MERCED COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

ASSET TRANSFER REVIEW

Review Report

January 1, 2011, through January 31, 2012



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

November 2013



November 12, 2013

Mark Hendrickson, Director Merced County Redevelopment/Successor Agency 2222 M Street Merced, CA 95340

Dear Mr. Hendrickson:

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 34167.5, the State Controller's Office (SCO) reviewed all asset transfers made by the Merced County Redevelopment Agency (RDA) to Merced County (County) or any other public agency after January 1, 2011. This statutory provision states, "The Legislature hereby finds that a transfer of assets by a redevelopment agency during the period covered in this section is deemed not to be in furtherance of the Community Redevelopment Law and is thereby unauthorized." Therefore, our review included an assessment of whether each asset transfer was allowable and whether it should be turned over to the Successor Agency.

Our review applied to all assets including, but not limited to, real and personal property, cash funds, accounts receivable, deeds of trust and mortgages, contract rights, and rights to payment of any kind. We also reviewed and determined whether any unallowable transfers of assets to the County or any other public agencies have been reversed.

Our review found that the RDA appropriately transferred \$439,623 in assets to the Successor Agency. Assets consisted of unencumbered cash and one parcel that was conveyed to the RDA by the County in 2008. We did not identify any unallowed transfers of assets between the County, and/or other public agencies.

If you have any questions, please contact Steven Mar, Bureau Chief, Local Government Audits Bureau, by phone at (916) 324-7226.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA Chief, Division of Audits

JVB/kw

cc: James L. Brown, County Executive Officer

County of Merced

Lisa Cardella-Presto, Auditor-Controller

County of Merced

Steve Gomes, Oversight Board Chairman

c/o County of Merced Redevelopment/Successor Agency

David Botelho, Program Budget Manager

California Department of Finance

Richard J. Chivaro, Chief Legal Counsel

State Controller's Office

Steven Mar, Bureau Chief

Division of Audits, State Controller's Office

Betty Moya, Audit Manager

Division of Audits, State Controller's Office

Cecilia Michaels, Auditor-in-Charge

Division of Audits, State Controller's Office

Contents

Review Report

Summary	1
Background	1
Objective, Scope, and Methodology	2
Conclusion	2
Views of Responsible Officials	2
Restricted Use	2

Asset Transfer Review Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) reviewed the asset transfers made by the Merced County Redevelopment Agency (RDA) after January 1, 2011. Our review included, but was not limited to, real and personal property, cash funds, accounts receivable, deeds of trust and mortgages, contract rights, and rights to payments of any kind from any source.

Our review found that the RDA appropriately transferred \$439,623 in assets to the Successor Agency. Assets consisted of unencumbered cash and one parcel that was conveyed to the RDA by Merced County (County) in 2008. We did not identify any unallowed transfers of assets between the County, and/or other public agencies.

Background

In January of 2011, the Governor of the State of California proposed statewide elimination of redevelopment agencies (RDAs) beginning with the fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 State budget. The Governor's proposal was incorporated into Assembly Bill 26 (ABX1 26, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011, First Extraordinary Session), which was passed by the Legislature, and signed into law by the Governor on June 28, 2011.

ABX1 26 prohibited RDAs from engaging in new business, established mechanisms and timelines for dissolution of the RDAs, and created RDA Successor Agencies to oversee dissolution of the RDAs and redistribution of RDA assets.

A California Supreme Court decision on December 28, 2011 (*California Redevelopment Association et al. v. Matosantos*), upheld ABX1 26 and the Legislature's constitutional authority to dissolve the RDAs.

ABX1 26 was codified in the Health and Safety Code (H&S Code) beginning with section 34161.

In accordance with the requirements of H&S Code section 34167.5, the State Controller is required to review the activities of RDAs, "to determine whether an asset transfer has occurred after January 1, 2011, between the city or county, or city and county that created a redevelopment agency, or any other public agency, and the redevelopment agency," and the date on which the RDA ceases to operate, or January 31, 2012, whichever is earlier.

The SCO has identified transfers of assets that occurred after January 1, 2011, between the RDA, the County, and/or other public agencies. By law, the SCO is required to order that such assets, except those that already had been committed to a third party prior to June 28, 2011, the effective date of ABX1 26, be turned over to the Successor Agency. In addition, the SCO may file a legal order to ensure compliance with this order.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Our review objective was to determine whether asset transfers that occurred after January 1, 2011, and the date upon which the RDA ceased to operate, or January 31, 2012, whichever was earlier, between the city or county, or city and county that created an RDA, or any other public agency, and the RDA, were appropriate.

We performed the following procedures:

- Interviewed Successor Agency personnel to gain an understanding of the Successor Agency operations and procedures.
- Reviewed meeting minutes, resolutions, and ordinances of the RDA, the Successor Agency and the Oversight Board.
- Reviewed accounting records relating to the recording of assets.
- Verified the accuracy of the Asset Transfer Assessment Form. This form was sent to all former RDAs to provide a list of all assets transferred between January 1, 2011, and January 31, 2012.
- Reviewed applicable financial reports to verify assets (capital, cash, property, etc.).

Conclusion

Our review found that the RDA appropriately transferred \$439,623 in assets to the Successor Agency. Assets consisted of unencumbered cash and one parcel that was conveyed to the RDA by the County in 2008. We did not identify any unallowed transfers of assets between the County, and/or other public agencies.

Views of Responsible Officials

At an exit conference on September 27, 2013, we discussed the review results with Mark Hendrickson, Director; Melissa Westerdoll, Staff Service Analyst; and Michael Lenhardt, Supervising Auditor, who agreed with the review results. Mr. Hendrickson further agreed that a draft review report was not necessary and that the report could be issued as final.

Restricted Use

This report is solely for the information and use of the County of Merced, the Successor Agency, the Oversight Board and the SCO; it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record when issued final.

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA Chief, Division of Audits November 12, 2013 State Controller's Office Division of Audits Post Office Box 942850 Sacramento, CA 94250-5874

http://www.sco.ca.gov