfers totaling \$1,519,682 (\$651,875+\$867,807) are not allowed. The Agency transferred funds in the amount of \$1,207,500 to Stater Bros. Markets (Stater). The Owner Participation Agreement did not specify a requirement for accelerated payments or conditions whereby the full amount is due. Had the agency followed the payment schedule as outlined in the agreement, the amount transferred would have been approximately \$555,625. Therefore, an adjustment for the remaining amount, \$651,875, has been made.

Additionally, the Agency transferred funds totaling \$867,807 to the City of Grand Terrace. HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city, county, or city and county that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are not enforceable obligations.

- The request to restrict assets in the amount of \$2,022,528 is not allowed. The Agency has not provided sufficient supporting documentation to restrict the total amount of bond proceeds as reported in the DDR.
- The request to restrict non cash assets totaling \$3,230,823 (\$3,219,889 + \$10,934) is not allowed. The Agency has not provided sufficient supporting documentation to restrict funds due from the City in the amount of \$3,219,889. Additionally, the Agency

has not provided sufficient supporting documentation to support the restriction of accrued investment earnings totaling \$10,934 as long term in nature.

- The Agency's request to retain \$5,002,721 in current unencumbered OFA balances to cover future obligations is not allowed. The Agency requested to retain \$5,278,709 to cover future obligations. However, the Agency has not adequately proven there will be insufficient property tax revenues to pay for these obligations. HSC section 34179.5 (c) (5) (D) requires an extensive analysis before retention of current unencumbered balances can be contemplated. This includes but is not limited to, providing a detail of the projected property tax revenues and other general purpose revenues to be received by the Agency, together with both the amount and timing of the bond debt service payments, for the period in which the oversight board anticipates the Agency will have insufficient property tax revenue to pay the specified obligations. It is not evident the thorough analysis required by HSC section 34179.5 (c) (5) (D) was conducted. Further, it is not evident that future property tax revenue will be insufficient or that there is an immediate need to retain these balances.

Should a deficit occur in the future, HSC provides successor agencies with various methods to address short term cash flow issues. These may include requesting a loan from the city pursuant to HSC section 34173 (h), or subordinating pass-through payments pursuant to HSC section 34183 (b). The Agency should seek counsel from their oversight board to determine the solution most appropriate for their situation if a deficiency were to occur.

Finance noted the county auditor controller adjusted the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS III) distribution for the period January through June 2013 by \$275,988 pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a). Therefore, Finance is allowing the retention of these funds in order to adequately fund approved ROPS III expenditures. Consequently, we are adjusting the balance by \$5,002,721 (\$5,278,709 - \$275,988).

- An adjustment in the amount of \$220,024 has been made for the July 12, 2012 payment to the San Bernardino County Auditor-Controller. The Agency has not provided sufficient supporting documentation to support the payment.

If you disagree with Finance's adjusted amount of OFA balances available for distribution to the taxing entities, 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 OFA balance available for distribution to the affected taxing entities is \$13,647,080 (see table below).

OFA Balances Available For Distribution To Taxing Entities	
Available Balance per DDR:	\$ 1,651,302
Finance Adjustments	
Add:	
Disallowed transfers	\$ 1,519,682
Requested retained balances not supported	5,002,721
Requested restricted balances not supported	5,253,351
Adjustment for the payment to the County Auditor-Controller	220,024
Total OFA available to be distributed:	\$ 13,647,080

Absent a Meet and Confer request, 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. Upon submission of payment, it is requested you provide proof of payment to Finance within five business days.

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 do not in any way eliminate the Controller's authority.

Ms. Cynthia A. Fortune
March 25, 2013
Page 4

Please direct inquiries to Nichelle Thomas, Supervisor or Susana Medina-Jackson, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



STEVE SZALAY
Local Government Consultant

cc: Ms. Betsy Adams, City Manager
Ms. Vanessa Doyle, Auditor Controller Manager, San Bernardino County
California State Controller's Office