



CITY OF OCEANSIDE

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

JOHN P. MULLEN
City Attorney
(760) 435-3979

BARBARA L. HAMILTON
Assistant City Attorney
(760) 435-3986

TARQUIN PREZIOSI
Senior Deputy City Attorney
(760) 435-3977

ANNIE M. PERRIGO
Deputy City Attorney
(760) 435-3972

DEBORAH NASH
Deputy City Attorney
(760) 435-3991

CAROLYN M. KHOUZAM
Deputy City Attorney
(760) 435-3975

July 12, 2012

Via U.S. Registered Mail

Tracy M. Sandoval
Auditor and Controller/Assistant Chief Financial Officer
County of San Diego
1600 Pacific Highway; Suite 166
San Diego, California 92101-2478

RE: Payment Under Protest of Payment Demanded by the San Diego County Auditor and Controller and Reservation of Rights

Dear Ms. Sandoval:

On July 9, 2012, the Successor Agency to the Oceanside Redevelopment Agency (the "Successor Agency") received a demand that it pay a total amount of \$6,121,409.09 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 34183.5(b)(2)(A).

The demand apparently represents a payment owed for the period January 1 – June 30, 2012 that County Auditor Controllers were unable to make on January 16, 2012.

The Successor Agency hereby pays the above demand under protest. The demand and its calculation are inaccurate and illegal and the mechanism for its enforcement illegal and unconstitutional. Payment is made with a complete reservation of all rights, including but not limited to, challenging the legality of the demand, its calculation and the mechanism for its enforcement and litigating any and all related legal and factual issues. You are also hereby placed on notice of the Successor Agency's intent to file an action in Sacramento which seeks an order from the Superior Court prohibiting the disbursement or distribution of these funds to any entity other than the Successor Agency. Accordingly, this payment by

Tracy M. Sandoval
County of San Diego
July 12, 2012
Page 2

the Successor Agency should not be distributed to taxing entities but should instead be held in a separate account until such time as that action is concluded.

Please contact us as soon as possible to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John P. Mullen". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

JOHN P. MULLEN
City Attorney

CC: Robert Scott, Department of Finance
Peter Weiss, City Manager, City of Oceanside



July 20, 2012

Kathy Brann, Redevelopment Manager
City of Oceanside
300 North Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054

Dear Ms. Brann:

The Department of Finance (Finance) is contacting you concerning a discrepancy between the amount your Successor Agency was billed on July 9, 2012 by the county auditor-controller pursuant to AB 1484, (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2012) and the amount that your Successor Agency subsequently remitted to them on July 12, 2012.

As you know, county auditor-controllers were required by July 9, 2012 to calculate and bill Successor Agencies for the amount of residual property tax revenue owed to cities, counties, special districts, and K-14 schools (collectively known as Affected Taxing Entities) for the period covered by the January 2012 through June 2012 Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS). Successor Agencies were required to remit the billed amount to the county auditor-controller by July 12, 2012 for distribution to the Affected Taxing Entities.

AB 1484 provides for penalties when a Successor Agency fails to remit the full billed amount to the county auditor-controller. These penalties are as follows:

- Both the Successor Agency and the City or County that operates the Successor Agency are subject to civil penalties equal to 10 percent of the amount owed to the Affected Taxing Entities, plus an additional monthly penalty equal to 1.5 percent of the amount owed to the Affected Taxing Entities.
- The City or County that operates the Successor Agency may have its monthly sales and use tax distributions withheld.
- The Successor Agency shall be prohibited from paying any Enforceable Obligations other than bond debt service payments.

Before any penalties are imposed, Finance would like to provide you an opportunity to share any information that you believe justifies the identified underpayment. At the very least, this information should include the following:

- The total amount of property tax available to the former redevelopment agency (RDA) prior to the property tax distribution that was used to fund the January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS (in most counties this distribution was in December 2011).

