



December 17, 2015

Mr. Perry Banner, Community Development Manager  
City of Lawndale  
14717 Burin Avenue  
Lawndale, CA 90260

Dear Mr. Banner:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

This letter supersedes the California Department of Finance's (Finance) Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) letter dated November 9, 2015. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (m), the City of Lawndale Successor Agency (Agency) submitted a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 15-16B) to Finance on September 30, 2015, for the period of January 1 through June 30, 2016. Finance issued a ROPS determination letter on November 9, 2015. Subsequently, the Agency requested a Meet and Confer session on one or more of the determinations made by Finance. The Meet and Confer session was held on November 17, 2015.

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 determinations being disputed.

- Item No. 38 – Housing administrative cost allowance in the amount of \$150,000. Finance continues to deny this item. Pursuant to HSC section 34171 (p), the housing entity administrative cost allowance is applicable only in cases where the city, county, or city and county that authorized the creation of the redevelopment agency (RDA) elected to not assume the housing functions. Because the housing entity to the former RDA of the City of Lawndale (City) is the City-formed Housing Authority (Authority), and the Authority operates under the control of the City, the Authority is considered the City under Dissolution Law (ABx1 26 and AB 1484).

The Agency contends that the City designated the Authority, as a separate legal entity from the City, to retain the housing functions pursuant to HSC section 34176 (b) (3) and should therefore be eligible for the housing entity administrative allowance. However, pursuant to HSC section 34167.10 (a), the definition of "city" includes, but is not limited to, any reporting entity of the city for purposes of its comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR), any component unit of the city, or any entity controlled by the city or for which the city is financially responsible or accountable. HSC section 34167.10 (a) defines "city" for purposes of all of Dissolution Law, which includes HSC section 34171, as amended by AB 471, and HSC section 34176. The Authority is included in the City's

CAFR, which identifies the Authority as a component unit of the City and states that the City is financially accountable for the component units.

Although the Authority is a separate legal entity from the City, HSC section 34167.10 (c) states that it shall not be relevant that the entity is formed as a separate legal entity. It should also be noted that HSC section 34167.10 (c) goes on to state that "the provisions of this section are declarative of existing law as the entities described herein are and were intended to be included within the requirements of this part [Part 1.8] and Part 1.85...and any attempt to determine otherwise would thwart the intent of these two parts." Therefore, based on our review, the City, by way of the Authority, elected to retain the housing functions pursuant to HSC section 34176 (a) and is not eligible for \$150,000 of housing entity administrative allowance.

- 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.

During the Meet and Confer process, the Agency contended that the CAC did not acknowledge a journal entry of \$144,099 as proof of payment from the Agency to the City. The Agency indicated that the CAC requires proof of payment to be in the form of an invoice, check, or wire transfer. However, Finance concurs that the journal entry does show the transfer of funds from the Agency to the City towards the loan repayment for Item No. 36. Therefore, as provided in HSC section 34186 (a) (1), Finance decreases the prior period adjustment resulting from the CAC's review by \$144,099 for Item No. 36.

Except for the item denied in whole or in part, Finance is not objecting to the remaining items listed on your ROPS 15-16B. The Agency's maximum approved RPTTF distribution for the reporting period is \$1,310,067 as summarized in the Approved RPTTF Distribution table on the next page:

<b>Approved RPTTF Distribution For the period of January through June 2016</b>	
Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations	1,346,067
Total RPTTF requested for administrative obligations	125,000
<b>Total RPTTF requested for obligations on ROPS 15-16B</b>	<b>\$ 1,471,067</b>
<b>Total RPTTF requested for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>1,346,067</b>
<u>Denied Item</u>	
Item No. 38	(150,000)
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for non-administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,196,067</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for administrative obligations</b>	<b>\$ 125,000</b>
<b>Total RPTTF authorized for obligations</b>	<b>\$ 1,321,067</b>
ROPS 14-15B prior period adjustment	(11,000)
<b>Total RPTTF approved for distribution</b>	<b>\$ 1,310,067</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>

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.

Mr. Perry Banner  
December 17, 2015  
Page 4

Please direct inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Dispute Resolution Supervisor, or Mary Halterman, Analyst, at (916) 445-3274.

Sincerely,



JUSTYN HOWARD  
Program Budget Manager

cc: Mr. Ken Louie, Finance Director, City of Lawndale  
Ms. Kristina Burns, Manager, Department of Auditor-Controller, Los Angeles County