915 L STREET # SACRAMENTO CA # 95814-3706 # WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

November 2, 2015

Ms. Amelia Soto, A/Project Manager City of Carson 701 East Carson Street Carson, CA 90745

Dear Ms. Soto:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the City of Carson Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the period January 1 through June 30, 2016 (ROPS 15-16B) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on September 22, 2015. Finance has completed its review of the ROPS 15-16B.

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

Claimed administrative costs exceed the allowance by \$174,442.
HSC section 34171 (b) (2) limits the fiscal year 2015-16 administrative expenses to three percent of the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) allocated to the Agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater. The Los Angeles Auditor-Controller's Office distributed \$250,000 administrative costs for the July through December 2015 period, thus leaving a balance of \$194,201 available for the January through June 2016 period. Although \$368,643 is claimed for administrative cost, only \$194,201 is available pursuant to the cap. Therefore, \$174,442 of excess administrative cost is not allowed.

In addition, Finance notes the following:

The Agency inadvertently requested the incorrect amount for Item No. 147 – TA Housing Bonds 2010A reserves. Per discussion with Agency staff and review of documentation provided, the \$1,081,624 requested for the six month period should be \$647,031. As a result, the Agency requested to apply the difference of \$434,593 (\$1,081,624-\$647,031) to Item No. 148 – Carson LRB 2009 reserves. The total ROPS 15-16B RPTTF funding requested for enforceable obligations remains unchanged.

Pursuant to HSC section 34186 (a) (1), the Agency was required to report on the ROPS 15-16B form the estimated obligations versus actual payments (prior period adjustment) associated with the January through June 2015 period (ROPS 14-15B). HSC section 34186 (a) (1) also specifies the prior period adjustment self-reported by the Agency is subject to review by the county auditor-controller (CAC). The amount of RPTTF approved in the table on the following page includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's review of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Ms. Amelia Soto November 2, 2015 Page 2

Except for the item denied in whole or in part, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16B. If you disagree with Finance's determination with respect to any items on your ROPS 15-16B, except for those items which are the subject of litigation disputing Finance's previous or related determinations, 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 maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$12,001,028 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

| Approved RPTTF Distribution  |    |            |
|--|----|------------|
| For the period of January through June 2016                                |    |            |
| Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations                   |    | 12,288,102 |
| Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations                       |    | 368,643    |
| Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B                       | \$ | 12,656,745 |
| Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations                  | \$ | 12,288,102 |
| Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations                       |    | 368,643    |
| Administrative costs in excess of the cap (see Admin Cost Cap table below) |    | (174,442)  |
| Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations                      | \$ | 194,201    |
| Total RPTTF authorized for obligations                                     | \$ | 12,482,303 |
| ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment  | I  | (481,275)  |
| Total RPTTF approved for distribution                                      | \$ | 12,001,028 |

| Administrative Cost Cap Calculation  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Total RPTTF for 15-16A (July through December 2015)                              | 2,518,606       |
| Total RPTTF for 15-16B (January through June 2016)                               | 12,288,102      |
| Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2015-2016  | 14,806,708      |
| Administrative cost cap for fiscal year 2015-16 (Greater of 3% of Total RPTTF or |                 |
| \$250,000)   | 444,201         |
| Administrative allowance for ROPS 15-16A (July through December 2015)            | <br>(250,000)   |
| Remaining administrative cost cap for ROPS 15-16B                                | <br>194,201     |
| ROPS 15-16B administrative obligations after Finance adjustments                 | <br>(368,643)   |
| Administrative costs in excess of the cap  | \$<br>(174,442) |

On the ROPS 15-16B form, the Agency reported cash balances and activity for the period January 1 through December 31, 2015. Finance will perform a review of the Agency's self-reported cash balances on an ongoing basis. Please be prepared to submit financial records and bridging documents to support the cash balances reported upon request. If it is determined the Agency possesses cash balances that are available to pay approved obligations, HSC section 34177 (I) (1) (E) requires these balances be used prior to requesting RPTTF.

Ms. Amelia Soto November 2, 2015 Page 3

Please refer to the ROPS 15-16B schedule used to calculate the total RPTTF approved for distribution:

## http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS

Absent a Meet and Confer, this is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for January 1 through June 30, 2016. This determination only applies to items when funding was requested for the six-month period. Finance's determination is effective for this time 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 it was 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 statutes. Therefore, as a practical matter, the ability to fund the items on the ROPS with property tax is limited to the amount of funding available to the Agency in the RPTTF.

Please direct inquiries to Kylie Oltmann, Supervisor, or Nicole Prisakar, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,

CC:

JUSTYN HOWARD Program Budget Manager

Mr. Daniel Zepeda, Accounting, City of Carson

Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County