Successor Agency Contact Information

Name of Successor Agency: El Cerrito

County: Contra Costa

Primary Contact Name: Scott Hanin

Primary Contact Title: City Manager

Address 10890 San Pablo Ave, El Cerrito, CA 94530

Contact Phone Number: 510-215-4300

Contact E-Mail Address: shanin@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us

Secondary Contact Name: Lori Trevino

Secondary Contact Title: Economic Development Manager

Secondary Contact Phone Number: 510-215-4383

Secondary Contact E-Mail Address: Itrevino@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us

SUMMARY OF RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE Filed for the January 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013 Period See Attached Page of Explanatory Notes for Lines B, C E and G

Name of Successor Agency:	El Cerrito
nume of outcoods rigolog.	2.00/110

		1	otal Outstanding ebt or Obligation
Outst	anding Debt or Obligation	\$	135,530,435
Curre	nt Period Outstanding Debt or Obligation		Six-Month Total
А	Available Revenues Other Than Anticipated RPTTF Funding		
В	Anticipated Enforceable Obligations Funded with RPTTF		2,959,899
С	Anticipated Administrative Allowance Funded with RPTTF		-
D	Total RPTTF Requested (B + C = D)		2,959,899
	Total Current Period Outstanding Debt or Obligation (A + B + C = E) Should be the same amount as ROPS form six-month total	\$	2,959,899
Е	Enter Total Six-Month Anticipated RPTTF Funding (Obtain from county auditor-controller)		
F	Variance (E - D = F) Maximum RPTTF Allowable should not exceed Total Anticipated RPTTF Funding	\$	(2,959,899)
Prior	Period (January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012) Estimated vs. Actual Payments (as required in HSC section 34186 (a))		
G	Enter Estimated Obligations Funded by RPTTF (Should be the lesser of Finance's approved RPTTF amount including admin allowance or the actual amount distributed)		_
Н	Enter Actual Obligations Paid with RPTTF		_
- 1	Enter Actual Administrative Expenses Paid with RPTTF		-
J	Adjustment to Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund (G - (H + I) = J)		-
K	Adjusted RPTTF (The total RPTTF requested shall be adjusted if actual obligations paid with RPTTF are less than the estimated obligation amount.)	\$	2,959,899

Certification of Oversight Board Chairman:
Pursuant to Section 34177(m) of the Health and Safety code,
I hereby certify that the above is a true and accurate Recognized
Obligation Payment Schedule for the above named agency.

William C. Jones III	Chairperson
Name	Title
Signature	Date

Name of Successor Agency:
County:

El Cerrito

Contra Costa

Oversight Board Approval Date: Augus

August 27, 2012

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE (ROPS III) January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013 See Attached Page of Explanatory Notes

