April 13, 2017

Ms. Bree Mawhcrter, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration
City and County of San Francisco
One South Van Ness Avenue, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Mawhcrter:

Subject: 2017-18 Annual Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (o) (1), the City and County of San Francisco Successor Agency (Agency) submitted an annual Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the period of July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018 (ROPS 17-18) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on January 31, 2017. Finance has completed its review of the ROPS 17-18.

Based on a sample of line items reviewed and application of the law, Finance made the following determinations:

- Item No. 1 – Agency Administrative Operations requested from Administrative Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) in the amount of $4,093,429 is partially allowed for $3,591,338. HSC section 34171 (b) (3) limits the Agency’s ROPS 17-18 Administrative Cost Allowance (ACA) to three percent of RPTTF distributed in fiscal year 16-17 less RPTTF distributed for administrative costs and sponsoring entity loan repayments. Therefore, the Agency’s maximum ACA for RCP 17-18 is $3,591,338, as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Cost Allowance Calculation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPTTF Distributed for Fiscal Year 2016-17</td>
<td>$122,702,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Distributed Administrative RPTTF</td>
<td>(2,991,263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Sponsoring Entity Loan Repayments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTTF Distributed for 2016-17 After Adjustment</td>
<td>119,711,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA Cap for 2017-18 (3% of $119,711,280)</td>
<td>3,591,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA Requested for 2017-18</td>
<td>(4,093,429)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$ (502,091)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although $4,093,429 is claimed for the ACA, only $3,591,338 is available pursuant to the ACA cap. The Agency’s excess ACA request of $502,091 is not allowed.
Item No. 12 – Supplemental Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (SERAF) repayment requested from RPTTF in the amount of $1,772,608 and with a total outstanding balance of $14,602,203 is approved. However, the total outstanding balance listed on ROPS 17-18 is overstated.

The ROPS 17-18 total outstanding balance should be $9,986,816 and after the ROPS 17-18 payment of $1,772,608, the total outstanding balance on the ROPS for the period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 (ROPS 18-19) should be $8,214,208.

Finance notes the repayment of the SERAF deferral is authorized for repayment under HSC sections 34171 (d) (1) (G) and 34176 (e) (6). The SERAF deferral was not a loan agreement between the former redevelopment agency and the city and county that created the redevelopment agency. Therefore, the Agency is not authorized to accrue three percent interest on the SERAF deferral under HSC section 34191.4 (b) (3).

Item No. 373 – Asset Management and Disposition Costs requested from RPTTF in the amount of $1,114,302 and Other Funds in the amount of $200,000 is partially allowed for $425,196 of RPTTF and $200,000 of Other Funds.

During Finance’s review, it was determined estimated costs totaling $689,106 pertain to costs associated with properties approved for transfer to the City and County of San Francisco (City and County) for continued governmental use in the Agency’s Long-Range Property Management Plan (LRPMP). The costs include, but are not limited to, appraisal costs, staffing costs, and consultant costs.

Pursuant to HSC section 34191.3 (a), a LRPMP approved by Finance shall govern and supersede all other provisions relating to the disposition and use of the real property assets of the Agency. Further, pursuant to HSC sections 34177 (e) and 34177 (h), the Agency is required to expeditiously wind down their affairs, including the expeditious disposal of properties.

The Agency’s LRPMP was approved by Finance on December 7, 2015. Properties approved for transfer to the City and County in the Agency’s LRPMP should be transferred and any costs associated with the properties are no longer Agency obligations. Therefore, estimated costs from RPTTF in the amount of $689,106 are not allowed.

Item No. 382 – Hotel Occupancy Tax Refunding Bonds (Hotel Bonds) requested from RPTTF in the amount of $4,054,875 and Other Funds in the amount of $4,829,750 is partially allowed for Other Funds in the amount of $4,829,750. The Hotel Bonds are payable and secured by Hotel Tax Revenues (i.e., Other Funds), not RPTTF. The Agency clarified the RPTTF request of $4,054,875 is not needed to meet the debt service obligation. Therefore, RPTTF in the amount of $4,054,875 is not allowed.

