

STAFF REPORT

DATE: November 3, 2015

TO: Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Davis

FROM: Stacey Winton, Media & Communications Officer
Ethan Walsh and Brent Hawkins, Best Best & Krieger
Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Redevelopment Agency Dissolution Process Update

Recommendation

1. Receive memo from Best Best and Krieger (Attachment 1) providing an update on the Redevelopment Agency Dissolution Process.
2. Pursuant to SB 107 and in order to receive a Department of Finance Finding of Completion, City and Successor Agency staff recommends the City Council approve the attached budget adjustment (Attachment 2) authorizing the City to transfer \$5,575,669 to the Successor Agency, and the Successor Agency generate the Due Diligence Review payment to the County Auditor-Controller prior to December 31, 2015.
3. Direct Successor Agency staff to commence work on the Long Range Property Management Plan and develop a plan for the sale, transfer or retention of former Redevelopment Agency properties.

Fiscal Impact

Payment of the Due Diligence Review (DDR) amount, \$5,575,669, will be made from current Redevelopment Agency fund balance and the General Fund. Approximately \$567,900 of the fund balance was expended to complete active projects at the time of dissolution. These funds will be reimbursed to the General Fund from the City of Davis' share of the DDR distribution. The DDR payment will be made to the Yolo County Auditor-Controller. The Auditor-Controller will then distribute funds to the other taxing entities according to their respective shares of property tax from within the former redevelopment project area.

The Yolo County Auditor-Controller approximates taxing distribution to include:

Taxing Entity	Distribution Percentage	Distribution Amount
Yolo County	9.1%	508,055
Yolo County Accumulated Capital Outlay Fund	1.0%	60,827
Yolo County Library	1.6%	91,681
City of Davis	21.0%	1,170,316
Davis Cemetery District	0.3%	18,070
Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito & Vector Control District	0.9%	47,878
Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	0.6%	31,444
Los Rios Community College	4.2%	231,689

Yolo County Office of Education	2.8%	154,927
Davis Joint Unified School District	33.5%	1,867,362
ERAF-Funds held by the County Treasury, reported to the State, and distributed to the schools based upon ADA reporting during normal apportionments	25%	1,393,450
Total	100%	5,575,699

Council Goal(s)

Ensure Fiscal Resilience

Background and Analysis

This report provides background and a status update on the dissolution of the former Redevelopment Agency of the City of Davis, along with a summary of impacts resulting from Senate Bill 107.

Attached to this report is a comprehensive summary of the legal aspects and implications of SB 107 prepared by Best Best & Krieger (Attachment 1).

Summary of Necessary Actions Pursuant to SB 107:

- **Due Diligence Review Payment** – The Due Diligence Review (DDR) was conducted by an independent auditor on non-housing Davis Redevelopment Successor Agency assets pursuant to AB 1484 to determine if assets were handled in accordance with the dissolution process. The report identified cash assets that must be paid to the Yolo County Auditor-Controller.

Pursuant to SB 107, Successor Agencies must make any outstanding final payments per the DDR by 12/31/15. If the Successor Agency fails to make the payment, the Successor Agency will never receive a Finding of Completion. This will result in the Successor Agency not being able to adopt a Long Range Property Management Plan (LRPMP) or to use a portion of the 2011 bond proceeds as outlined below.

- **Finding of Completion** - Once the DDR payment is made, the Department of Finance will issue Davis a Finding of Completion. Yolo County will distribute respective shares to the other taxing entities from within the former redevelopment project area, this includes the City of Davis.
- **Long Range Property Management Plan** - Following receipt of the Finding of Completion, the Davis Successor Agency is required to adopt a Long Range Property Management Plan (LRPMP) within 6 months. A LRPMP lists all properties owned by the Redevelopment Agency, categorizes them by use and indicates how the Successor Agency will dispose of those properties during the dissolution process. The use listed and approved by the Department of Finance will determine if the property can remain with the City/Successor Agency or if it needs to be sold. The LRPMP does not affect housing assets.