		Contract/	Contract/				Total Outstanding	Total Due			F	unding Sourc	e		
Item #	Project Name / Debt Obligation	Agreement Execution Date	Agreement Termination Date	Payee	Description/ Project Scope	Project Area	Debt or Obligation as of 6/30/12	During Fiscal Year 2012-13	LMIHF	Bond Proceeds	Reserve Balance	Admin Allowance	RPTTF	Other	Six-Month Total
	Grand Total						135,530,435	6,446,147	-	-	-	-	2,959,899	-	2,959,899
1	Tax Allocation Bonds 1997 A	12/17/1997	7/1/2019	Union Bank	Refunding of prior TAB for Redev Projs	City of El Cerrito	4,191,180	1,040,930					487,125		487,125
2	Tax Allocation Bonds 1998 B	12/17/1997	7/1/2015	Union Bank	Refunding of prior TAB for L&M Hsg Projs	City of El Cerrito	875,840	427,764					211,013		211,013
3	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 A	10/21/2004	7/1/2023	Union Bank	Tax-exempt TAB for Infrastructure Projs	City of El Cerrito	13,645,964	1,184,341					758,114		758,114
4	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 B Non-Hsg	10/21/2004	7/1/2012	Union Bank	Taxable TAB for Redev Projs	City of El Cerrito	481,045	481,045					-		-
5	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 B Hsg	10/21/2004	7/1/2023	Union Bank	Taxable TAB for L&M Hsg Projs	City of El Cerrito	5,389,513	406,308					134,888		134,888
6	2009-10 SERAF Loan	2/16/2010	NA	City L&M Housing Fund	Funds advanced for SERAF payment	City of El Cerrito	995,741	-					-		-
7	2005-06 ERAF Loan	4/17/2006	NA	City L&M Housing Fund	Funds advanced for ERAF payment	City of El Cerrito	251,577	-					-		-
8	Accrued Vacation Liability	NA	NA	City of El Cerrito	Accrued Vacation Liability of RDA- funded employees	City of El Cerrito	19,392	19,392					19,392		19,392
9	Valente Promissory Note	3/5/2009	3/5/2024	George Valente	Loan for land acquistion	City of El Cerrito	3,170,371	288,215					288,215		288,215
10	Ohlone Gardens Loan Agreement	6/24/2009	NA	Ohlone Gardens LP	Undisbursed loan commitment	City of El Cerrito	471,152	471,152					471,152		471,152
11	Eden Housing Loan Agreement	5/17/2011	NA	Eden Housing	Undisbursed loan commitment	City of El Cerrito	310,000	310,000					310,000		310,000
12	Cooperation Agreement	3/7/2011	11/24/2024	El Cerrito MSC	City of El Cerrito Redevelopment	City of El Cerrito	105,198,660	1,287,000					-		-
13	FY 2012-13 Administrative Allowance	Statutory	NA	City of El Cerrito	Administrative Allowance per AB1x26	City of El Cerrito	250,000	250,000					250,000		250,000
14	Due Diligence Review	NA	NA	NA	Accountant for AB1484 Due Diligence Review	City of El Cerrito	30,000	30,000					30,000		30,000
15	FY 2011-12 Administrative Allowance	ROPS I Unpaid	NA	City of El Cerrito	Administrative Allowance per AB1x26	City of El Cerrito	250,000	250,000					-		-

Name of Successor Agency:	El Cerrito
County:	Contra Costa

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 34186 (a) PRIOR PERIOD ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS vs. ACTUAL PAYMENTS RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE (ROPS I) January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012 See Attached Page of Explanatory Notes

						LM	IHF	Bond P	roceeds	Reserve	Balance	Admin A	llowance	RP'	TTF	Ot	her
Page/Form			Payee	Description/ Project Scope	Project Area	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Actual
		Grand Total Tax Allocation Bonds 1997	T	Refunding of prior TAB	City of EI	\$ 781,152	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,704	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 953,989	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 674,284
ROPS 1	1	A	Union Bank	for Redev Projs	City of El												
ROPS 1	2	Tax Allocation Bonds 1998 B	Union Bank	Refunding of prior TAB for L&M Hsg Projs	City of El Cerrito												
ROPS 1	3	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 A	Union Bank	Tax-exempt TAB for Infrastructure Projs	City of El Cerrito												
ROPS 1	4	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 B Non-Hsg	Union Bank	Taxable TAB for Redev Projs	City of El Cerrito												
ROPS 1	5	Tax Allocation Bonds 2004 B Hsg	Union Bank	Taxable TAB for L&M Hsg Projs	City of El Cerrito												
ROPS 1	6	Valente Promissory Note	George Valente	Loan for land acquistion	City of El Cerrito						29,704			288,216	0		\$ 258,511
ROPS 1	7	Cooperation Agreement	El Cerrito MSC	Impl. of City of El Cerrito Redev. Plan	City of El Cerrito												
ROPS 1	9	2009-10 SERAF Loan	City L&M Housing Fund	Funds advanced for SERAF payment	City of El Cerrito									331,914	0		331,914
ROPS 1	10	2005-06 ERAF Loan	City L&M Housing Fund	Funds advanced for ERAF payment	City of El Cerrito									83,859	0		83,859
ROPS 1	11	Ohlone Gardens Loan Agreement	Ohlone Gardens LP	Undisbursed loan commitment	City of El Cerrito	471,152	0										
ROPS 1	12	Eden Housing Loan Agreement	Eden Housing	Undisbursed loan commitment	City of El Cerrito	310,000	0										
ROPS 1	13	FY 2011-12 Administrative Allowance	City of El Cerrito	Administrative Allowance per AB1x26	City of El Cerrito								0	250,000	0		