- The total amount of property taxes received by the former RDA from the property tax distribution that was used to fund the January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS.
- If applicable, explanation and documentation that shows the former RDA/Successor Agency paid Finance-approved Enforceable Obligations on the January 2012-June 2012 ROPS using property tax revenues that were improperly coded on the ROPS as being from reserves, or from sources other than property tax revenue.
- The Successor Agency's current property tax reserves, and an explanation of why those sums cannot be used to pay the amount that the Successor Agency was billed on July 9, 2012.

To ensure Successor Agencies have an opportunity to explain any potentially mitigating circumstances, Finance does not intend to withhold sales and use tax revenues from cities or counties until the September 2012 sales and use tax disbursement, as authorized by Health and Safety Code section 34183.5. Nor does Finance intend to seek any civil penalties against Successor Agencies and cities and counties until September.

If a Successor Agency disputes its billing, it must submit information to Finance by July 31, 2012 that convincingly demonstrates its underpayment was legally justified. In such cases, Finance will ensure no penalties are applied to either the Successor Agency or to the city or county. If such information is not presented by July 31, 2012, and if the Successor Agency continues to refuse to pay the full billed amount, Finance will ensure the penalties required by AB 1484 are applied.

Please submit any pertinent information to redvelopment_administration@dof.ca.gov, and please title the e-mail "(Name of Successor Agency) July Billing Dispute Information". If you have previously submitted information to Finance concerning your disputed billing, please resubmit that information to ensure it is properly routed to the appropriate staff.

To ensure Finance has time to carefully consider your information, I suggest you send it as soon as possible. If you have any questions in the interim, please call (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely



ANA J. MATOSANTOS
Director

cc: County Auditor-Controller



CITY OF OCEANSIDE

OFFICE OF CITY MANAGER

July 27, 2012

Ms. Ana J. Matosantos, Director
Department of Finance
State Capitol, Room 1145
Sacramento, California 95814-4998

Via email: redvelopment_administration@dof.ca.gov

Subject: City of Oceanside Successor Agency July Billing Dispute

Dear Ms. Matosantos:

On July 12, 2012, pursuant to AB 1484, the City of Oceanside Successor Agency remitted \$1,527,698 instead of the \$6,121,409 that was billed by the auditor-controller on July 9, 2012. In addition to the wire transfer, the Oceanside Successor Agency also submitted to both DOF and the San Diego County Auditor-Controller a letter dated July 16, 2012, detailing the basis for the submittal and copies of the supporting documents identifying the payments made toward Enforceable Obligations for the period of January through June 2012.

The Oceanside Successor Agency, at the direction of the County Auditor-Controller, understood that no RPTTF deposits would be made and the Successor Agency had to use reserve balances during the January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS period to meet enforceable obligations—which is the basis for Oceanside's reduced payment.

The following will address the questions you raised in your July 20, 2012, letter:

1. The total amount of property tax available to the former RDA prior to the property tax distribution that was used to fund the January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS was \$2,828,687. (Please note that in the July 16, 2012, letter to Mr. Robert Scott of DOF, the amount of \$2,099,553 represented the fund balance which included projected payables at that time and did include the property tax distribution of \$886,053 received in November 2011).
2. The total amount of property taxes received by the former RDA from the property tax distribution that was used to fund the January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS was \$6,121,409.

3. The City's January 2012 to June 2012 ROPS identified \$4,646,236 to be applied to Enforceable Obligations to be paid from Reserve Balances—not from RPTTF. Although \$4,646,236 was budgeted, the actual expenditures were \$4,792,223. These funds were paid from Reserve Balances and the back-up material to support our contention that the funds were used for legitimate Enforceable Obligations is attached to this email. The primary Enforceable Obligations include:

i.	2002 Tax Allocation Bond	\$457,599
ii.	2003 Tax Allocation Bond	\$395,169
iii.	2003 Refund Tax Allocation Bond	\$79,675
iv.	2004 Refund Tax Allocation Bond	\$241,377
v.	LMIHF Deficit Reduction Loan	\$506,475
vi.	2009 DDA payment obligation	\$2,360,000