Properties that will be included in the LRPMP:

- Historic City Hall
 - 3rd & B/BHOF (bldg. only)
 - 1st & F Parking Garage (SB 107 designates public parking lots as a governmental purpose provided they do not generate revenue in excess of reasonable maintenance costs)
 - Hunt Boyer
 - Natsoulas Rehabilitation Loan (\$3,310)
 - Monticello Rehabilitation Loan (\$48,770)
- **Last and Final Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS)** - On January 1, 2016, the Successor Agency may submit a Last and Final ROPS for approval by the Oversight Board and the Department of Finance if (1) remaining debt is limited to administrative costs and payments pursuant to enforceable obligations with defined payment schedules; (2) all remaining obligations have been previously listed on the ROPS; and (3) the Successor Agency is not a party to outstanding or unresolved litigation.

On the effective date of the approved Last and Final ROPS, the Successor Agency no longer prepares and transmits ROPS and Oversight Board Resolutions to the Department of Finance, except for resolutions necessary for refunding bonds; Long Range Property Management Plans; amendments to Last and Final ROPS and final Oversight Board resolutions.

- **2011 Bond Proceeds** - SB 107 authorizes expenditure authority on a portion of 2011 bond proceeds once the Successor Agency has a Finding of Completion and a Last and Final ROPS. The Davis Successor Agency will be allowed to expend up to 35% of the 2011 bond proceeds. The 2011 bonds total \$15,688,470, with 35% equating to \$5,490,965. Expenditure of bond proceeds must be in a manner consistent with the original bond covenants and requires approval of the Oversight Board.
- **Administrative Changes**
 - Annual ROPS submittals begin February 1, 2016
 - Single county-wide oversight board takes effect on July 1, 2018
 - All future expenses for litigation must be paid from the administrative allowance

Attachments

1. Memo from Best Best & Krieger, 10/27/15
2. Budget Adjustment



Memorandum

To: Davis City Council
From: Harriet A. Steiner
Ethan J. Walsh
Date: October 27, 2015
Re: Update on Redevelopment Agency Dissolution Process

I. Introduction

This memo provides background and a status update on the dissolution of the former Redevelopment Agency of the City of Davis (the “Redevelopment Agency”), along with a summary of certain components of Senate Bill 107 that affect the Redevelopment Agency dissolution process, and actions that the Successor Agency and City should consider taking in light of this new legislation. The memo additionally summarizes Assembly Bill No. 2, which authorizes the establishment of “community revitalization authorities” as a new means of carrying out redevelopment activities. Finally, the memo provides a brief summary of the current status of the redevelopment pass-through agreement with Yolo County.

II. The Redevelopment Agency Dissolution Process

A. *AB 1X 26 and the Dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency*

In January 2011, as part of the Governor’s initial budget proposal, Governor Brown declared that he intended to advocate for legislation that would eliminate redevelopment agencies in California. In March 2011, the Redevelopment Agency issued tax allocation bonds to provide funding for future redevelopment projects, pursuant to which the Redevelopment Agency received \$15,688,470 in bond proceeds (collectively, the “2011 Bond Proceeds”) to provide funding for future redevelopment projects within the City. During this same time, the Redevelopment Agency and the City of Davis also entered into a Public Works Agreement, which required the Redevelopment Agency to transfer \$5,431,669 to the City to cover an anticipated funding gap for specific priority projects, including (1) a new hotel-conference facility; (2) a downtown mixed use parking structure; (3) the relocation of the Hunt-Boyer tankhouse; (4) improvements to the Central Park restroom and playground; (5) acquisition and rehabilitation of a South Davis restaurant building (for relocation of Caffè Italia); and (6) downtown streetscape improvements.

