

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCECLA: 12-01-0015
CAO: 0220-00013-2383

Date: January 10, 2012

To: The Council
The Mayor

From: Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst

Miguel A. Santana, City Administrative Officer

Subject: **DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF
LOS ANGELES AND DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY****SUMMARY**

On December 29, 2011 the California Supreme Court issued a decision in the case entitled Community Redevelopment Association et al., v. Ana Matosantos (S194861). The Court upheld AB1x26, the redevelopment elimination bill and struck down AB1x27, the bill that would have allowed redevelopment agencies to remain in operation as long as they made a payment to the state. Due to the ruling, the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) will be eliminated as of February 1, 2012. On January 6, 2012, Motion Wesson for Cardenas- Huizar (C.F. 12-0049) was introduced and requested that our Offices report on the implications of this ruling and include a description of the responsibilities of the Oversight Board and the Successor Agency created pursuant to the legislation; the impact and relevant actions that the City must take if it chooses to become the Successor Agency for the dissolution of CRA/LA and for Housing activities; and other relevant issues and dates that are associated with the court decision.

The most immediate action that the Council must take is whether or not to elect to become the Successor Agency for the close-out of CRA/LA activities. The Successor Agency is responsible only for the administrative close-out functions of the agency and the disposal of all assets and properties at the direction of the Oversight Board and the State Department of Finance (DOF). We note that the Successor Agency is not authorized to enter into or amend contracts or provide financial assistance. As a result, no new programs or projects can be funded by the Successor Agency. It should also be noted that liabilities and risks to the City associated with becoming the Successor Agency are substantial and not entirely quantifiable at this time. They include, but are not limited to costs associated with CRA/LA employees becoming City employees (salaries, pension, retirement contributions) and potential liability costs for outstanding and future litigation, as well as judgment and settlement costs. These liabilities and risks, which could become a potential negative impact on the General Fund, are discussed in greater detail later in the report. The primary benefits to the City if it chose to become the Successor Agency is the ability to both advocate for the projects included on the Enforceable Obligations list to the Oversight Board, which is limited because of the composition of the Oversight Board, and implement projects to ensure project completion. Should the City choose not to become the Successor Agency, these risks and liabilities could be mitigated and the impact to the General Fund minimized. The CRA/LA employees would become the employees of the Successor Agency, which would assume the related financial responsibility, and the City could potentially contract with the Successor Agency for implementation and completion of certain projects. However, there would be a perceived loss of control and advocacy for these projects. Other impacts, such as the required transfer and liquidation of CRA properties and assets, grants management, and property tax

distribution among other factors, would need to be determined after the City decides to be the Successor Agency or not. If the Council chooses not to become the Successor Agency a Resolution must be adopted by January 13, 2012 (see Attachment A for other Key Dates). This report provides a discussion of the benefits and risks related to this discussion.

Regardless of the Successor Agency decision, over the next few months the City will face a number of policy decisions relative to how it will pursue economic development in the future and funding options for that effort. Possible models include the establishment of a non-profit economic development corporation, creation of a City department or some combination of the two. Additionally, the role of the Housing Department and Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) and the Community Development Department (CDD) will need to be evaluated in the context of a new economic development model. Potential funding sources include the additional Property Tax Allocation the City will receive as a result of the termination of the CRA/LA (currently estimated at \$57.4 million in FY2011-12 and on average \$19 million thereafter). It should be noted that if enforceable obligations on the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) are not approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF, estimates for the additional Property Tax Allocation to the City could increase but that could be at the detriment to the community which the project resided in.

We are hopeful that the California Legislature, in the near future, will approve legislation that will allow the City or some other entity to continue economic development in some form using many of the current CRA/LA tools as well as provide certain necessary fixes to AB1x26. These fixes are needed particularly in the areas of the legislation which will prove to be very problematic for the City due to the dissolution of the CRA/LA.

CRA/LA Dissolution

Established in 1948, the CRA/LA is a public agency that partners with private investors to support growth, revitalization, and prosperity in the most neglected communities in the City of Los Angeles. There are currently 31 Redevelopment Project Areas (see Attachment B for a map of CRA/LA Redevelopment Project Areas) and work is carried out pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Sections 33000 et seq.). CRA/LA is charged with building affordable housing, creating jobs for working families, developing commercial and industrial sites, making public improvements, and helping build sustainable neighborhoods.

The CRA/LA 2011-12 Budget and Work Program totals \$671.4 million and consists of \$236 million in Tax Increment, \$162 million in Housing Trust Funds, \$162 million in Debt Service, \$81.5 million in Bond Proceeds, \$2.2 million in grants and \$27.3 million in General Revenue. CRA/LA Administrative costs consist of \$47.2 million for operations of which \$12 million is for equipment and \$35.2 million for salaries and benefits.

As of February 1, 2012, CRA/LA functions will be limited to close-out activities to be performed by a Successor Agency under the direction of an Oversight Board and the DOF. The Successor Agency will be responsible for the expeditious winding down of approximately \$422 million of obligations contained within the Enforceable Obligations Payment Schedule (EOPS) (based on the most recent submission to the State December 15, 2011) and assisting in liquidating assets of the CRA/LA. Enforceable Obligations include payments for outstanding bonds and loans, payments required by federal or state government (e.g. grants) or for employee pension obligations, judgments and settlements, legally binding and enforceable agreements or contracts including those for administration or operations, subject to approval of the Oversight Board and the DOF. No economic development functions will be conducted by the Successor Agency.

Oversight Board

AB1x26 requires that an Oversight Board be appointed and members report to the DOF on or before May 1, 2012. The Oversight Board will supervise the activities of Successor Agency and have "fiduciary responsibilities to holders of enforceable obligations and the taxing entities that benefit from distributions of property tax and other revenues."

The Oversight Board will consist of seven (7) members, four members of which are under the control of the County and to be appointed as follows:

- Two (2) members appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.
- One (1) member appointed by the largest special district, by property tax share, with territory in the territorial jurisdiction of the CRA/LA (County Flood Control District).
- One (1) member appointed by the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Education to represent schools.

Of the three (3) remaining members, two (2) members will be under the control of the City. These members are selected as follows:

- Two (2) members appointed by the Mayor of Los Angeles, one of which must be appointed as a representative of the employees of the CRA/LA and must be from the largest employee organization representing former CRA/LA employees. In this case, that would be AFSCME.
- One (1) member appointed by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to represent community college districts in the county of Los Angeles.

Composition of the Oversight Board remains the same regardless of if the City elects to be the Successor Agency or not. If positions on the Oversight Board are not filled by May 15, 2012, then the Governor will make the appointment.

The powers of the Oversight Board include, but are not limited to:

- Approving new repayment terms for outstanding loans.
- Issuance of refunding bonds in order to provide for savings or to finance debt service.
- Establishing reserves as required by indentures, trust indentures or similar documents governing the issuance of outstanding redevelopment agency bonds.
- Merging of project areas.
- Continuing the acceptance of grants if they require a match of more than five percent.
- Approving the retention of certain projects as development projects by the Successor Agency.
- Approving the ROPS. The ROPS will need to be submitted to the State Controller and Department of Finance by April 15, 2012, which is prior to the May 1, 2012 date for Oversight Board formation. The statute is silent if the approval time will be three (3) business days.
- Approving requests by the City to hold portions of the moneys of the Low and Moderate Income Housing Funds in reserve in order to provide cash to fund recognized obligations.
- Approving disposal of all assets and properties of the CRA/LA not deemed part of approved development projects. In the alternative, the Oversight Board may direct the Successor Agency to transfer ownership of assets used for a governmental purpose, such as roads, schools, parks and fire stations, to the appropriate public jurisdiction for compensation as determined by the agreement relating to the construction or use of the asset.
- Ceasing and terminating all existing agreements that do not qualify as Enforceable Obligations.
- Transferring housing responsibilities and all rights, powers, duties and obligations along with any amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund to appropriate entity.

- Terminating any agreement between the CRA/LA and any public entity located in Los Angeles County that obligates the CRA/LA to provide funding for debt service obligations of the public entity or for construction or operation of facilities of the public entity if that would be in the best interests of the Property Tax Recipients.
- Re-negotiating or terminating CRA/LA contracts with third parties to reduce liabilities or increase net revenues. This may include payments or remediation as necessary.

The Oversight Board may not enter into new contracts for any new economic development projects that are not included on the approved Enforceable Obligations list.

All actions of the Oversight Board may be reviewed by the DOF. The DOF will have three days from the date of the Oversight Board action to request a review and 10 days to approve the action or return it to the Oversight Board for reconsideration. This final action must be approved by the DOF.

Successor Agency

The Successor Agency is required to expeditiously close out the affairs of the CRA/LA, subject to approval of the Oversight Board and the DOF. All assets, properties, contracts, leases, records, buildings, and equipment of the CRA/LA are transferred to the Successor Agency on February 1, 2012 for administration and close-out activities. This includes all cash or cash equivalents and amounts owed to the CRA/LA as of February 1, 2012.