4. The Successor Agency's current property tax reserve is \$2,438,592, which, as part of the July 2012 to December 2012 ROPS, has been allocated to pay for Enforceable Obligations. If this amount were to be used to pay the amount billed on July 9, 2012, the Successor Agency would have inadequate funds to pay any of the enforceable obligations identified in the July 2012 to December 2012 ROPS. The Oceanside Successor Agency July 2012 to December 2012 ROPS includes \$3,620,368 in debt service payments for the following Enforceable Obligations:

i.	2002 Tax Allocation Bond	\$1,280,669
ii.	2003 Tax Allocation Bond	\$1,115,169
iii.	2003 Refund Tax Allocation Bond	\$608,914
iv.	2004 Refund Tax Allocation Bond	\$615,616

The alternative would be for the Successor Agency to remit the additional \$2,438,592 and have the ability to amend the July 2012 to December 2012 ROPS to have the enforceable obligations as RPTTF distributions.

We believe the information provided will demonstrate the underpayment was legally justified and would like to discuss the matter with your representative to resolve all the issues to everyone's mutual benefit. It is our intention to not only cooperate with the provisions of AB 1484, but to also maximize the returns to the taxing entities, which include the City's General Fund.

My direct number is 760-435-3066 if you or your staff have any additional questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Peter Weiss
City Manager

Cc: Tracey Sandoval, San Diego County

Cash Worksheet		Housing	Bond	Tax Increment Reserve Balance	Other Reserve Balance	*RPTTF	Other	Restricted Cash with Fiscal Agent	Total Cash
Beginning Balance	Fund 594/977	Fund 504/972	Fund 591/973					Fund 489/971	
12/31/2011	5,570,235	14,023,668	2,771,101	57,586	4,659,911	-	2,980,157	30,062,658	
Revenue 1/1/12 - 6/30/12:									
Tax Increment and Interest					1,461,498				1,461,498
Other revenue and adjustments	33,422	42,799	87,627		442,050				605,898
Demand payment to County paid July 2012					1,527,809				1,527,809
Developer payment accrued June 30					2,360,000				2,360,000
Transfer to CDC Housing Fund	(20,320)								(20,320)
Transfers and Pass through Payments	177,211				721,149				898,360
									-
									-
ROPS I Expenditures	39,642	1,626,244	411,101	145,213	1,875,909				4,098,109
Net Cash Available	5,366,484	12,440,223	-	-	2,438,592			2,980,157	23,225,456
	Housing	Bond	Reserve Balance		RROF	Other			Total Cash
7/1/2012 Balance	5,366,484	12,440,223	-	-	2,438,592	-			23,225,456
Revenue 7/1/12 -12/31/12:									
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
ROPS II Expenditures		1,256,270			3,773,874				5,030,144
Projected 12/31/ Balance	5,366,484	11,183,953	-	-	(1,335,282)	-			18,195,312

* Per Derk Symons at the DOF, this column is to be used for all tax increment activity. Oceanside did not receive any RPTTF for the year ended 6/30/11. These are Oceanside's cash reserves that are presented in the RPTTF column.

**RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE - CONSOLIDATED
FILED FOR THE JANUARY 1, 2012 to JUNE 30, 2012 PERIOD**

Name of Successor Agency Oceanside

	Current	
	Total Outstanding Debt or Obligation	Total Due During Fiscal Year
Balance Carried Forward From:		
Outstanding Debt or Obligation (From Form A, Page 1 Totals)	\$ 105,877,770	\$ 15,237,288
	Total Due for Six Month Period	
Outstanding Debt or Obligation (From Form B, Page 1 Totals)	\$ 9,605,873	
Available Revenues other than anticipated funding from RPTTF (Form C) Anticipated Funding from Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) (Form C)	\$ 9,605,873	
	\$ -	

Consolidate on this form all of the data contained on Form A, B and C. Form A is to include all outstanding obligation entered into for period filed. Form B is to include payment requirement for each enforceable obligation for each month. Form C is to enter the anticipated funding source for each listed enforceable obligation.