In June 2011, the Legislature adopted and the Governor approved AB 1X 26, which eliminated redevelopment agencies in California, effective February 1, 2012.¹ The

¹ AB 1X 26 originally called for the elimination of redevelopment agencies effective October 1, 2011, and was coupled with a second bill, AB 1X 27, which allowed redevelopment agencies to survive and continue to operate if the agencies made certain payments to help the State balance its budget. AB 1X 26 and 27 were challenged by the California Redevelopment Association in the California Supreme Court. The Supreme Court determined that AB 82507.00001\20932599.2

BBK
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Redevelopment Agency was prohibited from entering into any new contracts that would be necessary to undertake redevelopment activities between the date of adoption of AB 1X 26 and the elimination of the Redevelopment Agency on February 1, 2012. The Redevelopment Agency therefore held the 2011 Bond Proceeds until its dissolution in February 1, 2012, and did not enter into any contracts to spend the 2011 Bond Proceeds. Similarly, the City was not in a position to move forward with the projects contemplated under the Public Works Agreement, because the City has anticipated that the funds from the Public Works Agreement would be combined with the 2011 Bond Proceeds to fund those projects. The City therefore held the \$5,431,669 received through the Public Works Agreement until such time that the Redevelopment Agency or its successor was in a position to use the 2011 Bond Proceeds, and some or all of the contemplated projects could be fully funded.

Following dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, AB 1X 26 created the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Davis (the “Successor Agency”), a separate legal entity that is responsible for the wind-down of the former Redevelopment Agency’s activities. AB 1X 26 also called for the formation of an Oversight Board that is required to review and approve certain Successor Agency actions. The Oversight Board consists of seven members, with one member appointed by each of the following entities: (1) the Mayor of the City of Davis, (2) the County Board of Education, (3) the County Board of Supervisors, (4) Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, (5) the largest special district (by property tax share) with territory in the jurisdiction of the former Redevelopment Agency, (6) a member of the public appointed by the Board of Supervisors, and (7) a member representing the employees of the former Redevelopment Agency, appointed by the Mayor.

Once the Successor Agency and Oversight Board were established, the Successor Agency was required to approve a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (the “ROPS”) every sixth months, and submit the ROPS to the Oversight Board for approval. Following Oversight Board approval, the ROPS is then sent to the State Department of Finance (“DOF”) for further review and approval. The ROPS must be approved by both the Oversight Board and DOF in order to be valid. The ROPS serves two primary purposes: First, the Successor Agency can only expend money for obligations that are included on an approved ROPS. Second, the Successor Agency receives the property tax funds that previously went to the Redevelopment Agency to pay the obligations listed under the ROPS. Those property tax funds (previously referred to as “tax increment” when the Redevelopment Agency was in existence) are placed into a Real Property Tax Trust Fund (the “RPTTF”), and from there are distributed to the Successor Agency to the extent necessary to pay for the enforceable obligations listed on the approved ROPS. If any funds are left in the RPTTF after distribution to the Successor Agency to pay for approved enforceable obligations, then those funds are distributed to the taxing entities according to their respective shares of property tax from within the former redevelopment project area.

1X 27 was unconstitutional and therefore invalid, but AB 1X 26 was constitutional and remained in effect. As part of its decision, the Supreme Court adjusted the dates set forth in AB 1X 26 to allow additional time ensure that all deadlines in the new law would be met, meaning that redevelopment agencies were eliminated effective on February 1, 2012.

BBK
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

When the Successor Agency prepared its initial ROPS, it included expenditure of a portion of the 2011 Bond Proceeds on the ROPS, as the Successor Agency continued to hold the bond proceeds as the successor to the Redevelopment Agency, and all Successor Agency expenditures must be included on the ROPS. DOF rejected the Successor Agency's requested use of bond proceeds, declaring that the Successor Agency did not have authorization to enter into new contracts for redevelopment activities. As a result, the Successor Agency was unable to spend the 2011 Bond Proceeds and continued to hold those funds.