Specific duties of the Successor Agency include, but are not limited to:

- Paying for and performing Successor Enforceable Obligations.
- Maintaining reserves in the amount required by indentures, trust indentures or similar documents governing the issuance of outstanding redevelopment agency bonds.
- Remitting unencumbered balances of redevelopment agency funds, including amounts in the Low and Moderate Housing Fund to the county auditor-controller for distribution to the taxing entities.
- Disposing of CRA/LA assets and properties expeditiously and in a manner aimed at maximizing value as directed by the Oversight Board. Proceeds from asset sales and related funds that are no longer needed to close-out the affairs of the agency, as determined by the Oversight Board, shall be transferred to the county auditor-controller for distribution as property tax proceeds.
- Transferring of the housing functions and assets to the appropriate entity.
- Collection of debts.
- Oversee the development activities of properties deemed to be enforceable obligations by the Oversight Board and the DOF.
- Absorb all CRA/LA Employees.

The City will automatically become the Successor Agency for CRA/LA close-out activities unless it opts out by adopting and filing a Resolution to that effect with the County Auditor-Controller no later than January 13, 2012. If the City opts out, the local agency in the County (e.g., Los Angeles County, or any city or special district in the Los Angeles County) that submits its resolution first to the County Auditor-Controller will become the Successor Agency. The statute does not include dates or a timeline for this process to occur. If no local agency elects to serve as Successor Agency then a new public body will be formed and designated as the "Designated Local Authority (DLA)" to act as the Successor. The DLA will be composed of three (3) Governor appointed residents of Los Angeles County and will remain in place until a local agency elects to become the Successor Agency. It should be noted that the statute does not include dates or a timeline for the DLA process to occur. In such case, the law usually infers a reasonable amount of time.

Although the Successor Agency will perform the work required to close-out CRA activities, it is important to note that the actions of the Successor Agency are subject to approval of the Oversight Board, which may or may not approve the recommendations of the Successor Agency. Additionally, the actions of the Oversight Board are subject to review by the DOF.

Until February 1, 2012 CRA/LA remains in place and is required to pay its Enforceable Obligations. It is also required to preserve assets, minimize liabilities and preserve its records.

Employees

The Successor Agency will become the employer of all represented and unrepresented employees of the CRA/LA. The CRA/LA currently has 192 employees on its payroll. In accordance with AB1x26 the Successor Agency would be required to assume all provisions and costs associated with the four Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's) currently in place between the CRA/LA and its employees. Layoffs and furloughs of CRA/LA employees are highly likely if the City is the Successor Agency.

The assumption of the CRA/LA MOU's in total would represent the creation of a significant disparate group of employees within the City workforce. CRA/LA salaries, pension and benefits are significantly better than those currently provided to most City employees (average City salary: \$72,000; average CRA/LA salary: \$109,524). Transitioning a large group of employees from a non-civil service work environment to the City's civil service environment is administratively complex and potentially involves amending some of the City's longstanding personnel classification practices.

The CRA/LA's current MOU has a termination date of June 30, 2012, but also contains a provision which allows the MOU to continue until a new MOU has been approved or the impasse procedures have been exhausted. Due to the circumstances in which negotiations would take place, securing an agreement by June 30, 2012 is unlikely and would result in the parties going to impasse. The impasse procedure would be conducted under the State's Public Employee Relations Board process. Recent State legislation has mandated a fact finding component to the impasse process. As a result, it is unlikely that the parties would finish the impasse procedure in less than 90 days, which would require the City to maintain the existing CRA/LA MOU employment provisions through September 2012 at a minimum. This is problematic due to variances between the City's MOU's and the CRA/LA MOU's in areas like salary, benefits, pension and layoff procedures (see Attachment C)

AB1x26 allows for an Administrative Cost Allowance that is limited to five percent of the property tax allocated for FY2011-12 and three percent of the property tax allocated to the Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund for each fiscal year thereafter. The Administrative Cost Allowance is subject to approval of the Oversight Board. The State-mandated Administrative Cost Allowance limitation and the requirement to adhere to the current CRA/LA MOU are fundamentally incompatible unless the City assumes a General Fund obligation to fund the MOU. Additional information relative to the Administrative Cost Allowance and potential General Fund liabilities are provided in the Administrative Budget section of this report.

The CRA/LA MOU's contain a provision that requires employees receive a 120-day notice prior to any layoff and require that prior to a decision to institute layoffs the City meet and consult with the unions to determine if there are alternatives to the proposed layoffs. Even if layoff notices were provided immediately, these provisions ensure that the current CRA/LA employees would be maintained through mid-May 2012. The City cannot reduce the workforce sooner, and cannot receive Tax Increment funding due to the Administrative Cost Allowance, resulting in a guaranteed General Fund obligation. In addition, due to other limitations in AB1x26 there will be no work for some of these employees to perform.

Unlike City employees, CRA/LA employees pay Social Security taxes (6%) and the CRA/LA pays the employer share (7.25%) In addition, CRA/LA employees are provided a CAL PERS pension. The current MOU's provide that CRA/LA pays the employer share of the CAL PERS pension (15.89%) and also picks up the employee's share (7%). In total, CRA/LA is funding employee related retirement only costs at almost 30 percent. For comparison, LACERS funding is at 27 percent, but that also includes retiree health which is not included in the CRA/LA 30 percent. Due to current law on vested pension rights, these benefits are vested for current employees of the CRA/LA up to the date of their layoff, and arguably continue as vested benefits if the employees are transitioned to the City. Should the City elect to become the Successor Agency, employees could contend that the City has agreed to continue to provide the pension benefits, as currently constituted. This would obligate the City to maintain the current pension design and costs and require the City to enter into a contract with CalPERS, which may take several months to approve. The assumption of this pension benefit would also be contrary to the City Charter as the Charter specifies the terms of the pension benefit to which City employees are entitled.

In addition, CRA/LA MOU's provides retiree health benefits that are funded on a pay-as-you-go basis and provide for different vesting schedules and higher maximum dollar contributions than those provided to current City employees. CRA/LA employees do not contribute any monies to pay for the costs of retiree health. Given the escalation of healthcare costs, should the City become the successor agency, it will inherit a substantial unfunded liability.

Administrative Budget

AB1x26 requires the Successor Agency to prepare an Administrative Budget that is subject to the approval of the Oversight Board. The bill also provides for an Administrative Cost Allowance that is payable from property tax revenues of up to five percent of the property tax allocated to the Successor Agency for FY2011-12 and up to three percent of the property tax allocated to the Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund for each fiscal year thereafter. The legislation states that the allowance amount excludes any costs that can be paid from bond proceeds or from sources other than property tax. The Administrative Cost Allowance is subject to approval of the Oversight Board and costs in excess of the Administrative Cost Allowance are a General Fund liability.

For FY2011-12, the CRA/LA estimates the available Administrative Cost Allowance to be approximately \$11.4 million. From July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011, the CRA/LA spent approximately \$19.3 million on salaries, benefits, and administrative (computers, utilities, insurance, etc.). The CRA/LA is projecting to spend \$21.7 million from January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012, for a total of \$41 million in FY2011-12. The CRA/LA currently has 192 employees on its payroll.

While the legislation refers to an Administrative Cost Allowance for FY2011-12, the dissolution of the CRA/LA is effective February 1, 2012.

Given that the Administrative Cost Allowance for FY2011-12 is approximately \$11.4 million, the City's General Fund may be liable for approximately \$29.6 million if the Oversight Board does not approve the FY2011-12 CRA/LA salary, benefits, and administrative costs as an Enforceable Obligation. The Administrative Cost Allowance is projected to be \$7.6 million in FY2012-13 and \$7.7 million in FY2013-14.

Our Offices contacted the State Department of Finance to obtain clarification regarding the relevant dates for the term of the Administrative Budget in FY2011-12 and in future fiscal years. Based on the advice of the staff at the Department of Finance, the five percent Administrative Cost Allowance (estimated at \$11.4 million) can be used for the Administrative Budget from February 1 through June

30, 2012. The three percent Administrative Cost Allowance will apply in FY2012-13 and in subsequent fiscal years until the former redevelopment agency is dissolved and the debt has been disposed. In this scenario, the CRA/LA's projected salary, benefits, and administrative costs for the February 1 through June 30, 2012, time period is approximately \$18.3 million. Given the advice of the Department of Finance relative to the application of the Administrative Cost Allowance, the City's General Fund may be liable for approximately \$6.9 million if the City elects to become the Successor Agency. This information is detailed in the table at the end of this section.