Certification of Oversight Board Chairman:
Pursuant to Section 34177(l) of the Health and Safety code,
I hereby certify that the above is a true and accurate Recognized
Enforceable Payment Schedule for the above named agency.

Name _____ Title _____
Signature _____ Date _____

Name of Successor Agency: Oceanside

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Per AB 26 - Section 34177(i)
Filed for Period Jan to June, 2012

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Payee	Description	Total Outstanding Debt or Obligation	Total Due During Fiscal Year
1) 2002 Tax Allocation Bond	Bank of New York	Bonds issued to fund Prop. Acq/CIP	\$ 25,513,231	\$ 1,717,893
2) 2003 Tax Allocation Bond	Bank of New York	Bonds issued to fund RDA Projects	\$ 21,889,005	\$ 1,492,398
3) 2003 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	Bank of New York	Bonds issued to refund 1993 TAB	\$ 5,427,675	\$ 678,689
4) 2004 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	Bank of New York	Bonds issued to refund 1994 TAB	\$ 16,223,921	\$ 849,093
5) 20% Set-Aside Deficit	CDC LMIH Fund	Loan for Public Works project	\$ 1,023,330	\$ 506,475
6) LMIH Fund Loan	CDC LMIH Fund	2010 SERAF Payment	\$ 1,116,968	\$ -
7) General Legal Services	Best Best & Krieger	Continue work w/Legal Counsel	\$ 79,548	\$ 6,000
8) Redevelopment Bonds	Stradling Yoca	Continue work w/Bond Counsel	\$ 70,860	\$ 6,000
9) Beach Resurf. Negotiations	Keyser Marston	Continue work w/Financial Consult.	\$ 32,285	\$ 3,000
10) General Economic Analysis	Keyser Marston	Continue work w/Financial Consult.	\$ 42,829	\$ 3,000
11) Auditor	LSL Auditor	Necessary audits	\$ 6,800	\$ 6,800
12) Employee cost (H)	Employees of Agency	Payroll for employees	\$ 300,000	\$ 130,967
13) Administrative Operations (H)	City of Oceanside	Space Rent, equipment, supplies	\$ 27,360	\$ 16,672
14) Administrative Operations	City of Oceanside	Space Rent, equipment, supplies	\$ 495,592	\$ 271,365
15) Employee cost	Employees of Agency	Payroll for employees	\$ 882,914	\$ 826,347
16) Parking Lot Lease	GF Development	Lease for two parking lots	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
17) Mission Cove	CSG	Financial consultant	\$ 30,000	\$ 15,858
18) Business Development	Harbor Lights	Downtown promotions	\$ 20,000	\$ 9,417
19) Beach Negotiations	BBK	Outside consultant for hotel	\$ 65,000	\$ 5,129
20) Beach Hotel Site Prep	Hansons	Relocation of Grave House	\$ 80,000	\$ 450
Totals - This Page			\$ 73,387,318	\$ 6,605,553
Totals - Page 2			\$ 32,490,452	\$ 8,631,735
Grand total - All Pages			\$ 105,877,770	\$ 15,237,288

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Per AB 26 - Section 34177(i)
Filed for Period Jan to June, 2012