B. *AB 1484 and the Due Diligence Review Process*

In June 2012, the Legislature adopted and the Governor approved Assembly Bill 1484, which made certain modifications to AB 1X 26. Among other amendments, AB 1484 added provisions that required the Successor Agency to retain an independent auditor to prepare two separate due diligence reviews ("DDRs") of the Redevelopment Agency's assets at the time of dissolution. The first DDR determined the amount of assets the Redevelopment Agency should have held in its low and moderate income housing fund at the time of dissolution (the "Housing Funds DDR"). The second DDR determined the amount of assets the Redevelopment Agency should have held in all other funds at the time of dissolution (the "Other Funds DDR").

AB 1484 further required that in the event a DDR determined that any funds that were transferred from the Redevelopment Agency to the City after January 1, 2011, and those funds were not transferred pursuant to an enforceable obligation, those funds must be transferred back to the Successor Agency, and included as part of the cash assets of the former Redevelopment Agency. Once each of the DDRs was complete and approved by DOF, the Successor Agency must pay to the County Auditor-Controller an amount equal to the cash assets that should have been held by the Redevelopment Agency at the time of dissolution, based on DOF's approval of the DDR (the "DDR Payment"). The DDR Payment is then distributed to the public agencies that receive property tax from the redevelopment project area, according to their respective property tax shares.

Once the Successor Agency makes the required DDR Payment, DOF is required to issue a "finding of completion" to the Successor Agency. Upon receipt of the finding of completion, the Successor Agency is able to (1) prepare a Long Range Property Management Plan ("LRPMP") that provides authority to sell or transfer the real property assets of the former Redevelopment Agency; (2) repay certain loans made from the City to the Redevelopment Agency (Davis had no such loans so this provision is inapplicable in this case); and (3) spend proceeds from bonds issued prior to 2011.

The Successor Agency completed its Other Funds DDR in January 2013 and determined that no funds were available to be distributed to the County Auditor-Controller. In its review of the Other Funds DDR, DOF disagreed, and declared that the Successor Agency was required to remit \$5,575,669 to the County Auditor Controller. This amount consisted of \$5,431,639 that was transferred from the Redevelopment Agency to the City pursuant to the

BBK
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Public Works Agreement, and \$144,030 that was transferred to the City's self-insurance fund to pay the RDA's proportionate share of employee benefit costs. Until this amount was remitted to the County Auditor-Controller, the Successor Agency would not receive a finding of completion.

The Successor Agency and City did not agree with this determination, as the Successor Agency and City believed that the Public Works Agreement constituted an enforceable obligation, and that there were constitutional limitations that prohibited the State from redirecting those funds back to the taxing entities. The City did not return the money received pursuant to the Public Works Agreement, and the Successor Agency therefore did not have funds to remit to the County Auditor-Controller, as demanded by DOF. Due to this dispute, however, the City held the funds received pursuant to the Public Works Agreement, while the City and Successor Agency evaluated how to address this disagreement. At the time, a number of other jurisdictions including the City of Brentwood had sued DOF based on similar disputes and the City and Successor Agency awaited the outcome of those cases to determine whether to initiate a similar challenge.

Like Davis, the City of Brentwood and its Redevelopment Agency entered into public works agreements in early 2011 to facilitate ongoing and future redevelopment projects. DOF directed the City to transfer funds received pursuant to Brentwood's public works agreements back to the Successor Agency to make Brentwood's Other Funds DDR Payment. The City of Brentwood and its successor agency challenged DOF's determination on its DDR, and appealed after the Superior Court ruled in DOF's favor. The Court of Appeals held that AB 1484 did allow DOF to order cities to return funds received pursuant to City-Redevelopment Agency agreements, and that these agreements did not constitute enforceable obligations as defined by AB 1X 26 and AB 1484. (*City of Brentwood v. Cohen* (2015) 237 Cal.App.4th 488.) Brentwood requested review by the California Supreme Court, but that request was denied on September 16, 2015. The Brentwood case indicates that the Successor Agency does have to remit the full amount demanded by DOF, that a challenge to DOF's determination on Davis's Other Funds DDR would not be successful.

