



ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 4, 2013

TO: The Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Former Temple City Redevelopment Agency

FROM: Tracey L. Hause, Administrative Services Director

SUBJECT: **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION NO. OB 2013-09 APPROVING AN ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2013 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013, FOR THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE FORMER TEMPLE CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

RECOMMENDATION:

- a) Review the proposed Administrative Budget for the period of July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013 (i.e., "Administrative Budget"), for the Successor Agency to the Former Redevelopment Agency; and
- b) Adopt Resolution No. 2013-09 approving the Administrative Budget for the Successor Agency to the Former Redevelopment Agency.

BACKGROUND:

1. On June 29, 2011, as part of adopting the State of California Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 budget, the Governor signed two trailer bills, AB X1 26 and AB X1 27, into law. The legislation was effective on June 29, 2011. AB X1 26 eliminated redevelopment agencies as of October 1, 2011. Under AB X1 26 (chapter 5, Statutes of 2011), an Oversight Board was established to oversee the actions of the Successor Agency to the Temple City Redevelopment Agency (Successor Agency).
2. On July 18, 2011, the California Redevelopment Association and League of California Cities filed suit to invalidate AB X1 26 and AB X1 27.
3. On December 29, 2011, the California Supreme Court announced its decision in *CRA v. Matosantos* upholding AB X1 26 as a constitutional exercise of the Legislature's power, but striking down AB X1 27 as unconstitutional. On January 13, 2012, in the absence of any election to the contrary, the City of Temple City (i.e.,

“City”) became the successor entity for the general functions of the Temple City Community Redevelopment Agency.

4. On February 1, 2012, unless urgency legislation or another pending lawsuit intervened, every redevelopment agency in the State of California was dissolved and a successor agency was created for each redevelopment agency.
5. On February 25, 2013, the Oversight Board adopted the 13-14A ROPS that included a line item in the amount of \$125,000 for administrative costs.

ANALYSIS:

The Successor Agency is allowed an administrative allowance, subject to approval by the Oversight Board. This allowance is up to three percent of the property tax within the Project Agency or at least \$250,000 for any fiscal year unless negotiated by the Successor Agency and Oversight Board.

The Successor Agency is requesting \$123,976 for its Administrative Budget to cover costs to administer the distribution of the Former Redevelopment Agency’s (i.e., “Agency’s”) assets to fulfill all other obligations for the former Agency. The proposed Administrative Budget includes personnel costs, costs related to the preparation for and hosting Oversight Board meetings and costs related to meeting the requirements of AB 1484 that is not included in the 13-14A ROPS. A detailed breakdown of the budget and the costs related to the ROPS is attached as Exhibit “A” to this Resolution.

CONCLUSION:

In order to ensure the Successor Agency can collect related administrative costs as reported in the 13-14A ROPS, adoption of an Administrative Budget is required by State law.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact as a result of this motion; it only memorialized the anticipated financial activities of the Successor Agency for the period of July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013, while distributing the Agency’s assets.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Resolution No. OB 2013-09