Name of Successor Agency:	El Cerrito
County:	Contra Costa

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE (ROPS III) -- NOTES January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013

SUMMARY PAGE BIC The Successor Agency's Administrative Allowance of \$250,000 is to be funded from RPTTF and is listed in the RPTTF column of the itemized ROPS. Therefore the allowance is included in Line B, not Line ROPS II Line 13 body. E County Auditor Controler is unable to provide an estimate of antiopated RPTTF funding prior to September 4, 2012. G Finance's approved RPTTF amount was \$953,988 for ROPS I, but in a RPTTF was distributed to the Successor Agency for ROPS I ROPS I was funded with the pution of the Tax Increment received by the Agency in December, 2011 that was placed in the Successor Agency's Roderoveleprent Obligation Reliament Fund (*RORF) on February 1, 2012. ROPS III Amounts in the Total Outstanding Obligation column are as of 6/30/2012 and therefore include payments made on ROPS II during FY 2012-13. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distribut Agency from the County Auditor-Controler. 8 This item is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. 10 DOP approved this item on ROPS I; but dranged the funding source from PPTTT to LIMPT, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHT, and no funds from the LMIHT were deposited for Declarations, Rolled and Injunction. El Certic Successor Agency is Robert Competion of all the funding source. See correspondence distell July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Will of More Declarations, Rolled and Injunction. El Certic Successor Agency is Robert Competiol of all tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTT pending resolution or the disquise over the funding source. See correspondence claired July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Will of More Total Control on the ROPS is disputing DOPS disapproved in liter on ROPS I to the Control on the ROPS is disputing DOPS disputi		# Notes/Con	Item #
ROPS III Lim 13 below. Cauthy Auditor Controller is unable to provide an estimate of anticipated RPTTF Funding prior to September 4, 2012. G. Agency in December, 2011 that was placed in the Successor Agency for ROPS I, ROPS I was funded with the portion of the Tax Increment received by the Agency in December, 2011 that was placed in the Successor Agency's Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund ("RORF") on February 1, 2012. ROPS III Anounts in the Total Outstanding Obligation column are as of 8/30/2012 and therefore include payments made on ROPS II during FY 2012-13. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distribut Agency from the County Auditor-Controller. 8 This term is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. 10 DOF approved this term on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMHFF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMHFF, and no funds from the LMHFF were deposited term is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wird of Mix for Declaratory Relief and Injunction. El Certific Successor Agency in ROPS II. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMHFF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMHFF, and no funds from the LMHFF were deposited term is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wird of Mix for Declaratory Relief and Injunction. El Certific Successor Agency in Certification of the dispute. 10 The Successor Agency is directly and the ROPS in the Certification of the Certification of the ROPS II. The obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance on the RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF for RPPTF. In the RPTT		SUMMARY F	
Finance's approved RPTTF amount was \$963,989 for ROPS I, but no RPTTF was distributed to the Successor Agency for ROPS I. ROPS I was funded with the portion of the Tax Increment received by the Agency in December, 2011 that was placed in the Successor Agency's Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund ("RORF") on February 1, 2012. ROPS III Amounts in the Total Outstanding Obligation column are as of 6/30/2012 and therefore include payments made on ROPS II during FY 2012-13. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distribut Agency from the County Auditor-Controller. This Item is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to IMHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMHF, and no funds from the LMHH were deposited them is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated vily 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Viril of Mc for Decharatory Reflerial maliprination, IE Certifo Successory PROFE Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to IMHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMHF, and no funds from the LMHF were deposited than is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, bending resolution for the dispute. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to IMHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMHF, and no funds from the LMHF were deposited than is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, bending resolution for the dispute. The Successor Agency is subjected to the ROPS to the Successor Agency or Robert Campbell et al. The Successor Agency is subjected to the ROPS I for ROPS I included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column)	ROPS. Therefore the allowance is included in Line B, not Line C. Also see note for		B/C