C. *Senate Bill 107*

Senate Bill 107 was adopted during the last legislative session as a budget trailer bill and went into effect September 22, 2015. SB 107 makes several additional modifications to the statutes enacted by AB 1X 26 and AB 1484. This memo only summarizes those changes that are directly relevant to the Successor Agency and the City of Davis.

SB 107 provides that a Successor Agency must either make the DDR Payment or enter into a written installment payment plan with DOF for the payment of the DDR Payment over time by December 31, 2015, or it will never receive a finding of completion. If the Successor Agency does not receive a finding of completion, it cannot adopt a Long Range Property Management Plan ("LRPMP") for the disposition of Redevelopment Agency properties. The LRPMP allows the Successor Agency to obtain approval from DOF for all

BBK
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

property transfers in a single document, rather than having each property transfer or sale approved individually. The LRPMP also allows the Successor Agency to (1) transfer property that was constructed and is being used for a governmental purpose to transfer that property to the City for continued governmental use, (2) retain of the property for future development, (3) sell the property or (4) use the property to fulfill an enforceable obligation. If the Successor Agency does not have an approved LRPMP, it must either (1) transfer property that was constructed and is being use for a governmental purpose to the City, or (2) sell the property, with a goal of maximizing the return to the taxing entities. The LRPMP provides the Successor Agency with some additional flexibility and efficiency in dealing with the disposal of former Redevelopment Agency properties, and would have benefit to the Successor Agency.

Additionally, SB 107 provides a new benefit for those Successor Agencies that have received a finding of completion. If a Successor Agency has received a finding of completion it may spend a percentage of any 2011 bond proceeds on a sliding scale, based on the date of issuance of the 2011 bond proceeds, and whether or not the Successor Agency has received a “Last and Final ROPS,” as described below. In Davis, the Redevelopment Agency issued bonds in March 2011, and based on this new authorization the will be permitted to use 35% of its 2011 bond proceeds, or approximately \$5,490,965, for redevelopment purposes once the Successor Agency receives a finding of completion and a Last and Final ROPS. The Successor Agency would be required to retain the remaining bond proceeds and use them to defease the 2011 bonds at the earliest time permitted by the bond documents, unless further legislation is passed that would permit the Successor Agency to use additional bond proceeds.

SB 107 allows the Successor Agency to submit a Last and Final ROPS to its Oversight Board provided that it meets certain qualifications. In order to be eligible for a Last and Final ROPS, the Successor Agency’s remaining debt must be limited to administrative costs and enforceable obligations with defined payment schedules, all remaining obligations must have been listed on a previous ROPS and approved for payment by DOF, and the Successor Agency must not be a party to any outstanding litigation. Once the Last and Final ROPS is approved, that document will establish the maximum amount of RPTTF funds that the Successor Agency can receive each year until all outstanding debt is paid off, and the Successor Agency will no longer need to submit a ROPS for approval each six months, as is currently the case.

D. Recommendation To Pay DDR Payment

City and Successor Agency staff recommend that the City Council authorize the City to transfer the \$5,575,669 to the Successor Agency, and the Successor Agency make the DDR Payment to the County Auditor-Controller prior to December 31, 2015. The Successor Agency is not likely to successfully challenge DOF’s determination based on the holding in the *Brentwood* case, and the Successor Agency will derive significant benefits from receiving a finding of completion. First, the City will receive approximately \$1,170,315 into the City general fund as its proportionate share of the DDR Payment (this is the anticipated amount of the City’s share of the DDR Payment as one of the taxing entities), and second the Successor

BBK
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Agency will be permitted to expend \$5,490,965 for redevelopment purposes once it receives the finding of completion and approval of the Last and Final ROPS. Further, the Successor Agency will be able to commence work on the LRPMP, and develop a plan for the sale, transfer or retention of former Redevelopment Agency properties.

