



October 12, 2015

Mr. Jeff Muir, CFO
Culver City
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232

Dear Mr. Muir:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m) (1) (A), the Culver 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 September 10, 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 \$80,342. HSC section 34171 (b) limits the fiscal year 2015-16 administrative expenses to three percent of property tax 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 \$504,858 available for the January through June 2016 period. Although \$585,200 is claimed for administrative cost, only \$504,858 is available pursuant to the cap. Therefore, \$80,342 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 Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) approved in the table on the next page includes the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's review of the Agency's self-reported prior period adjustment.

In addition, Finance noted on the Agency's ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment worksheet, the Agency under reported Other Funds authorization totaling \$54,346. Specifically, Item No. 8, \$6,750; Item No. 9, \$544; Item No. 10, \$19,935; and Item No. 40, \$27,117. Finance authorized these expenditures in our OB determination letter dated January 21, 2015. Per HSC section 34177 (a) (3), only those payments listed on a ROPS may be made by the Agency from the funds specified on the ROPS up to the amount authorized by Finance. As these Other Funds were previously expended, the increase in authorization does not result in increased

expenditure authority for the ROPS 15-16B period; rather, the increase in authorization should merely allow the Agency to reconcile actual expenditures to the authorization.

Except for the item denied 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/](http://www.dof.ca.gov/redevelopment/meet_and_confer/)

The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$20,281,318 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	19,776,460
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	585,200
Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B	\$ 20,361,660
Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations	\$ 19,776,460
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	585,200
Administrative costs in excess of the cap (see Admin Cost Cap table below)	(80,342)
Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations	\$ 504,858
Total RPTTF authorized for obligations	\$ 20,281,318
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	0
Total RPTTF approved for distribution	\$ 20,281,318

Administrative Cost Cap Calculation	
Total RPTTF for 15-16A (July through December 2015)	13,860,209
Total RPTTF for 15-16B (January through June 2016)	19,776,460
Less approved unfunded obligations from prior periods	(8,474,746)
Total RPTTF for fiscal year 2015-2016	25,161,923
Administrative cost cap for fiscal year 2015-16 (Greater of 3% of Total RPTTF or \$250,000)	754,858
Administrative allowance for ROPS 15-16A (July through December 2015)	(250,000)
Remaining administrative cost cap for ROPS 15-16B	504,858
ROPS 15-16B administrative obligations after Finance adjustments	(585,200)
Administrative costs in excess of the cap	\$ (80,342)

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: on the following page
Ms. Erica McAdoo, Sr. Management Analyst, Culver City
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County
California State Controller's Office