



May 24, 2012

Emily Boyd, Principal Accountant
City of Lincoln
600 6th Street
Lincoln, CA 95648

Dear Ms. Boyd:

Subject: Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule Approval Letter

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 34177 (l) (2) (C), the City of Lincoln Successor Agency submitted Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS) to the California Department of Finance (Finance) on May 24, 2012 for the periods January to June 2012 and July to December 2012. Finance is assuming appropriate oversight board approval. Finance has completed its review of your ROPS, which may have included obtaining clarification for various items.

January through June 2012 ROPS

Except for items disallowed in whole or in part as EOs noted below and in our letter dated April 27, 2012, Finance is approving the remaining items listed in your ROPS.

HSC section 34171 (d) lists enforceable obligations characteristics. Based on a sample of items reviewed and application of the law, the following do not qualify as EOs:

- Line items 4 and 6 are loan agreements with the City totaling \$4.5 million. HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that loans between the city that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are not enforceable unless the loan agreements were entered into within the first two years of the date of the creation of the RDA.

July through December 2012 ROPS

Except for items disallowed in whole or in part as EOs noted below, Finance is approving the remaining items listed in your ROPS.

HSC section 34171 (d) lists enforceable obligations characteristics. Based on a sample of items reviewed and application of the law, the following do not qualify as EOs:

- Line items 4 and 6 are loan agreements with the City totaling \$4.5 million. HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that loans between the city that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are not enforceable unless the loan agreements were entered into within the first two years of the date of the creation of the RDA.

This is our determination with respect to any items funded from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) for the June 1, 2012 property tax allocations. If your oversight board disagrees with our determination with respect to any items not funded with property tax, any future resolution of the disputed issue may be accommodated by amending the ROPS for the appropriate time period. Items not questioned during this review are subject to a subsequent review, if they are included on a future ROPS. If an item included on a future ROPS is not an enforceable obligation, Finance reserves the right to remove that item from the future ROPS, even if it was not removed from the preceding ROPS.

Please refer to Exhibit 12 at http://www.dof.ca.gov/assembly_bills_26-27/view.php for the amount of RPTTF that was approved by Finance based on the schedule submitted.

As you are aware the amount of available RPTTF is the same as the property tax increment that was available prior to ABx1 26. This amount is not and never was an unlimited funding source. 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 in the RPTTF.

Please direct any inquiries to Evelyn Suess, Supervisor or Brian Dunham, Lead Analyst (916) 322-2985.

Sincerely,



MARK HILL
Program Budget Manager

cc: Ms. Jayne Goulding, County Auditor Controller, Placer County