III. Assembly Bill No. 2: Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities

Assembly Bill No. 2 (“AB 2”) provides authority for the creation of community revitalization and investment authorities (“Revitalization Authorities”), which have the power to receive property tax increment funds to be used for redevelopment purposes, through the same constitutional provisions that authorized redevelopment agencies to receive tax increment funds. Revitalization Authorities have many of the same powers as redevelopment agencies, including the power to acquire property through eminent domain, subject to certain time and geographic limitations. A Revitalization Authority can be formed by the City, or by a joint powers authority (a “JPA”) consisting of the City and other taxing entities. Local educational agencies (such as school districts) are not permitted to participate in a Revitalization Authority JPA. The board of a Revitalization Authority would consist three members of the City Council and two members of the public that live or work in the community revitalization and investment area that would be formed. If the authority is formed as a JPA, then a majority of the members of the authority board must be members for the legislative bodies of the public agencies that created the authority, and a minimum of two board members must be members of the public that live or work within the community revitalization and investment area.

The Revitalization Authority may carry out a community revitalization plan (the “Revitalization Plan”) within a specific community revitalization and investment area (the “Revitalization Area”). Not less than 80 percent of the land in the Revitalization Area, calculated by census tracts or census block groups, must be characterized by both of the following conditions:

1. An annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median income.
2. Three of the following four conditions:
 - A. Non-seasonal unemployment that is at least 3 percent higher than statewide median unemployment;
 - B. Crime rates that are 5 percent higher than the statewide median crime rate;
 - C. Deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure such as streets, sidewalks, water supply, sewer treatment or processing, and parks;



D. Deteriorated commercial or residential structures.

The Revitalization Plan may include a provision that allows the Revitalization Authority to receive property tax increment from within the Revitalization Area, except that the Revitalization Authority could not receive any property tax that is allocated to any educational entities, and each individual taxing agency must adopt a resolution directing the county auditor-controller to allocate its share of property tax increment from within the Revitalization Area to the Revitalization Authority. Each taxing agency may revoke its authorization at any time upon 60 days' notice to the county auditor-controller, provided that the Revitalization Authority will still receive tax increment that has been pledged to the repayment of debts, until those debts are fully paid off by the Revitalization Authority. Further, if the Revitalization Area includes any land that is part of the former Redevelopment Agency's project area, the Revitalization Plan must include a provision that tax increment amounts payable to a Revitalization Authority are subject and subordinate to any preexisting enforceable obligations of the Successor Agency. At least 25% of the tax increment funds received by the Revitalization Authority must be set aside for the development of affordable housing.

The Revitalization Plan must be considered at least three separate public hearings that take place at least 30 days apart. At the third public hearing, the Authority Board must consider all written and oral protests received prior to close of the public hearing. If more than 50% of the combined number of property owners and residents in the area who are at least 18 years old protest the Revitalization Plan, the Authority Board must terminate the proceedings. If between 25 and 50% of the combined number of property owners and residents in the area who are at least 18 years old protest against the Plan, the Board must hold a mail-in ballot election on the Plan. If a majority of the property owners and residents vote against the plan, then the Revitalization Authority shall not take any further action to implement the proposed plan, and shall not propose a new or revised plan for at least one year following the date of the election.

Once formed, the Revitalization Authority must adopt annual reports on its activities within the Revitalization Area. Every ten years during the 30 year life of the Revitalization Plan, the Revitalization Authority must hold a protest proceeding and give property owners and residents the opportunity to protest against the Revitalization Plan. If between 25 and 50 percent of the combined property owners and residents protest against the Plan, then a mail-in ballot election must be held. If the Revitalization Authority receives a majority protest, either initially or through the mail-in ballot process, the Revitalization Authority must cease all activities within the Revitalization Area except for the repayment of debt. City staff has not done a comprehensive survey of the City, but it is very unlikely that there are significant areas in the City that would qualify for inclusion in a Revitalization Area.