ROPS III Amounts in the Total Outstanding Obligation column are as of 6/30/2012 and therefore include payments made on ROPS II during FY 2012-13. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distribut Agency from the County Auditor-Controller. B This Item is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited from Post I and the ROPS Is to be paid from RPTTF ending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Virtle of Microbiantry Relief and injunction. El Certro Successor Agency v Robert Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited to the being relationed to this ROPS by the paid from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited to the being relationed to this ROPS by the paid from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited to the being relationed to the ROPS to paid from RPTTF, and the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is deposited to the ROPS to funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited to the such as a funding source from RPTTF to the funding source see correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wirl of Microbian RPTTF, pending resolution of the microbian RPTTF to the RPTTF pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency and the RPTTF obtained and the RPTTF to t		County Audit	E
Amounts in the Total Outstanding Obligation column are as of 6/30/2012 and therefore include payments made on ROPS II during FV 2012-13. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distribut Agency from the County Auditor-Controller. This Item is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited them is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wint of Met for Declaratory Relief and Injunction, El Certrio Successor Agency V Robert Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution for the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wint of Met for Declaratory Relief and Injunction, El Certrio Successor Agency Robert Campbell et al. The Successor Agency is disputing pool and ROPS I is an advantage of the Successor Agency Robert Campbell et al. As the funding source of the Successor Agency's Administrative Allowance is RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance column, which appears redundan Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Certrio and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the RV Although DOF approved this item on ROPS I, included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column) The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for th			G
Agency from the County Auditor-Controller. This Item is being added to ROPS III, as it was not identified prior to preparation of ROPS I and ROPS II. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wirt of Me for Declaratory Relief and injunction. El Certrio Successor Agency P Robert Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited that is being retained on this ROPs I be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Wirt of Me for Declaratory Relief and Injunction. El Certrio Successor Agency is Robert Campbell et al. The Successor Agency is disputing 2007 Set disapproval of this item on ROPS I and ROPS II. See correspondence from legal counsel Sky Woodruff, Meyers Nave dated 6/1/2012. This item is being retained and Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Certrio and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the ROPF, rather than charging those costs directly to the River PRIOR		ROPS III	
OPF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Writ of Metacatardy Reliaf and Injunction. El Cerrito Successor Agency v Robert Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited them to be long treatment on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF. pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Writ of Metacatardy Relief and Injunction, El Cerrito Successor Agency v Robert Campbell et al. The Successor Agency is disputing DOF's disapproval of this item on ROPS I and ROPS II. See correspondence from legal counsel Sky Woodruff, Meyers Nave dated 6/1/2012. This item is being retained paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. As the funding source of the Successor Agency's Administrative Allowance is RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance column, which appears redundan Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Cerrito and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the RV. Although DOF approved this item on ROPS I, there were insufficient funds distributed from the RPTTF for ROPS I. Therefore the Item is being retained on the ROPS for future funding from RPTTF. PRIOR PERIOD PAYMENTS Funding in the Successor Agency's RORF for ROPS Lincluded only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years'	3. The only source of funds for ROPS III will be RPTTF distributed to the Successor		
tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Writ of Me for Declaratory Relief and Injunction, El Cerrito Successor Agency Nobert Campbell et al. DOF approved this item on ROPS I, but changed the funding source from RPTTF to LMIHF, which Successor is disputing, as there are no funds in the LMIHF, and no funds from the LMIHF were deposited tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Writ of Me for Declaratory Relief and Injunction, El Cerrito Successor Agency v Robert Campbell et al. 12 The Successor Agency is disputing DOFs disapproval of this item on ROPS I and ROPS II. See correspondence from legal counsel Sky Woodruff, Meyers Nave dated 6/1/2012. This item is being retained paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. 13 As the funding source of the Successor Agency's Administrative Allowance is RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance column, which appears redundan Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Cerrito and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the RUPP RIVING PRIVING PRIV		This item is b	8