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Payee	Description	Total Outstanding Debt or Obligation	Total Due During Fiscal Year
1) Drainage Improvements	Various	Contractors, inspectors, engineering and general support	\$ 1,640,606	\$ 1,640,606
2)				
3) Tyson/Wisconsin Parking Lot	Various	Contractors, inspectors, engineering and general support	\$ 2,174,981	\$ 2,174,981
4)				
5) Waterfront Restrooms	Various	Contractors, inspectors, engineering and general support	\$ 436,358	\$ 436,358
6)				
7) Beach Resort	TC Construction/City of Oceanside	Qualifying public costs	\$ 5,208,717	\$ 3,510,000
8) Beach Resort	SD Malkin	Bond issue #1 /covenants	\$ 13,800,000	\$ -
9) Beach Resort	SD Malkin	Bond issue #2 /covenants	\$ 3,360,000	\$ -
10) Beach Resort	SD Malkin	Performance based TI for public parking/covenants	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
11)				
12) Mission Avenue Improve.	Various	Contractors, inspectors, engineering and general support	\$ 519,790	\$ 519,790
13)				
14) Lot 23 parking structure	Various	Contractors, inspectors, engineering and general support	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000
15)				
16)				
17)				
18)				
19)				
20)				
Totals - This Page			\$ 32,490,452	\$ 8,631,735
Total Page 2			\$ 32,490,452	\$ 8,631,735

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Per AB 26 - Section 34177(0)
Filed for Period January to June, 2012

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Project Area	Payments by Month												Adjustments from Prior Schedule	TOTAL
		January	February	March	April	May	June	Subtotal							
1) 2002 Tax Allocation Bond	Downtown	0	457,599	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457,599		457,599
2) 2003 Tax Allocation Bond	Downtown	0	392,080	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,089	0	395,169		395,169
3) 2003 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	Downtown	0	79,675	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79,675		79,675
4) 2004 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	Downtown	0	241,377	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241,377		241,377
5) 20% Set-Aside Deficit	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506,475	0	506,475		506,475
6) LMIH Fund Loan	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
7) General Legal Services	Downtown	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000		6,000
8) Redevelopment Bonds	Downtown	0	500	500	1,400	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	6,000		6,000
9) Beach Resort Negotiations	Downtown	0	500	750	750	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	3,000		3,000
10) General Economic Analysis	Downtown	0	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	1,000	1,000	3,000		3,000
11) Auditor	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,400	3,400	6,800		6,800
12) Employee cost (H)	Downtown	38,821	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38,821		38,821
13) Administrative Operations (H)	Downtown	2,280	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,280		2,280
14) Administrative Operations	Downtown	19,115	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	144,115		144,115
15) Employee cost	Downtown	62,026	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	85,000	85,000	407,026		407,026
16) Parking Lot Lease	Downtown	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	30,000		30,000
17) Mission Cove	Downtown	15,858	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,858		15,858
18) Business Development	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
19) Beach Negotiations	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
20) Beach Hotel Site Prep	Downtown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Totals - This Page		143,100	1,267,231	96,750	99,650	103,200	633,264	2,343,195	0	2,343,195	0	2,343,195	0	2,343,195	
Totals - Page 2		541,239	500,000	795,000	770,000	1,423,543	3,232,896	7,262,678	0	7,262,678	0	7,262,678	0	7,262,678	
Grand total - All Pages		684,339	1,767,231	891,750	869,650	1,526,743	3,866,160	9,605,873	0	9,605,873	0	9,605,873	0	9,605,873	

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Per AB 26 - Section 34177(i)
File for Period January to June, 2012