IV. Pass-Through Agreement with Yolo County

The Redevelopment Agency, the City of Davis and Yolo County entered into a Pass-Through Agreement that established the formula for the Redevelopment Agency's tax-



increment sharing with Yolo County. The Agreement provides the County with an allocation of property tax in excess of what it would receive if the Redevelopment Plan were not in effect. The Pass-Through Agreement provides, however, that the Agency may cease making its payments if the County approves urban development within the City's Planning Area. The County Auditor-Controller has been distributing payments to the County based on the formula set forth in the Pass-Through Agreement since the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, and the County has not approved any urban development within the City's Planning Area during that time. This is consistent with AB 1X 26 and AB 1484, which provide that the taxing entities should receive pass-through payments in accordance with existing pass-through agreements as if the Redevelopment Agency were still in existence. If, however, the County were to approve urban development within the City's Planning Area, the City and Successor Agency would have the option to terminate the Pass-Through Agreement and the County would no longer be eligible for pass-through allocations under that Agreement.

Conclusion

City staff recommends that the Council direct staff to transfer to the Successor Agency the funds necessary to make the DDR Payment and receive a finding of completion. City staff does not recommend that the Council take any action to pursue formation of a community revitalization and investment authority at this time, but staff will monitor the evolution of that new law, to see whether it may be a helpful tool in the future.

F-928-20
07/90
TO: City Manager
VIA: Finance Director

CITY OF DAVIS
Request for Budget Adjustment
Fiscal Year 2015/16

Agenda Item: 09
City Council Meeting Date: 11/3/15

FROM: _____

Dept Head Kelley 10-27-15
Signature and Date

I request the following budget adjustments:

A. Internal Transfers of Currently Appropriated Funds:

TRANSFERS FROM PROGRAM NAME	FUND NO.	DIV/ PROG.	ACTIVITY	ELEMENT/ OBJECT	AMOUNT (CR)	FUND
					\$ -	
					\$ -	
					\$ -	
					\$ -	
				TOTAL	\$ -	

B. New Appropriation's Source of funding/Revised Revenue Change:

General Fund Transfer to 891	891	9895	910	9530	\$ (567,900)	891
Downtown Capital Revitalization Fund Transfer to 891	891	9895	910	9530	\$ (4,863,769)	891
General Fund Transfer to 891	001	9895	910	9530	\$ 567,900	001
Downtown Capital Revitalization Fund Transfer to 891	476	9895	910	9530	\$ 4,863,769	476
RDA Successor Agency Fund Balance				891	\$ 144,030	
New/Revised Revenue Account	001	0000	303	0510	\$ 1,170,896	001
		Revenue Account Number				
				TOTAL	\$ 6,746,595	

C. Allocation of Internal Transfers and/or New Appropriations:

TRANSFERS TO PROGRAM NAME	FUND NO.	DIV/ PROG.	ACTIVITY	ELEMENT/ OBJECT	AMOUNT (DR)	FUND
RDA Successor Administration	891	9101	470	5013	\$ 5,575,699	891
					\$ -	
					\$ -	
					\$ -	
				TOTAL	\$ 5,575,699	

D: Reason For Adjustment (Explain fully. Attach sheet if necessary. If new revenue, record a description on reverse side on Part VI.)
To Transfer funds from the General Fund and Downtown Capital Revitalization Fund to the Redevelopment Successor Agency
and appropriate the \$5,575,699 for payment to Yolo County in response to the State of California Due diligence review.
In addition, recognize General Fund residual revenue from the RDA distribution 21% of \$5,575,699 which is \$1,170,896.

FINANCE DIRECTOR

CITY MANAGER

A. ☐ Funds have been appropriated & are available.

A. ☐ Approved
☐ Disapproved

B. ☐ Funds have been appropriated.

☒ Funds must be appropriated.

B. ☐ City Council appropriated funds.
☐ City Council informed of revised revenue estimate.

Kelley Hutchins 10/27/15
Signature and Date

Signature and Date

Date: 10/27/15 BA No. 047

Posted By: _____