tem is being retained on this ROPS to be paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute over the funding source. See correspondence dated July 9, 2012 and July 12, 2012, and Petition for Writ of Me for Declaratory Relief and Injunction, El Cerrito Successor Agency v Robert Campbell et al. 12 The Successor Agency is disputing DOF's disapproval of this item on ROPS I and ROPS II. See correspondence from legal counsel Sky Woodruff, Meyers Nave dated 6/1/2012. This item is being retained paid from RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. 13 As the funding source of the Successor Agency's Admnistrative Allowance is RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance column, which appears redundan Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Cerrito and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the RI Although DOF approved this item on ROPS I, there were insufficient funds distributed from the RPTTF for ROPS I. Therefore the Item is being retained on the ROPS for future funding from RPTTF. 14 PRIOR PERIOD PAYMENTS 15 Funding in the Successor Agency's RORF for ROPS I included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years' tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column.) 16 The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). 17 The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). 18 The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the		Item is being	10
As the funding source of the Successor Agency's Admnistrative Allowance is RPTTF, the obligation is listed in the RPTTF column rather than the Administrative Allowance column, which appears redundan Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Cerrito and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the RI Although DOF approved this item on ROPS I, there were insufficient funds distributed from the RPTTF for ROPS I. Therefore the Item is being retained on the ROPS for future funding from RPTTF. PRIOR PERIOD PAYMENTS Funding in the Successor Agency's RORF for ROPS I included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years' tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column.) The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute.		Item is being	11
Administrative costs are being borne by the City of El Cerrito and will be reimbursed by the Successor Agency from deposits from the RPTTF to the RORF, rather than charging those costs directly to the Reference of the Reference of the Rore of the	druff, Meyers Nave dated 6/1/2012. This item is being retained on this ROPS to be		12
PRIOR PERIOD PAYMENTS Funding in the Successor Agency's RORF for ROPS I included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years' tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column.) 6 The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment and Interest (listed as "Other"). 10 The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). 11 The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute.			13
Funding in the Successor Agency's RORF for ROPS I included only two sources: FY2011-12 Tax Increment received by the Redevelopment Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and prior years' tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column.) The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF.	g retained on the ROPS for future funding from RPTTF.	Although DO	14
prior years' tax increment and interest (uses listed in the Reserve Balance column.) The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTP.		PRIOR PERI	
The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF.	Agency in December 2011 (uses listed in the Other column) and a small residual of		
The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, RORF funds used for the payment originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other"). The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF.	nt originated as Reserve Balance and FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other")	The Success	6
The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF.	nt originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other").	The Success	9
RPTTF, pending resolution of the dispute. The Successor Agency listed this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. DOF approved the item for funding with LMIHF. However, there were no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS.	nt originated as FY2011-12 Tax Increment (listed as "Other").	The Success	10
	ere no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS III to be paid from		11
	ere no funds in the LMIHF. This Item is being retained on ROPS III to be paid from		12
The Successor Agency listed and the DOF approved this item on ROPS I for funding with RPTTF. However, there were insufficient funds to pay this ite and it is being retained on ROPS III to be paid from F	ay this ite and it is being retained on ROPS III to be paid from RPTTF.	The Success	13