The CRA/LA contends that if the City is the Successor Agency, the following costs may not be applicable after February 1, 2012: Insurance (\$1.3 million), Facility Costs (\$1.3 million) and City Oversight services (\$1.5 million). If this is correct and the Oversight Board approves the anticipated salary, benefits, and administrative costs, the City's General Fund liability may be reduced to approximately \$2.8 million through the end of the current fiscal year. In this scenario, the City as the Successor Entity, may want to consider implementing 23 – 58 furlough days to fund the applicable General Fund liability.

**Potential City General Fund Liability with City as Successor Entity
February 1 – June 30, 2012**

	CRA/LA Salaries, Benefits & Admin. (2/1/12-6/30/12)	5% Admin. Cap Allocation (FY2011-12)	Potential costs that may need funding (2/1/12 – 6/30/12)*	Potential GF Liability	Potential Furlough Days
With Potential Costs*	\$18.3 million	\$11.4 million	-	\$6.9M	58
Without Potential Costs*	\$18.3 million	\$11.4 million	(\$4.1million)	\$2.8M	23

* The following costs may not be applicable after February 1, 2012: Insurance (\$1.3 million), Facility Costs (\$1.3 million) and City Oversight services (\$1.5 million)

Successor Agency Analysis

While it is not possible, at this time, to determine with certainty all potential benefits, liabilities, risks and impacts to the City for either assuming or not assuming the role of Successor Agency of the CRA/LA. This report provides a summary of the pertinent information, issues and potential ramifications of both options with later sections of this report providing additional discussion. Representatives from CRA/LA, City Administrative Officer, Chief Legislative Analyst, Personnel Department, City Attorney, Mayor's Office and the Chair of the Housing and Economic Development Committee have been meeting and reviewing the adopted legislation and the California Supreme Court (Court) ruling in the case entitled California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos. The City Attorney has provided advice during this process as to the potential ramifications to the City.

The following will be applicable whether the City is the Successor Agency or not:

- **All actions are subject to the review and approval of the Oversight Board and the DOF.**
- City would have the ability to advocate for the retention, continuation and/or completion of certain projects as development projects by the City to the extent that the projects maximizes value versus the complete liquidation and disposal of all CRA/LA assets and properties.

- City as an interested party would have the ability to provide information, input and recommendations in the form of oral and written presentations, correspondences and reports.
- City would have the ability to advocate for the retention and/or completion of certain CRA/LA grants.
- City would have the ability to advocate for the establishment of a reserve account for shortfalls for liabilities (current and future) and contingency costs.
- City will appoint two members of the seven-member Oversight Board.

If the City elects to **become** the Successor Agency, the following provides some of the pros and cons:

Pros

- City would assume the leadership role of monitoring and/or compliance roles for covenants for completed projects.
- City would assume an oversight role for project completion with enforceable obligations.
- City would have greater access to CRA/LA contracts and documents.

Cons

- If CRA/LA staff becomes City employees, the City could eventually assume responsibility for financial liabilities (salaries, pension, retirement contributions).
- City would assume responsibility for the Oversight Board meetings and may incur such costs in the Successor Agency's administrative budget.
- City would assume responsibility for the Successor Agency's administrative costs, including but not limited to CRA/LA employee costs, Oversight Board meetings, City Oversight. **Any shortfall could become a potential negative impact on the City's General Fund.**
- City could assume responsibility for potential liability costs relative to outstanding and future litigation as well as judgment and settlement costs. **Any shortfall could become a potential negative impact on the City's General Fund.**
- **No reserves set aside** for shortfalls for liabilities (current and future) and contingency costs. This will be subject to approval of the Oversight Board, whose actions are subject to review by the Director of Finance.
- **City assumes 192 CRA/LA employees without the full funding.**

If the City chooses to **opt out** and not become the Successor Agency, the following provides some of the pros and cons:

Pros

- City could contract with the Successor Agency or Oversight Board for implementation and completion of certain projects.
- CRA/LA staff would become employees of the Successor Agency, who would then assume responsibility for financial liabilities associated with the CRA/LA employee (salaries, pension, and retirement contributions).
- Liability transferred to Successor Agency.
- Minimal impact to the City's General Fund.
- If approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF, the City could contract with the Successor Agency or Oversight Board for project implementation and completion or the Successor Agency could transfer the contract to the City.

Cons

- Perceived loss of the ability to advocate for certain projects. However the City's two appointments to the Oversight Board could advocate the City's position relative the retention, continuation and/or completion of certain projects.
- Perceived loss of control of project implementation and completion.

- At any time, any party could name the City in a lawsuit regardless of what entity assumes the role of Successor Agency and the City could be responsible for any outstanding and future litigation costs which would have a negative impact on the General Fund.

Liabilities

If the City decides to be the Successor Agency, one of the most significant yet unknown liabilities is the City's exposure to lawsuits from contractors, developers, and others impacted by the cancellation of contracts, agreements, project delays and other activities associated with the close out activities of CRA/LA. The cost of the defense of these lawsuits would be the responsibility of the City, if it becomes successor agency and approval of settlements would be subject to approval by the Oversight Board and the DOF. Although any known settlements have been added to the EOPS, potential future liabilities are unknown at this time. It should be noted that even if the City decides not to be the Successor Agency, the City could be named as defendants in future lawsuits.

However, there is some language in the legislation that limits, but does not eliminate, the City's exposure. Section 34173 (e) reads "The liability of any successor agency . . . shall be limited to the extent of the total sum of property tax revenues it receives pursuant to this part and the value of assets transferred to it as a Successor Agency. The City could be liable for its share of the tax increment plus the value of the assets it had received from the CRA/LA, even if those assets had already been distributed to the Property Tax Recipients. Moreover, the defense costs would also be a general fund cost. None of the other Property Tax Recipients are at risk for past monies received in the event of a shortfall, only the Successor. In order for the City to obtain reimbursement out of future property tax increment it would have to persuade the Oversight Board and the DOF that it should be a recognized enforceable obligation.

The Oversight Board and the DOF approve settlements. AB1x26 gives the Oversight Board as well as the successor agency, the authority and standing to appeal any judgment or to set aside any settlement or arbitration decision. Accordingly, for settlements to be paid as "enforceable obligations" from tax increment, in addition to obtaining City approval as provided by the City Charter, the approval of the Oversight Board would also be required. If the Oversight Board does not approve the proposed settlement and the City desires to proceed nonetheless, then tax increment funds would not be available to fund such a settlement.

Property Tax Distribution

The City as Successor Agency will create in its treasury a Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund (the "City Fund"). Initially, it will be funded with all existing assets and funds of the CRA/LA which are transferred to it as of February 1, 2012.

The County Auditor-Controller will create within the County treasury a Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund ("County Trust Fund") that is deemed to be a special fund of the dissolved CRA/LA to pay the principal and interest on loans, advances and indebtedness incurred to fund redevelopment projects (collectively the "Redevelopment Obligations"). It will be administered by the County.

Tax increment revenues that would have been allocated to CRA/LA are allocated to the County Trust Fund by the County. Amounts in excess of those necessary to pay the Redevelopment Obligations of the CRA/LA are deemed property tax revenues. Such Redevelopment Obligations by operation of the law are deemed extinguished and paid, but the Successor Agency is not absolved from payment thereof.

Every 6 months, the Successor Agency would prepare for Oversight Board and the DOF for approval, a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule, which includes reserves required by indentures and identification of the source of funds for payment. The allowed sources of funds are:

- (1) Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund;
- (2) Bond proceeds;
- (3) Reserve balances;
- (4) Administrative cost allowance;
- (5) the County Trust Fund, but only to the extent no other funding source is available or when payment from property tax revenues is required by an Enforceable Obligation or the law; and
- (6) Other revenue sources, including rents, concessions, asset sale proceeds, etc., as approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF.

Unencumbered balances are remitted to the County for distribution to the Property Tax Recipients. In other words, unless all funds are encumbered under the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule, they are not retained by the City and would be transferred every six months. This includes unencumbered amounts in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund, revenues such as rents, as well as any funds received from asset sales that are not needed for approved redevelopment projects or to otherwise close-out the affairs of the agency.

The County Auditor-Controller collects the property taxes that would have otherwise gone to the CRA/LA and deposits them into the County Trust Fund. The monies in the County Trust Fund are distributed in the following order: (1) Property tax pass through payments; and (2) amounts approved under the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (in the following order (i) debt service payments for tax allocation bonds; (ii) payments on revenue bonds, if needed, (iii) other scheduled payments required to be paid by property tax increment) (3) the City's approved administrative costs. The remainder is then distributed to the Property Tax Recipients. Regardless of if the City is the Successor or not, the City would receive a portion of the sale of assets if there are excess funds per the distribution method described above.

Attachment D is a schedule that shows the FY2010-11 weighted average percentage of AB1290 Tax Increment revenues by project area shared by the Property Tax Recipients. Based on this schedule, the four largest weighted average percentage of the additional Property Tax are 30.38 percent for the City, 25.33 percent for the County, 18.67 percent for LAUSD and 20.83 percent for ERAF.

