



November 6, 2015

Mr. Johnny Ford, Executive Director  
City of Compton  
205 South Willowbrook Avenue  
Compton, CA 90220

Dear Mr. Ford:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the City of Compton 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 28, 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 Nos. 21, 22, and 24 – Housing Administrative Costs totaling \$155,000 are not enforceable obligations. HSC section 34176 (a) (1) states if a city, county, or city and county elects to retain the authority to perform housing functions previously performed by a RDA, all rights, powers, duties, obligations, and housing assets shall be transferred to the city, county, or city and county. Since the City of Compton assumed the housing functions, the administrative costs associated with these functions are the responsibility of the housing successor. Therefore, these items are not enforceable obligations and not eligible for Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) Administrative funding on this ROPS.
- Administrative costs exceed the allowance by \$313,500. HSC section 34171 (b) (2) limits fiscal year 2015-16 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax allocated to the successor agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater. As a result, the Agency is eligible for \$250,000 in administrative expenses. The Los Angeles Auditor-Controller's Office distributed \$250,000 for the July through December 2015 period, thus leaving a balance of zero available for the January through June 2016 period. Although \$418,500 was claimed for administrative cost, Item Nos. 21, 22, and 24 totaling \$155,000 are denied and Item No. 50 for legal services in the amount of \$50,000 is considered an administrative expense and is added to the cap for a total adjustment of \$105,000. Therefore, \$313,500 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). The amount of RPTTF approved in the table below includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's review of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

Except for the items that has been denied in whole or in part and the item that has been reclassified, 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/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/meet_and_confer/)

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$2,826,101 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	2,826,101
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	418,500
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>\$ 3,244,601</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 2,826,101</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations</b>	<b>418,500</b>
<u>Reclassified Item</u>	
Item No. 50	50,000
<u>Denied Items</u>	
Item No. 21	(40,000)
Item No. 22	(15,000)
Item No. 24	(100,000)
	(105,000)
Administrative costs in excess of the cap (see Admin Cost Cap table below)	(313,500)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 2,826,101</b>
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	0
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 2,826,101</b>

<b>Administrative Cost Cap Calculation</b>	
Total RPTTF for 15-16A (July through December 2015)	5,403,970
Total RPTTF for 15-16B (January through June 2016)	2,826,101
<b>Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2015-2016</b>	<b>8,230,071</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)	(250,000)
<b>Remaining administrative cost cap for ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>0</b>
ROPS 15-16B administrative obligations after Finance adjustments	(313,500)
<b>Administrative costs in excess of the cap</b>	<b>\$ (313,500)</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 Brian Dunham, Lead Analyst at (916) 445-1546.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Program Budget Manager

cc: Dr. Kofi Sefa-Boakye, Director of Redevelopment, City of Compton  
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County