Item Nos. 408, 409, and 410 – 2017 Bonds are adjusted from $20,805,582 to $12,950,995 in order to match the final debt service schedules. The Agency was approved to issue 2017 Bonds via Finance’s approval of Oversight Board (OB) Resolution Nos. 11-2016 and 12-2016. At the time the Agency prepared the ROPS 17-18, the 2017 Bonds had not been issued. Therefore, the Agency estimated
the debt service for the 2017 Bonds on ROPS 17-18. During Finance’s review, the 2017 Bonds were issued and the Agency provided the final debt service schedules. Based on the actual debt service obligations for the 2017 Bonds, Finance made the following adjustments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Project/ Obligation Name</th>
<th>RPTTF Requested</th>
<th>RPTTF Adjustment</th>
<th>RPTTF Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>2017A Bonds</td>
<td>$11,142,514</td>
<td>($7,452,345)</td>
<td>$3,690,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>2017B Bonds</td>
<td>4,191,298</td>
<td>($2,862,451)</td>
<td>1,328,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>2017C Bonds</td>
<td>5,471,770</td>
<td>2,460,209</td>
<td>7,931,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,805,582</strong></td>
<td>($7,854,587)</td>
<td><strong>$12,950,995</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for the items adjusted, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on the ROPS 17-18. If the Agency disagrees with Finance’s determination with respect to any items on the ROPS 17-18, except items which are the subject of litigation disputing Finance’s 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 Finance’s website:

[http://dof.ca.gov/Programs/Redevelopment/Meet_And_Confer/](http://dof.ca.gov/Programs/Redevelopment/Meet_And_Confer/)

The Agency’s maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is $142,346,941 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table on Page 5 (see Attachment).

RPTTF distributions occur biannually, one distribution for the July 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017 period (ROPS A period), and one distribution for the January 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018 period (ROPS B period) based on Finance’s approved amounts. Since Finance’s determination is for the entire ROPS 17-18 period, the Agency is authorized to receive up to the maximum approved RPTTF through the combined ROPS A and B period distributions.

On the ROPS 17-18 form, the Agency reported cash balances and activity for the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Finance reviews the Agency’s self-reported cash balances on an ongoing basis. The Agency should be prepared to submit financial records and bridging documents to support the cash balances reported upon request.

The Agency was not required to report the estimated obligations versus actual payments (prior period adjustment) associated with the July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 period (ROPS 15-16). The Agency will report actual payments for ROPS 15-16 on ROPS 18-19, pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a) (1). A prior period adjustment may be applied to the Agency’s ROPS 18-19 RPTTF distribution. Therefore, the Agency should retain any unexpended ROPS 15-16 RPTTF.
Absent a Meet and Confer, this is Finance’s determination regarding the obligations listed on the ROPS 17-18. This determination only applies to items when funding was requested for the 12-month period.

The ROPS 17-18 form submitted by the Agency and Finance’s determination letter will be posted on Finance’s website:

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

Finance’s determination is effective for the ROPS 17-18 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 the RPTTF is the same as the amount of property tax increment available prior to the enactment of the 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 the RPTTF.

Please direct inquiries to Wendy Griffie, Supervisor, or Jonathan Cox, Lead Analyst, at (916) 322-2985.

Sincerely,

JUSTYN HOWARD
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Nadia Sesay, Interim Executive Director, City and County of San Francisco
    Mr. James Whitaker, Property Tax Manager, San Francisco County
## Attachment

### Approved RPTTF Distribution
For the period of July 2017 through June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROPS A Period</th>
<th>ROPS B Period</th>
<th>ROPS 17-18 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPTTF Requested</td>
<td>$54,475,258</td>
<td>$96,878,913</td>
<td>$151,354,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative RPTTF Requested</td>
<td>2,046,714</td>
<td>2,046,715</td>
<td>4,093,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RPTTF Requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,521,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,925,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,447,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTTF Requested</td>
<td>54,475,258</td>
<td>96,878,913</td>
<td>151,354,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. 373</td>
<td>(344,553)</td>
<td>(344,553)</td>
<td>(689,106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. 382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,054,875)</td>
<td>(4,054,875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. 408</td>
<td>(4,637,231)</td>
<td>(2,815,114)</td>
<td>(7,452,345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. 409</td>
<td>(1,759,302)</td>
<td>(1,103,149)</td>
<td>(2,862,451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. 410</td>
<td>(4,941)</td>
<td>2,465,150</td>
<td>2,460,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6,746,027)</td>
<td>(5,852,541)</td>
<td>(12,598,568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPTTF Authorized</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,729,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,026,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,755,603</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative RPTTF Requested</td>
<td>2,046,714</td>
<td>2,046,715</td>
<td>4,093,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Administrative Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(502,091)</td>
<td>(502,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative RPTTF Authorized</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,046,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,544,624</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,591,338</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RPTTF Approved for Distribution</strong></td>
<td>$49,775,945</td>
<td>$92,570,996</td>
<td>$142,346,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>