Property Tax Discussion

The dissolution of the CRA/LA under AB1x26 will result in a distribution of net tax increment resources to the various taxing entities, after accounting for certain fees, pass-throughs and enforceable obligations. Since dissolution of the CRA/LA is effective February 1, 2012, the City will be entitled to additional payments of property tax (former tax increment) beginning FY2011-12. Regardless of the Successor Agency decision, CRA/LA estimates that the City could receive a total of \$95.5 million in additional payments of property tax over a period of three fiscal years (FY 2011-14). The \$95.5 million would be a floor number and, as enforceable obligation items on the ROPS are not approved by the Oversight Board and DOF, this number could increase.

If the City becomes the Successor Agency, the City could receive a total of \$122.2 million (\$95.5 million in additional property tax payments and \$26.7 million in AB1x26 administrative cap allowance). However, the \$26.7 million AB1x26 administrative cap allowance will not sufficient to pay all of the costs, which would include but is not limited to CRA/LA employees, Oversight Board meetings, City oversight, liability and contingency costs. As these figures are calculated without deducting for overhead expenses **any shortfall would become a potential negative impact on the City's General**

Fund. Below is a table that provides a breakdown of the additional property tax payments to the City and \$26.7 million in AB1x26 administrative cap allowance for the Successor Agency:

Fiscal Year	Property Tax	AB1x26 Administrative	Totals
2011-12*	\$57.4 million	\$11.4 million	\$68.8 million
2012-13	17.9 million	7.6 million	25.5 million
2013-14	<u>20.2 million</u>	<u>7.7 million</u>	<u>27.9 million</u>
Total	<u>\$95.5 million</u>	<u>\$26.7 million</u>	<u>\$122.2 million</u>

**Note: The FY2011-12 covers a five-month period from February 1 to June 30, 2012. For FY2011-12, the AB1x26 administrative cap allowance assumes the full five percent can be used for the Administrative Budget from February 1 through June 30, 2012*

The primary source of revenue for the additional property tax is Gross Tax Increment resources. The \$57.4 million in projected additional property tax for FY2011-12 includes funds that will result in a one-time distribution for the current fiscal year only. For FY2011-12, CRA/LA will have \$85.7 million in unencumbered carryover resources and \$97.3 million which was originally set aside for the anticipated VARP payment. These funds would be swept and then distributed to the Property Tax Recipients. For FY2012-13 and FY2013-14, the property tax projections numbers are lower because the additional funds may not be available for distribution to the Property Tax Recipients in the future. Please note that these figures are preliminary estimates and are subject to change based on many factors such as interpretation of the adopted legislation relative to enforceable obligations and decisions made by the Oversight Board and the DOF.

However, the City's additional property tax payment could be reduced or eliminated to pay for any shortfall between the total amount of enforceable obligations and the amount of funds paid to the Successor Agency. Certain costs would be paid from the funds made available to the Successor Agency and any revenues realized by the successor agency from the sale of CRA/LA assets. However, the City would be obligated to pay for any shortfall amounts. Every six months a new ROPS will be approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF which will provide a budget of the redevelopment tax increment projections and enforceable obligations for that six month period. If a Successor Agency determines, and the County Auditor-Controller and the State Controller verify, that the Successor Agency will not have sufficient funds to pay the approved obligations on the ROPS, then the deficiencies shall be deducted in the following order from the County Trust Fund payments to:

- No distribution of redevelopment tax increment will be made to any local agency (the school entities, county or city the additional payments of property tax due to the dissolution of the CRA/LA);
- Administrative costs of the Successor Agency;
- If a deficiency still exists, then the subordinated pass-through payments to school entities and local entities would go to make bond payments;

CRA/LA Grants and General Revenue

The CRA/LA currently administers a total of \$420.1 million in active Grants (both pending and awarded) which have a total match fund requirement of \$28.1 million. Only Grants that require less than a 5% match and that are approved by the Oversight Board can be retained. The Oversight Board and the DOF can direct all other grants to be returned. Grants with a greater than 5% match can be retained if the City elects to make up the difference, subject to the approval of the granting agency. The Oversight Board and DOF will be required to approve the continuing the acceptance of grants if they require a match of more than five percent, even if the match of more than five percent is already encumbered. The Grants administered by the CRA/LA include, but are not limited to, the Citywide Section 8 Housing Assistance Program, Proposition 84, Community Development Block Grant, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority Call for Projects, California

Department Transportation Planning and Economic Development Administration. Grants could be transferred to the City. See Attachment E for a list of CRA/LA grants. Most of the grants on our list with a 5% or greater match requirement are the Metro Call project, which has been matched with City Prop C funds.

Below is a table that provides a breakdown of the CRA grants, general revenue and loan collections for a period of three fiscal years (FY2011-12 thru FY2013-14):

Fiscal Year	Grants	CRA/LA General Revenue	Loan Collections	Totals
2011-12*	\$20.5 million	\$1.4 million	\$2.3 million	\$24.1 million
2012-13	41.0 million	3.3 million	5.3 million	49.6 million
2013-14	<u>41.0 million</u>	<u>3.3 million</u>	5.3 million	49.6 million
Total	<u>\$102.5 million</u>	<u>\$8.0 million</u>	<u>\$12.9 million</u>	<u>\$123.3 million</u>

**Note: The FY2011-12 covers a five-month period from February 1 to June 30, 2012. FY2012-13 and FY2013-14 cover a 12-month period and estimated amounts are doubled.*

On March 8, 2011, Council approved the transfer of property from the CRA/LA to the City in repayment of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) no-term loans, in the amount of approximately \$50 million (C.F. 11-0354). The transfer included the California Plaza Towers One and Two, Omni Hotel and MLK Shopping Center (properties). According to the CRA/LA, since 1983, the lease payments associated with the properties were considered CRA/LA General Revenue until the properties were transferred to the City as a repayment of the CDBG no-term loans.

The CRA/LA loan portfolio will need additional research to determine the source of funds. In addition, there may be existing contractual obligations or legal requirements (e.g. HUD/grant obligations) which could prevent them from being distributed to the Property Tax Recipients. These issues and following questions will be addressed under separate cover at a later date.

Based on estimates provided by the CRA/LA, these resources total \$245.6 million for the three fiscal years (FY2011-12 thru FY2013-14):

- \$95.5 million in additional payments of property tax;
- \$26.7 million in Administrative costs for the Successor Agency;
- \$102.5 million in are federal, state and local grant resources;
- \$8.0 million in CRA/LA general revenue; and,
- \$12.9 million in loan collections.

Transfer of Housing Functions

AB1x26 provides that the city that authorized the creation of a redevelopment agency may elect to retain the housing assets and functions previously performed by the redevelopment agency. If a city elects to retain these assets and functions as a successor housing entity, all rights, duties, powers and obligations will be transferred to the successor entity, except for any funds in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund.

The City Attorney has advised that pursuant to the State Supreme Court's decision, the deadline by which the City may elect to retain the housing assets and functions previously performed by the CRA/LA is January 31, 2012. The legislation also states that the entity assuming the housing functions may enforce affordability covenants and perform related activities pursuant to Community Redevelopment Law. The assets and functions will automatically be transferred to the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) if the City does not adopt a Resolution stating that it elects to retain the housing assets and functions by January 31, 2012.

Our Offices are working with the CRA/LA and the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) to analyze the impact to the City where it relates to assuming the housing functions. Just as there are financial and legal risks to the City associated with being the Successor Agency, there are risks with assuming the housing functions. As such, our Offices will report to Council under separate cover with an analysis of the implications of the decision relevant to the housing issues.

Subsequent to the State Supreme Court's decision, Senate Bill (SB) 654 (Steinberg) was amended on January 4, 2012. While the dissolution of redevelopment agencies includes remitting unencumbered balances of all redevelopment agency funds, including funds specifically designated for low and moderate income housing, to the county auditor-controller for distribution to the taxing entities, SB 654, as proposed, revises the definition of the term "enforceable obligation" and modifies provisions relating to the transfer of housing funds and responsibilities associated with dissolved redevelopment agencies. The bill provides that any funds deposited in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund of a dissolved redevelopment agency be transferred to the Successor Agency. SB 654 is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee on January 10, 2012.

Cooperation Agreement and Property Transfers

In March 2011, the Council approved a \$930 million Cooperation Agreement (CF: 11-0086) between the City and CRA/LA and the conveyance of 74 properties (CF: 11-0086-S1) from CRA/LA to the City. The Cooperation Agreement and the properties are subject to the approval of the Oversight Board and the DOF. We recommend that the City Attorney report back on how these two actions will be impacted by AB1x26.

