



December 17, 2013

Ms. Diane Perkin, Director of Administrative Services Department  
City of Lakewood  
5050 Clark Avenue  
Lakewood, CA 90712

Dear Ms. Perkin:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated November 1, 2013. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Lakewood Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14B) to Finance on September 19, 2013, for the period of January through June 2014. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on November 1, 2013. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more of the items denied by Finance. The Meet and Confer session was held on November 13, 2013.

Based on a review of additional information and documentation provided to Finance during the Meet and Confer process, Finance has completed its review of the specific items being disputed.

- Item No. 25 – City loan for ROPS 13-14A enforceable obligations in the amount of \$451,484. Finance continues to deny this item. The agency claims they did not receive all of the approved Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) distribution during the July through December 2013 period (ROPS 13-14A). Our review indicates that the Agency did not receive all approved RPTTF because of a prior period adjustment per HSC section 34186, for the July through December 2012 ROPS period, that caused a reduction in the ROPS 13-14A RPTTF distribution amount. After further analysis, Finance determined that the prior period adjustments made by the Los Angeles County Auditor Controller (CAC) are accurate and appropriate. The Agency was permitted to retain \$1,818,980 million in the Other Funds and Accounts Due Diligence Review letter dated May 2, 2013, the amount distributed by the County Auditor Controller for the July through December 2012 period (ROPS II). The Agency reported expending \$1,367,496 during the ROPS II period; therefore, the Controller made a prior period adjustment for the \$451,484. Because these funds were not expended in the ROPS II period, the funds should have been available for the ROPS 13-14A period and the loan was not necessary.

We note, that while HSC section 34173 (h) allows the city that created the former redevelopment agency to loan funds for administrative costs, enforceable obligations, or

project related expenses at its discretion, the Agency did not submit an Oversight Board Resolution to Finance for review and approval. Per HSC section 34179 (h), an Oversight Board Action shall not become effective until approved by Finance.

- Item No. 26 – Future litigation expenses in the amount of \$20,000. Finance no longer denies this item. Finance initially denied the item as it is our understanding no litigation has occurred. However, during the meet and confer, the Agency provided documentation that litigation was filed on November 5, 2013. The Agency also provided a contract for litigation representation and previous invoices to support the ROPS 13-14B estimate. Therefore, this item is an enforceable obligation payable from RPTTF.
- Administrative costs claimed exceed the allowance by \$66,000. HSC section 34171 (b) limits fiscal year 2013-14 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax allocated to the Agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater. As a result, the Agency is eligible for \$250,000 in administrative expenses. While \$125,000 was approved for administrative costs during the ROPS 13-14A period, the \$191,000 requested for ROPS 13-14B exceeds the \$250,000 administrative cap for the fiscal year. Therefore, \$66,000 of excess administrative cost is not allowed.

Pursuant to HSC Section 34186 (a), successor agencies were required to report on the ROPS 13-14B form the estimated obligations and actual payments (prior period adjustments) associated with the January through June 2013 period. HSC Section 34186 (a) also specifies that the prior period adjustments self-reported by successor agencies are subject to audit by the county auditor-controller (CAC) and the State Controller. The amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's audit of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Except for the item denied in whole or in part as an enforceable obligation, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 13-14B.

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$318,740 as summarized on the following page:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution Amount For the period of January through June 2014</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	645,224
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	191,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 836,224</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>645,224</b>
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 25	(451,484)
<b>Total RPTTF approved for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>193,740</b>
<b>Total RPTTF allowable for administrative obligations (see Admin Cost Cap table below)</b>	<b>125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF approved for obligations</b>	<b>318,740</b>
ROPS III prior period adjustment	0
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 318,740</b>
<b>Administrative Cost Cap Calculation</b>	
Total RPTTF for 13-14A (July through December 2013)	2,889,277
Total RPTTF for 13-14B (January through June 2014)	193,740
<b>Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2013-14</b>	<b>3,083,017</b>
Allowable administrative cost for fiscal year 2013-14 (Greater of 3% or \$250,000)	250,000
Administrative allowance for 13-14A (July through December 2013)	125,000
<b>Allowable RPTTF distribution for administrative cost for ROPS 13-14B</b>	<b>125,000</b>

Pursuant to HSC section 34177 (l) (1) (E), agencies are required to use all available funding sources prior to RPTTF for payment of enforceable obligations. Beginning with the ROPS 13-14B period, Finance required successor agencies to identify fund balances for various types of funds in its possession. During our ROPS 13-14B review, Finance requested financial records to support the fund balances reported by the Agency; however, Finance was unable to reconcile the financial records to the amounts reported. As a result, Finance will continue to work with the Agency after the ROPS 13-14B review period to properly identify the Agency's fund balances. If it is determined the Agency possesses fund balances that are available to pay approved obligations, the Agency should request the use of these fund balances prior to requesting RPTTF in ROPS 14-15A.

Please refer to the ROPS 13-14B schedule that was used to calculate the approved RPTTF amount:

[http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS 13-14B Forms by Successor Agency/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/ROPS/ROPS_13-14B_Forms_by_Successor_Agency/).

This is Finance's final determination related to the enforceable obligations reported on your ROPS for January 1 through June 30, 2014. This determination applies only to items where 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 periods. All items listed on a future ROPS are subject to a subsequent review and may be denied even if it was or was not denied on this ROPS or a preceding ROPS. The only exception is for those items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination from Finance pursuant to HSC section

34177.5 (i). Finance's review of items that have received a Final and Conclusive determination 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 that was available prior to enactment of ABx1 26 and AB 1484. This amount is not and never was an unlimited funding source. 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 successor agency in the RPTTF.

To the extent proceeds from bonds issued after December 31, 2010 exist and are not encumbered by an enforceable obligation pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d), HSC section 34191.4 (c)(2)(B) requires these proceeds be used to defease the bonds or to purchase those same outstanding bonds on the open market for cancellation.

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Danielle Brandon, Lead Analyst, at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



Justyn Howard  
Assistant Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Edianne Rodriguez, Senior Accountant, City of Lakewood  
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller  
California State Controller's Office