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Total from Form B	Source of Payment							TOTAL	Paid from Reserves	Actual	Difference	Notes
		RPTTF	Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund	Bond Proceeds	Reserve Balances	Administrative Cost Allowance	Other Revenue Sources						
1) 2002 Tax Allocation Bond	\$ 457,599				\$ 457,599				\$ 457,599				Semi-annual Tax Allocation Bond payments 2002 TABS
2) 2003 Tax Allocation Bond	\$ 395,169				\$ 395,169				\$ 395,169				Semi-annual Tax Allocation Bond payments 2003 TABS
3) 2003 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	\$ 79,675				\$ 79,675				\$ 79,675	\$ 1,680,295	\$ 1,768,200	\$ 87,905	Semi-annual 2003 Refunding TAB
4) 2004 Refund Tax Allocation Bd	\$ 241,377				\$ 241,377				\$ 241,377				Semi-annual 2004 Refunding TAB
5) 20% Set-Aside Deficit	\$ 506,475				\$ 506,475				\$ 506,475				Funds previously borrowed from Low Mod
6) LMIH Fund Loan	\$ -								\$ -				
7) General Legal Services	\$ 6,000				\$ 6,000				\$ 6,000				General legal consultants amount shown is carry forwards from previous years
8) Redevelopment Bonds	\$ 6,000				\$ 6,000				\$ 6,000	\$ 24,800	\$ 72,566	\$ 47,766	Bond Council for ongoing projects, amount shown is carry forwards from previous years
9) Beach Resort Negotiations	\$ 3,000				\$ 3,000				\$ 3,000				Reason Project amount shown is carry forwards from previous years
10) General Economic Analysis	\$ 3,000				\$ 3,000				\$ 3,000				General Financial consultants amount shown is carry forwards from previous years
11) Auditor	\$ 6,800				\$ 6,800				\$ 6,800				Auditors expense
12) Employee cost (H)	\$ 38,821		\$ 38,821						\$ 38,821				
13) Administrative Operations (H)	\$ 2,280		\$ 2,280						\$ 2,280				Redevelopment Adm. rent, equipment, supplies, expenses
14) Administrative Operations	\$ 144,115				\$ 144,115				\$ 144,115	\$ 144,115	\$ 312,475	\$ 168,360	
15) Employee cost	\$ 407,026				\$ 407,026				\$ 407,026	\$ 407,026	\$ 253,982	\$ (153,044)	Redevelopment employee expense
16) Parking Lot Lease	\$ 30,000				\$ 30,000				\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 25,000	\$ (5,000)	Existing parking lot lease
17) Mission Cove	\$ 15,858		\$ 15,858						\$ 15,858				
18) Business Development	\$ -								\$ -				
19) Beach Negotiations	\$ -								\$ -				
20) Beach Hotel Site Prep	\$ -								\$ -				
Totals - This Page	\$ 2,343,195	\$ -	\$ 56,959	\$ -	\$ 2,286,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,343,195	\$ 2,286,236	\$ 2,432,223	\$ 145,987		
Totals - Page 2	\$ 7,262,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,902,678	\$ 2,360,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,262,678	\$ 2,360,000	\$ 2,360,000	\$ -		
Grand total - All Pages	\$ 9,605,873	\$ -	\$ 56,959	\$ 4,902,678	\$ 4,646,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,605,873	\$ 4,646,236	\$ 4,792,223	\$ 145,987		

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Per AB 26 - Section 34177(1)
File for Period January to June, 2012

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Total from Form B	Source of Payment						TOTAL
		RPTTF	Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund	Bond Proceeds	Reserve Balances	Administrative Cost Allowance	Other Revenue Sources	
1) Drainage Improvements	\$ 1,255,634			\$ 1,255,634				\$ 1,255,634
2)	\$ -							\$ -
3) Tyson/Wisconsin Parking Lot	\$ 1,908,717			\$ 1,908,717				\$ 1,908,717
4)	\$ -							\$ -
5) Waterfront Restrooms	\$ 402,767			\$ 402,767				\$ 402,767
6)	\$ -							\$ -
7) Beech Resort	\$ 2,938,368			\$ 578,368	\$ 2,360,000			\$ 2,938,368
8) Beech Resort	\$ -							\$ -
9) Beech Resort	\$ -							\$ -
10) Beech Resort	\$ -							\$ -
11)	\$ -							\$ -
12) Mission Avenue Improve.	\$ 407,192			\$ 407,192				\$ 407,192
13)	\$ -							\$ -
14) Lot 23 parking structure	\$ 350,000			\$ 350,000				\$ 350,000
15)	\$ -							\$ -
16)	\$ -							\$ -
17)	\$ -							\$ -
18)	\$ -							\$ -
19)	\$ -							\$ -
20)	\$ -							\$ -
Totals - This Page 2	\$ 7,262,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,902,678	\$ 2,360,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,262,678
Total Page 2	\$ 7,262,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,902,678	\$ 2,360,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,262,678