Legislative Strategy

The legislation as enacted is problematic and requires clarifying language in many areas. It is our understanding that legislation simply extending the CRA dissolution date from February 1 to later in the Spring 2012 is imminent. Irrespective of the Successor Agency decision, it is a policy decision if the City decides to support such legislation. We anticipate that additional legislation will be introduced this session to make technical changes and clarify the intent of some provisions. We have no information suggesting support for neither repealing the legislation nor re-constituting redevelopment that involves any Property Tax revenue sharing. As the City finalizes its approach relative to future economic development involving City revenues, it may be advisable to pursue legislation allowing the use of redevelopment tools that remain in State law despite the elimination of redevelopment as we know it. The CLA and CAO will continue to monitor legislative activities and will report in two weeks with a strategy. Additionally, the CLA will prepare Resolutions for Council approval, upon request.

Recent Litigation

On September 26, 2011, a case entitled Cerritos et al. al. v. State of California et al., was filed in the California Superior Court which argues, among other things, that the tax distribution instructions detailed in AB1x26 are unconstitutional because they were passed with a simple majority as opposed to the 2/3 majority vote required for changes to the allocation of property tax revenue to local agencies. A hearing has been scheduled for January 27, 2012, where the Court may consider delaying the CRA/LA dissolution of February 1, 2012. We note that this case does not challenge the State's ability to dissolve redevelopment agencies. The CLA and CAO will continue to monitor this case will report back to Council with any updates.

AB1290

In 1993, the State legislature enacted Assembly Bill (AB) 1290, which allocates 20 percent of all property TI funds generated from RPAs created or amended after December 1993 to the affected taxing entities (i.e., city, county, school district, community college district, and others). The City's share of AB 1290 funds, by Council policy, had been retained by the Agency to be used in the project area in which taxes were generated, but On March 8, 2011 the Council instructed CRA/LA to transfer all unencumbered AB1290 funds (C.F. 11-0086) to the City. Subsequently, CRA/LA remitted \$23.5 million to the City on March 15, 2011, retaining only previously encumbered funds. CRA/LA reports that approximately \$3 million in encumbered AB1290 funds remain with the Agency to fund 12 projects within multiple redevelopment project areas.

The AB1x26 does not modify the calculations relative to the City Share of AB1290 funds. As a result, the City will continue to receive the City Share of AB 1290 funds, but as redevelopment project areas begin to expire, future revenues will decline.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the legislation and the benefits and risks associated with becoming the Successor Agency do not lead to a clear course of action. The makeup of the Oversight Board and flow of net Property Tax revenues (separate from tax increment flows associated with Successor Agency operations) remain the same regardless of whether the City becomes the Successor Agency or not. Additionally, substantial immediate decreases in current CRA administrative costs will be required regardless of who the Successor Agency is, and the City's future course of action relative to economic development would be separate from any Successor Agency role. There are substantial but largely unquantifiable risks associated with the Successor Agency function. The legislation as currently written would have the City, as the Successor Agency, liable for decisions of the Oversight Board on which it would have only two of seven votes, and the interests of the remaining five votes would largely be in conflict with the City's.

Some or all of these risks could be mitigated through amendments to the legislation. However, those amendments cannot occur prior to the Successor Agency decision deadline of January 13. Accordingly, a decision to become the Successor Agency would have to be based on the belief that the City would be more successful in having projects placed on the Enforceable Obligations list and ensuring that those projects are carried out if it were staffing and presenting information to the Oversight Board directly. Additionally, it is essential to assess the likelihood of legislative fixes necessary to effectively carry out the legislation and mitigate risks that are currently overly burdensome to the Successor Agency.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In light of the substantial unknowns and potential impact to the General Fund, we believe that it is not in the City's interest to become the Successor Agency at this time.

Relative to the City taking on the role as the Successor Agency that the Council, subject to approval of the Mayor;

1a. Adopt a Resolution to elect not to become the Successor Agency to the former redevelopment agency; and submit to the County Auditor-Controller by January 13, 2012. Seek legislation to reduce liability and allow the City to elect to later be Successor Agency if areas of concern are mitigated.

or

1b. Adopt a Resolution to affirm the City's election to assume the role as the Successor Agency. However seek legislation to reduce and eliminate liability and minimize the impact to the General Fund.

2. Instruct the CLA and the CAO with the assistance of the LAHD to report with an analysis of the implications relevant to the transfer of the housing functions of the former redevelopment agency to the City and request the City Attorney, with the assistance of the CLA and CAO, to prepare the required Resolutions for Council adoption before January 31, 2012.

3. Request the City Attorney, with the assistance of the CLA and the CAO, to identify and prepare the required Resolutions and/or actions that are technical in nature that the Council must take before January 31, 2012.

4. Authorize the CLA and the CAO to make any technical corrections and take any actions required to implement the intentions of Council's action.

5. Request City Attorney to report in Closed Session relative to the Cooperation Agreement between the City and the CRA/LA.

6. Instruct CLA and the CAO to report on the current economic development functions conducted in the City and provide alternatives/models on how the City can conduct economic development in the future (consolidation of city departments, creation of a non-profit, other).

7. Instruct the CLA to continue to monitor: (1) State Legislation and prepare the necessary Resolutions for Council Adoption; and (2) litigation relative to AB1x26 and report to Council with any future impacts to the City.

FISCAL IMPACT

If the City becomes the Successor Agency, there is a potential General Fund Impact of \$109.3 million based on an estimated cost of \$103.8 million for the retirement and OPEB Payment based on the assumption that a determination is made that these costs are not classified as an enforceable obligation and are not approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF. This analysis assumes full payment in FY2012-13 of the amortized unfunded pension liability costs of \$51.8 million (which is double the \$25.9 million) and the retiree healthcare liability costs of \$52 million. The City as the Successor Agency could be responsible for paying these liabilities which could be substantially higher once CalPERS completes an actuarial valuation. Additionally, the City would not receive any additional

property tax payment or the Administration Cost allowance for FY2012-13 because these funds will be used toward the payment of the pension and the retiree healthcare liability costs.

There is a potential General Fund Impact of \$31.7 million if a determination is made that these costs are classified as an enforceable obligation and are approved by the Oversight Board and the DOF. This scenario still assumes full payment of the \$103.8 million unfunded pension and retiree healthcare liability costs in FY2012-13. If insufficient funds are available to cover the enforceable obligations, the City would need to obtain a \$34.9 million loan from the County Treasurer to cover the shortfall. For this scenario, the City also would not receive any additional property tax payment or the Administration Cost allowance for FY2012-13 because these funds will be used toward the payment of the pension and the retiree healthcare liability costs.

Attachments:

- A. Key Dates
- B. Map of CRA/LA
- C. Employment Model of Non-Compatibility
- D. CRA/LA AB1290 Reimbursements
- E. CRA/LA Active and Pending Grants
- F. Major CRA/LA Projects with Enforceable Obligations

MAS:GFM:LJS:MKK:02120076c

AB1x26 Dissolution Key Dates

January 13, 2012: Last day to adopt a resolution to opt-out of being Successor Agency.

January 19, 2012: Last CRA/LA Board of Commissioners meeting. CRA/LA will present a final EOPS for approval by the CRA/LA Board of Commissioners for transmittal to the State.

January 31, 2012: Last day to adopt a resolution to identify a Housing Successor Agency, otherwise these functions will be transferred to HACLA by default.

February 1, 2012: Redevelopment Agencies are dissolved and all assets and close-out activities are transferred to the Successor Agency.

April 15, 2012: First ROPS due.

May 1, 2012: Oversight Board appointments due. If positions on the Oversight Board are not filled by May 15, 2012, then the Governor will make the appointment.

May 16 2012: County Auditor-Controller to transfer revenues to the Successor Agency to pay for obligations listed in the ROPS. Payments are made bi-annually with the next payment to be made on June 1, 2012 and on January 16 and June 1 thereafter.

July 1, 2012: County Auditor Controller to complete audit of CRA/LA assets, liabilities, and pass-through obligations.

July 15, 2012: Audit of CRA/LA due to State Controller's Office.

July 1, 2016: Consolidation of all Oversight Boards into one County-wide Oversight Board.



