



November 10, 2015

Ms. Jan Sprague, Admin Secretary  
California City  
21000 Hacienda Boulevard  
California City, CA 93505

Dear Ms. Sprague:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the California City 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 October 1, 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 determinations:

- Item No. 18 – Litigation costs in the amount of \$50,000 have been reclassified to the administrative cost allowance (ACA), and therefore, claimed administrative costs exceed the allowance by \$50,000. Pursuant to HSC section 34171 (d) (1) (F) (i), legal expenses related to civil actions, including writ proceeding, contesting the validity of the dissolution law, or challenging acts taken pursuant to the dissolution law shall only be payable out of the ACA.

Additionally, HSC section 34171 (b) (2) limits fiscal year 2015-2016 administrative expenses to three percent of the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) funds allocated to the Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund for the fiscal year or \$250,000. The Kern County Auditor-Controller distributed \$125,000 for the July through December 15-16A period, thus leaving a balance of \$125,000 available for the January through June 15-16B period. Although \$125,000 is claimed for ACA, Item No. 18 for litigation cost in the amount of \$50,000 is considered general administrative cost and should be counted toward the cap. Therefore, \$50,000 of excess administrative cost is not allowed.

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). Proposed CAC adjustments were not received in time for inclusion in this letter; therefore, the amount of (Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund) RPTTF approved in the table on the next page only reflects the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$872,609 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table below:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of January through June 2016</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	797,609
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>\$ 922,609</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>797,609</b>
<u>Reclassified Item</u>	
Item No. 18	(50,000)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 747,609</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations</b>	<b>125,000</b>
<u>Reclassified Item</u>	
Item No. 18	50,000
Administrative costs in excess of the cap (see Admin Cost Cap table below)	(50,000)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 872,609</b>
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	0
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 872,609</b>

<b>Administrative Cost Cap Calculation</b>	
Total RPTTF for 15-16A (July through December 2015)	125,000
Total RPTTF for 15-16B (January through June 2016)	175,000
<b>Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2015-2016</b>	<b>300,000</b>
Administrative cost cap for fiscal year 2015-16 (Greater of 3% of Total RPTTF or \$250,000)	250,000
Administrative allowance for ROPS 15-16A (July through December 2015)	(125,000)
<b>Remaining administrative cost cap for ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>125,000</b>
ROPS 15-16B administrative obligations after Finance adjustments	(175,000)
<b>Administrative costs in excess of the cap</b>	<b>\$ (50,000)</b>

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 (l) (1) (E) requires these balances be used prior to requesting RPTTF.

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,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Tom Weil, City Manager, California City  
Ms. Mary B. Bedard, Auditor-Controller, Kern County