

REDEVELOPMENT'S FUTURE Effects of California Supreme Court Decision re: AB X1 26 & AB X1 27

Presented to the City Council January 17, 2012



ABX1 26 & ABX1 27 Refresher

- Senate and Assembly passed two state budget trailer bills on June 15, 2011
 - Bills signed by Governor on June 29, 2011
- · Assembly Bill X1 26 (ABX1 26)
 - Suspended redevelopment powers effective June 29, 2011
 - Abolished redevelopment agencies effective October 1, 2011
- Assembly Bill X1 27 (ABX1 27)
 - · Created Alternative Voluntary Redevelopment Program
 - Imposed "voluntary payments" to avoid AB X1 26 impacts





CRA v. Matosantos

- July 18, 2011 The League of California Cities and CRA Filed a lawsuit in the California Supreme Court challenging the constitutionality of ABX1 26 and ABX1 27.
- August 2011 Court agreed to take the case and issued an immediate stay on most of AB1X 26 and all of AB1X 27.
- December 29, 2011 Court upheld AB1X 26 and invalidated AB1x 27; certain deadlines extended.



3



Court Findings

- Court found AB1X 26 constitutional because the Legislature has the broad power to establish or dissolve local agencies as it sees fit.
 - Nothing in Article XVI, Section 16 of the California Constitution or Proposition 22 voids the Legislature's power to dissolve redevelopment agencies.
- Court found AB1X 27 unconstitutional because the "opt-in" payments were not truly voluntary.
 - The "Voluntary" Payment violated Proposition 22 (Article XIII, Section 25.5 of the California Constitution.
- Court severed AB1X 26 and AB1X 27 because of differences in the application of their severability clauses and AB1X 26 is independently enforceable.



-1



Successor Agency

- On February 1, 2012, all redevelopment agencies are dissolved.
- Successor Agency is the Sponsoring Community (i.e., the City Council) unless it elects not to be.
 - Otherwise first local agency submitting to the County Auditor-Controller a duly adopted resolution electing to become Successor Agency.
- All Agency authority, assets (cash, land, etc.) and obligations are transferred to the Successor Agency.



5



Successor Agency

- Successor Agency is responsible for discharging the redevelopment agency's obligations via a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule.
 - Schedule covers 6-month periods, starting January 1, 2012.
 - · First draft is due by March 1, 2012.
- ROPS totals \$1.28 billion
- Successor Agency must dispose of the former redevelopment agency's assets or properties.
- Successor Agency must wind down all affairs of the former redevelopment agency.
- Successor Agency must prepare an administrative budget for the Oversight Board's approval and pay administrative costs.
 - Administrative budget may be up to 5 percent of the property tax allocated to the Successor Agency for FY2011-2012 and up to 3 percent in each succeeding fiscal year.



6



Agency Assets

- Fixed Assets
 - Equipment

- Wrigley Market Place and Ren Sq. \$14,100,000

- Land Held For Resale
 - Westside (misc. parcels)
 - Ocean and Alamitos (OPA)
 - Courthouse (lease)

- 34 E Sunset St.(North LB)

\$33,920,000

- Remaining Bond Proceeds

\$15,200,000



7



Oversight Board Membership

- · Oversight Board established as follows:
 - 1 member appointed by County Board of Supervisors
 - 1 member appointed by County to represent the public
 - · 1 member appointed by the Mayor to represent the City
 - · 1 member appointed by largest special district
 - 1 member appointed by County Superintendent of Education
 - 1 member appointed by the Chancellor of the Community College Districts
 - 1 member appointed by the Mayor to represent employees of the redevelopment agency
- To be established by May 1, 2012



8



Oversight Board Purpose

- Oversight Board for successor agency established to:
 - Take control of land assets and dispose as expeditiously as possible at highest value, regardless of best land use.
 - All land sale proceeds are transferred to County Auditor-Controller for distribution to taxing agencies (schools, counties, special districts, cities).
 - Define enforceable obligations (excludes any agreement between the Agency and the City).
 - · Board has ability to renegotiate and terminate contracts.
 - Remaining unencumbered funds would be transferred to the County Auditor-Controller for distribution to taxing agencies.
- Oversight Board activities subject to review by the State Dept. of Finance



٥



Housing Requirements

- Sponsoring Community may also elect to assume the housing functions of the Redevelopment Agency.
 - Includes housing assets (excluding amounts in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund) along with related rights, powers, liabilities, duties and obligations.
 - If Sponsoring Community does not elect to assume these functions, the functions and all related assets will be transferred to the local housing authority.





Administration Budget

- AB1X 26 allows the Successor Agency an administration budget.
 - Defined as up to 5% of property tax allocated to Successor Agency for FY 2011-2012 and up to 3% each succeeding fiscal year.
 - Required to support the Oversight Board and the work of the Successor Agency in dissolving the Redevelopment Agency's assets:
 - Appraisals
 - · Real estate transactions
 - · Basic administrative support
 - State-mandated monitoring and compliance of affordable housing assets
 - It is unclear at this time if the available funding will be sufficient to cover expenses or if General Fund resources will also be required.
 - Minimum budget is \$250,000; current estimates range from \$1.9M to \$4.5M

11



Fiscal Impact

- Estimated Positions Impacted 59 Full Time Equivalents (FTE)
 - 20.75 FTE in the Redevelopment Bureau
 - 15.25 FTE in the Housing Services Bureau
 - 23 FTE in within other bureaus in Development Services and other City departments
- Impact to General Fund
 - Exact impact unknown at this time due to several unknown variables
 - Redevelopment supports approximately \$6 million in services annually that would otherwise be paid by General Fund. Examples include:
 - · Code enforcement
 - · Graffiti abatement
 - · Neighborhood improvements
 - · CityPlace parking structure debt service
 - City's position is that \$119 million debt repayment to General Fund is an enforceable obligation, although AB1X 26 specifically excludes such debt.





Community Improvement Commission

- Prior to dissolution of redevelopment, three boards and commissions have provided guidance and direction on housing and community improvements:
 - · Redevelopment Agency Board
 - Long Beach Housing Development Corporation (LBHDC)
 - · Community Development Advisory Commission
- Establishment of a Community Improvement Commission is proposed to consolidate these three boards and commissions into one new entity.



13



Community Improvement Commission

- The Community Improvement Commission would:
 - · Advise City Council on:
 - Community services
 - · Housing and neighborhood revitalization services
 - · Use of CDBG funding
 - · Management of the City's non-profit housing corporation
 - Have the potential to tap into new funding sources through grants, loans and endowments.
 - Consolidate community services, reduce redundancies, improve efficiencies and enhance the delivery of programs and services.



14