**EMPLOYMENT MODEL
NON-COMPATIBILITY**

CITY	CRA	RISK/COMMENT
Civil Service System	Not Civil Service	Integrating the CRA workforce into the City is a complex process. The path to full integration with civil service status pursuant to Charter Section 1021 requires Civil Service Commission action including establishment of background standards, qualifications and methods to ascertain if the employee meets the standards. Employment through exemption from civil service is limited by Charter Section 1001, and would require Council action to expand the number of allowable exemptions, and would be contrary to AB 26.
Salary Disparity	Salary Disparity	There have been numerous classification and compensation studies of the CRA. All indicate that the City pays significantly less than the CRA to perform comparable work. Inclusion in the workforce on a permanent basis compounds the City's internal salary disparity problems, further complicating the collective bargaining process.
Pension: City employees are covered by LACERS and contribute 7% for pension and up to 4% for retiree health. Currently the City is paying 27% of pay for LACERS pensions, which is expected to decline in 2012-13 due to the increase in employee contributions. The City is not a Social Security employer.	Pension: CRA employees are covered by CAL PERS. Employees do not contribute to the plan, and CRA is not pre-funding retiree health benefits. CRA also provides Social Security, with the employer and employee both paying their share.	By law the CRA employees must remain in the CAL PERS system through the expiration of their MOU's. Under vested rights doctrine it is likely that the City would be required to continue with the CAL PERS system for these employees if they become City employees due to the language of AB 26. This would require the City to make the employer and employee contribution, currently a total of 22.81% of pay. City would also be required to pay the employer share of Social Security, currently 7.25%. Total City contribution is 30% of pay. The 30% of pay is likely to increase as the size of the workforce declines, and pension costs continue to escalate. Further, there is an unverified liability to CalPERS for the unpaid pension obligations, with an estimate of \$25 million. Further legal analysis is required as to whether the City can become a Social Security employer for these limited number of employees only.

**EMPLOYMENT MODEL
NON-COMPATIBILITY**

CITY	CRA	RISK/COMMENT
<p>Retiree Health: The City provides a maximum subsidy of the two party Kaiser rate to retirees depending upon years of service. Employees are currently contributing up to 4% of pay for this benefit. The City has pre-funded this benefit since 1987.</p>	<p>Retiree Health: The CRA contributes a maximum subsidy of \$1190 per month for retiree health, and an amount equal to City's retiree single party PPO dental rate. CRA has not pre-funded the retiree health benefit. Employees do not contribute to the cost of the benefit.</p>	<p>Due to the escalation in the price of healthcare, this is a substantial risk for the City. The law is evolving on post employment benefits, but it is possible that the current subsidy of \$1190 month is a vested benefit, thereby creating a substantial unfunded liability. It cannot be stated with certainty that this will be an allowable cost by the oversight committee. If not, it becomes a substantial obligation of the General Fund if the City becomes the successor entity. The current estimate is over \$53 million, but has not been verified, and historically most healthcare cost estimates have been significantly understated.</p>
<p>Layoff: There are currently no limitations on layoffs for City workers.</p>	<p>The MOU for CRA employees requires a 120 day notice before an employee can be removed from the workforce, and contain complex bumping rights provisions similar to civil service.</p>	<p>The 120-day notice is problematic due to the State limitation on funding that is available for administration. Sufficient tax increment money is not available to keep the 192 employees for 120 days as required by the MOU; as a result the City General Fund would become responsible for all amounts above the state 5% limitation. Additionally the bumping rights process effectively precludes maintaining staffing continuity on critical projects.</p>
<p>MOU Expiration: All City labor contracts have a definite term with a fixed ending date</p>	<p>CRA MOU's have an expiration date, and remain in effect until a successor MOU is agreed upon or impasse procedures have been completed.</p>	<p>CRA's labor relations program is under the auspices of the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB), unlike the City's labor relations program that is under the City's Employee Relations Board. It is likely that the unions would attempt to delay the termination of the MOU for as long as possible. As a result it is likely that they would delay negotiations and attempt to extend the impasse process, which under new legislation requires a fact-finding obligation. Unlike the ERB process, the recommendation of the three-person fact-finding panel is made directly to the City Council. It is highly unlikely that the fact finding would be completed within 90 days. Therefore, it is likely that the City would be obligated to continue the current CRA MOU's through the end of September 2012 at a minimum. Given the salary disparity and other unfunded obligations in the MOU, this will increase the period of time that the General Fund would be obligated to fund CRA employees.</p>

**EMPLOYMENT MODEL
NON-COMPATIBILITY**

CITY	CRA	RISK/COMMENT
<p>Compensation: The City is permissibly self insured for Workers' Compensation.</p>	<p>Workers' Compensation: CRA has insured it's worker's compensation liability and has an outstanding contract with a vendor</p>	<p>Traditionally in a layoff environment, there is a higher incidence of worker's compensation claims, If the City is the successor entity, any works' compensation case filed by CRA workers would become an unfunded obligation of the General Fund. Given the current worker's compensation law, and the obligation to provide medical treatment for the life of the claim, substantial unfunded liability is likely.</p>
<p>Unemployment</p>	<p>Unemployment</p>	<p>Given the 5% and subsequent 3% limitation on administrative expenses, and the MOU required delay in any layoff process, it is unlikely that these costs would be recognized by the Oversight Committee as a recognized obligation. As a result, these costs would have to be covered by the General Fund.</p>

- Potential General Fund Impact
1. Unfunded Pension Costs
 2. Unfunded Retiree Healthcare
 3. Unemployment
 4. Workers' Compensation

ATTACHMENT D

FY11 AB1290 REIMBURSEMENTS

Sum of Amount			
TaxEntityCode	TaxEntityName	Total	%
001.00	Los Angeles County	8,079,431.27	25.33%
007.00	Los Angeles County Fire Department	196,797.20	0.62%
030.00	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	301,189.46	0.94%
053.00	Wilmington Cemetery District	435.46	0.00%
061.10	Los Angeles County West Vector Control District	3,932.33	0.01%
061.80	Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District	5,957.68	0.02%
066.00	Sanitation District of Los Angeles County	2,628.39	0.01%
188.00	City of Los Angeles	9,687,808.55	30.38%
310.00	MWD - City of L.A. Area	93,341.41	0.29%
350.00	Water Replenishment District of Southern CA	649.34	0.00%
400.00	ERAF	6,643,870.99	20.83%
400.15	Los Angeles County Office of Education	126,309.35	0.40%
805.00	Los Angeles Community College District	796,727.30	2.50%
887.00	Los Angeles Unified School District	5,953,779.31	18.67%
Grand Total		31,892,858.04	100.00%

CRA/LA ACTIVE GRANTS - AWARDED & PENDING



Grant	Project	CRA Region	CBA Project Area	Source of Funds	Grant Application Date	Award Notification Date	Award Start	Award End	Original Appraised Amount	Amount Awarded	CRA/LA Match	CBA Contract	Lead Applicant	Comments	Greater Blended Activity	Expenditure
ARRA - CDBG-R	West Angeles Plaza	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cities	HUD through CDBG through County Dept of Public Health	9/15/2009	9/15/2009	Awarded	9/14/2009	2,500,000 \$	2,500,000 \$		Monette Banks-Cox	CRALA	PEP forms required	No	No
ARRA - Community Planning	Connecticut Store Conversion Program	Citywide	Citywide	DOE through EAD	11/19/2009	12/21/2009	Awarded	2/27/2010	250,000 \$	240,000 \$		Jenna Guegar	CRALA	CRALA applying to County DPH	Yes	Yes
ARRA - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program - Formula	Commercial taxless energy retrofit program	Citywide	Citywide	DOE through EAD	7/11/2009	11/19/2009	Awarded	2/18/2009	3,000,000 \$	2,770,000 \$		Sharon G	EAD		No	Yes
ARRA - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program - Formula	Clean Tech Corridor Integrated Strategy	Downtown	Central Industrial	DOE through EAD	7/1/2009	11/18/2009	Awarded	2/18/2009	500,000 \$	425,000 \$		Sharon G	EAD		No	Yes
ARRA - Neighborhood Stabilization Program	Buckingham Senior Housing	South LA	Central Industrial	GA Department of Housing and Community Development	9/1/2009	12/21/2009	Awarded	2/15/2010	10,000,000 \$	10,000,000 \$		Carelyn Hill	CRALA	CRALA will partner with META Housing	No	No
ARRA - State Energy Program: Municipal Financing Districts	Commercial taxless energy retrofit program	Citywide	Citywide	California State Commission	9/1/2009	12/21/2009	Awarded	2/15/2010	5,000,000 \$	4,748,800 \$		Sharon G	CRALA		No	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Environmental Justice Mobility Plan and Opportunities for Wilmington Employees and Residents (EMPOWER)	Citywide	LA Harbor Industrial Center	Caltrans	7/28/2011	Awarded		7/28/2011	250,000 \$	18,750 \$			CRALA	State is asking that another City Department serve as the lead applicant due to uncertainty of redevelopment	Yes	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Clean Tech Regional Goods Movement Transportation Improvements	Downtown	Central Industrial	Caltrans	8/18/2010	Awarded		8/18/2010	200,000 \$	188,000 \$		Curt Gibbs	CRALA		Yes	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Improving Linkages from the Van Nuys Antenna/Maint to Van Nuys Boulevard	East Valley	Picoima / Panorama City	Caltrans	8/18/2010	Awarded		8/18/2010	300,000 \$	300,000 \$		Oscar Novelo	CRALA		Yes	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Historic Core Streetscape Building Rehab & Signage	Citywide	Central Industrial	DOE through EAD		Awarded				592,500 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Alameda - Harry Bridges Landscape Buffer	Citywide	LA Harbor Industrial Center	DOE through EAD		Awarded				1,814,041 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Venice & Hope Community Center	Citywide	CD 9	CD 9		Awarded				3,000,000 \$			CRALA		Yes	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Brownfield Revitalization Fund	Various	Various	CDBG	N/A	Awarded		N/A	1,000,000 \$	7,352,000 \$		Dan Weissman	CRALA	Complis.	No	Yes
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	IMANI FE	Citywide	Citywide	DOE through EAD		Awarded				2,800,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	North Hollywood Arts District	Citywide	North Hollywood	DOE through EAD		Awarded				270,209 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Center Street (H-2) Mixed Use Development	Citywide	LA Harbor Industrial Center	DOE through EAD		Awarded				1,310,558 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Adams Blvd, Commercial Facade	Citywide	Hollywood & Central	DOE through EAD		Awarded				550,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Santa Barbara Plaza-Marion	Citywide	Citywide	DOE through EAD		Awarded				15,175,000 \$			CRALA		No	Yes
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Santa Monica/Western Pedestrian Safety Improvement	Citywide	Hollywood	DOE through EAD		Awarded				132,056 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Western Silicon Streetscape Phase II	Citywide	Western Silicon	DOE through EAD		Awarded				100,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Vermont Commercial Facade and Signage	Citywide	Exposition	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				125,000 \$			CRALA	On 3/9/2011 Cal extended use of funds to 9/11/11	No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Patrol/Power	Citywide	Patrol/Power	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,250,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Vermont Senior Housing	Citywide	Patrol/Power	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,575,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Adams/Central Mixed Use	Citywide	CD 9	CD 9		Awarded				900,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Broadway Streetscape	Citywide	City Center	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				550,000 \$			CRALA		No	Yes
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Brownfield Revitalization Fund	Citywide	Various	CDBG	N/A	Awarded		N/A	570,000 \$	550,000 \$		Dan Weissman	CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Broadway Streetscape	Citywide	City Center	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Brownfields Development Opportunities	Citywide	N/A	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				500,000 \$			CRALA	\$100,000 was returned to CDD for CEQA/NEPA	No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	CleanTech Business Incubator	Citywide	Central Industrial	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				3,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Crown Coach Industrial Site Expansion	Citywide	Central Industrial	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				4,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Westlake Theatre	Citywide	Hollywood & Central	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				4,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Marion Square	Citywide	South LA	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Vision Theatre Renovation, Phase II	Citywide	South LA	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Burbank Boulevard Streetscape	Citywide	East Valley	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				500,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Marion Square	Citywide	South LA	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,500,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Northwest Valley Industrial Expansion Project	Citywide	East Valley	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				700,000 \$			CRALA	(Application ID 327355)	No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	CleanTech Business Incubator	Citywide	Downtown	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				1,000,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Wilmington Industrial Tract Expansion	Citywide	Harbor	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				500,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Old City Jail (Lincoln Heights Jail) Feasibility Study	Citywide	Harbor	CDBG through EAD		Awarded				50,000 \$			CRALA		Yes	No
Economic Development Administration (EDA) Grant	Sun Valley EDA Public Improvements Project	Citywide	Picoima/Panorama City	Department of Commerce	9/1/2009	3/2/2010	Awarded	8/25/2010	3,165,771 \$	3,165,771 \$		Duran Villegas	CRALA		Yes	Yes
Federal Earmark FY10	Downtown Street Car	Citywide	Downtown	Commerce Dept FY10		Awarded				250,000 \$			CRALA		No	No
HUD Sustainable Communities	NELA Collaborative	Citywide	Hollywood & Central	HUD	6/15/2010	8/1/2010	Awarded	10/29/2010	3,000,000 \$	2,250,000 \$		Alsem Becker	CRALA	CRALA match includes 2 existing contracts (\$427,685) and funds (\$301,000) associated with EB010 and Pasadena Grants (\$455,765)	Yes	Yes

ATTACHMENT E

CRAILA ACTIVE GRANTS - AWARDED & PENDING



Grant	Project	CRA Region	City Center	Source of Funds	Grant Approval Date	Application Due Date	Award Notification Date	Award Status	Original Application Amount	CRAILA Match	CRA Match	Lead Architect	Comments	Grant Expenditure Status
LA Dept of Transportation Los Angeles County Preservation	Preservation of Affordable 3RD Units Central Plaza Gateway Restoration Project	Downtown	City Center	Preservation	2/24/2009		Awarded		\$ 300,000			Dave Neubacker		Yes
MTA	Hollywood Pedestrian/Transit Crossroads Streetscape Improvements	Hollywood & Central	Hollywood	MTA	12/8/2002		Awarded		\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,032,000	\$ 865,000	Genald Gubbahn	Received news through public notice 100 historic assignment submitted early 2011 design award submitted early to be completed with West of 7th Ave reconstruction project.	Yes
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) P.728	North Hollywood Streetscape	Hollywood & Central	Hollywood	MTA	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 1,051,000			Genald Prada	Construction completed 9/8/11.	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Hollywood Pedestrian/Transit Crossroads Streetscape Improvements - Phase B	Hollywood & Central	Hollywood	MTA	3/31/2007		Awarded		\$ 540,000	\$ 618,000	\$ 241,000	Genald Gubbahn	LOA Approved 8/17/2010	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Hollywood Integrated Road Information System	Hollywood & Central	Hollywood	MTA	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 2,191,000	\$ 1,692,000	\$ 1,028,000	Genald Gubbahn	LOA Approved 2/19/09	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Washington Boulevard Transit Enhancements Downtown	Downtown	CD 9	MTA (CMAQ)	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 1,671,000	\$ 378,000		Jason Neville		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Washington Boulevard Transit Enhancements Downtown	Downtown	CD 9	Prop C	3/31/2007		Awarded		\$ 335,000			Jason Neville		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Gold Line WH-FI	Downtown	Various	MTA	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 970,000				LOA signed 7/1/09	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Gold Line WH-FI	Downtown	Various	Prop C	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 283,000					Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Downtown LA Alternatives Green Transit Modes Trial Program	Downtown	Various	MTA (CMAQ)	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 821,000			Dave Neubacker		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Experience LA Web 2.0 Interactive Transit Mapping	Downtown	Various	MTA (CMAQ)	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 270,000	\$ 33,000		Curt Gibbs		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Experience LA Web 2.0 Interactive Transit Mapping	Downtown	Various	Prop C	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 67,000			Curt Gibbs		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2007)	Downtown LA Alternatives Green Transit Modes Trial Program	Downtown	Various	Prop C	1/15/2007		Awarded		\$ 205,000			Dave Neubacker		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Arts District/ Little Tokyo Cool Line Station Linkages	Downtown	Little Tokyo	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 1,519,891	\$ 1,737,882	\$ 400,328	Jeff Carpenter	\$859K from Call, \$869K from Measure R Light Rail Access Funding; Match based on Light Rail Access Funding.	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Arts District/ Little Tokyo Cool Line Station Linkages	Downtown	Little Tokyo	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 380,000			Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Arts District/ Little Tokyo Cool Line Station Linkages	Downtown	Little Tokyo	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,238,050	\$ 854,513	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Arts District/ Little Tokyo Cool Line Station Linkages	Downtown	Little Tokyo	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 500,000	\$ 282,258		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Central Avenue Historic Corridor Streetscape Improvements (4th to 8th St)	Downtown	CD 9	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 2,011,000	\$ 1,687,250	\$ 890,416	Jason Neville	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Central Avenue Historic Corridor Streetscape Improvements (4th to 8th St)	Downtown	CD 9	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 502,000	\$ 423,678		Jason Neville		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Downtown East Chavez Medians (Chinatown/El Pueblo/C Chavez/Main/ Green Corridor Improvements)	Downtown	Chinatown	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 1,181,500	\$ 423,598	\$ 156,640	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Downtown East Chavez Medians (Chinatown/El Pueblo/C Chavez/Main/ Green Corridor Improvements)	Downtown	Chinatown	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 295,000	\$ 104,428		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Downtown LA Inter-Modal Transit Information and Wayfinding	Downtown	Historic Core	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 3,200,000	\$ 1,283,384		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Downtown LA Inter-Modal Transit Information and Wayfinding	Downtown	Historic Core	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 800,000	\$ 322,548		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Figueras Corridor Bike Station & Cycling Enhancements	Downtown	CD 8	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,104,897	\$ 451,211	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Figueras Corridor Bike Station & Cycling Enhancements	Downtown	CD 8	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 400,000	\$ 311,179		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Boyle Heights Chavez Ave Streetscape/Ped Improvements	Eastside	Adelante Esada	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 3,200,000	\$ 2,787,500	\$ 2,439,389	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Boyle Heights Chavez Ave Streetscape/Ped Improvements	Eastside	Adelante Esada	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 800,000	\$ 686,917		Jeff Carpenter		Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Eastside Light Rail Pedestrian Linkages, Phase II	Eastside	Adelante Esada	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,148,850	\$ 624,413	Jeff Carpenter	\$1,075M from Call, \$1,075M from Measure R Light Rail Access Funding	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Eastside Light Rail Pedestrian Linkages, Phase II	Eastside	Adelante Esada	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 608,000	\$ 685,102	\$ 390,955	Jeff Carpenter	Award match split btw Mid- Cites/Crenshaw; Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Stockton/ MLK Crenshaw Access to the Exp Light Rail Station	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cites	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 152,000	\$ 173,776		Jeff Carpenter	Award split btw Mid-Cites/Crenshaw	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Stockton/ MLK Crenshaw Access to the Exp Light Rail Station	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cites	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,587,950	\$ 1,614,705	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds (Project staff has been identified)	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Stockton/ MLK Crenshaw Access to the Exp Light Rail Station	South LA	Exposition Park/Hoover	MTA	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 400,000	\$ 337,437		Jeff Carpenter	Award match split btw Mid- Cites/Crenshaw; Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds.	Yes
MTA Call for Projects (2009)	Stockton/ MLK Crenshaw Access to the Exp Light Rail Station	South LA	Exposition Park/Hoover	Prop C	4/17/2009		Awarded		\$ 608,000	\$ 685,102	\$ 390,955	Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds.	Yes
National Parks Service - Preserve America Program	Asian Pacific Islander (API) Preserve America Community	Downtown, Hollywood/Central	Crenshaw Chavez/Lite Tokyo, Korastown, East Hollywood	Prop C	11/1/2009		Awarded		\$ 152,000	\$ 173,776		Jeff Carpenter	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds.	Yes
Prop 10 (Light Infrastructure Grant (IG) Program)	Crenshaw/Mid-Cities Corridors	South LA	Crenshaw, Mid-Cities	CA Housing and Community Development	6/1/2008		Awarded		\$ 1,000,000	\$ 250,000		Jay Vratil	Match based on MTA Board report, includes Prop C funds.	Yes

ATTACHMENT E

CRAWLA ACTIVE GRANTS - AWARDED & PENDING



Grant	Project	CBA Region	CBA Project Area	Source of Funds	Grant Notification Date	Application Due Date	Award Notification Date	Award Status	Original Amount	Amount Awarded	CRAWLA Match	CBA Contact	Lead Applicant	Committee	Greater Bay Area	Expenditure Priority
Prop 10 Infrastructure Grant (IG) Program	Figueras Corridor - Linking South LA to Downtown	Downtown, South LA	City Center, Hoover, CD 9	CA Housing and Community Development	8/1/2008			Awarded		30,000,000		Jay Vrasa	CRAWLA		Yes	Yes
Prop 10 Infrastructure Grant (IG) Program	Yale Terrace	Downtown	Chinatown	CA Housing and Community Development	8/1/2008			Awarded		3,450,520		Bblana Yung	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Prop 10 Infrastructure Grant (IG) Program	Blossom Plaza	Downtown	Chinatown	CA Housing and Community Development	8/1/2008			Awarded		10,000,000		Bblana Yung	City		Yes	No
Prop 40 State Urban Park Grant	Venice Hope Recreation Center	Downtown	CD 9	State Prop 40				Awarded		3,000,000	2,800,000		CRAWLA		Yes	Yes
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Ord & Yale Street Park (Chinese Pedestrian Garden Park)	Downtown	Chinatown	California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	9/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	4,999,705	4,999,705	\$13,500	Bblana Yung	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Nevin Avenue Elementary School Park	Downtown		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	2,898,340	2,898,340		Matt Mason	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Vermont Median Park	Downtown		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	4,998,853	4,998,853	1,103,047	WBI Cipes	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Sharon-Wall Park	Downtown		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	4,999,833	4,999,833		Matt Mason	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Wishnie Center/Kerestrom Central Park (Irmy New Park - 1878 Wishnie Blvd.)	Hollywood & Central		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	5,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	Catherine Sim	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Midway Zosalo Park (formerly Lafayette Park Expansion)	Hollywood & Central		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	5,000,000	5,000,000	1,000,000	Candice Sim	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	New Park - La Mirada Park	Hollywood & Central		California Department of Parks and Recreation	4/1/2009	3/1/2010	11/15/2010	Awarded	1,223,300	1,223,300		Gerald Gubalan	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	South Los Angeles Green Alley Master Plan	Downtown	CD 9	California Statewide Growth Council	8/9/2010	8/31/2010	12/31/2010	Awarded	271,000	271,000		Jason Neville	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Downtown Los Angeles Open Space Master Plan	Downtown	Downtown Region Wide	California Statewide Growth Council	2/1/2010	4/30/2010	12/31/2010	Awarded	250,000	250,000		Karan Yamamoto	CRAWLA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Venice Hope Recreation Center	Downtown	CD 9	California Statewide Growth Council				Awarded		591,000	424,822		CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Pacolina Complete Streets Initiative (RENEW)	East Valley	Pacolina / Panorama City	California County Dept of Public Health	3/19/2010	10/19/2010		Awarded	240,000	240,000		Duran Valdes	Pacolina Beach		No	Yes
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Performing Arts High School	Downtown	Chinatown	California	7/14/2010	10/19/2010		Awarded	350,000	280,030		Bblana Yung	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Nevin Elementary School	Downtown	CD 9	California	4/15/2008	8/25/2008		Awarded	855,000	855,000		Oscar Iino	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Ricardo Lizarraga Elementary School	Downtown	CD 9	California	4/15/2008	11/20/2008		Awarded	910,000	910,000		Jason Neville	CRAWLA		Yes	No
SAFE/TEALU Federal Earmark	Central Avenue Public Improvements	South LA	Watts Corridor	Federal Budget	N/A			Awarded	3,200,000	800,000		Charlote Brenner	CRAWLA		Yes	No
SAFE/TEALU Federal Earmark	Central Avenue Streetscape Improvements	Downtown	CD 9	Federal Budget				Awarded	1,696,000			Cur Gibbs	CRAWLA		Yes	No
Transportation Food Access	Transportation and Food Access (Environmental Justice, Context-Sensitive)	Downtown	CD 9	DOT/EP				Awarded	228,500			Jerry Stanth	CRAWLA		Yes	Yes
U.S. EPA Brownfields Cleanup Grants	Stanton/Wall	Downtown	CD 9	U.S. Agency	8/1/2010	10/15/2010	6/9/2011	Awarded	200,000	200,000		Dan Weissman	CRAWLA		Yes	No
U.S. EPA Brownfields Cleanup Grants	Wilmington Block 27	Harbor	LA Harbor Industrial Center	U.S. Agency	8/1/2010	10/15/2010	6/9/2011	Awarded	200,000	200,000		Dan Weissman	CRAWLA		No	No
Finalized Total \$ 34,418,196 \$ 20,133,173																
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Alameda Street Downtown LA: Goods Movement	Downtown	Central Industrial	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	Final on - final	3,250,000	3,786,750	3,340,325	Cur Gibbs/Josh Roemer	CRAWLA		Yes	No
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Washington Blvd. Pedestrian/Transit Access, Phase 2 (San Pedro to Alameda)	Downtown	CD 9	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	Final on - final	1,287,000	1,481,633	883,187	Jerry Stanth/Josh Roemer	CRAWLA		Yes	No
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Hollywood Blvd. Streetscape Improvements: Gower to Western	Hollywood & Central	Hollywood	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	Final on - final	1,990,000	2,222,035	1,700,357	Maysa Rivera	CRAWLA		Yes	No

ATTACHMENT E

CRA/ALA ACTIVE GRANTS - AWARDED & PENDING



Grant	Project	CRA Region	CRA Project Area	Stacks of Funds	Grant Anticipation Date	Application Due Date	Award Anticipation Date	Award Status	Original Application Amount	Amount Awarded	CRA/ALA Match	CRA Contact	Last Applicant	Comments	Grants Expenditures Match FYM	ACTIVITY
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Orange Line Extension - Sherman Way Station Pedestrian Improvements	West Valley	Reader/Canoga Park	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	(Preliminary Recommendation on - final pending)	1,385,000 \$	1,098,089 \$	598,575	Tabitha Lum	CRA/ALA	Award/match infilled to FY15-FY17 \$	Yes	No
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Exposition/University Park Expo Line Bike Hubs		Exposition Park/Hover	MTA				(Preliminary Recommendation)	\$	1,800,000			CRA/ALA		Yes	No
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Exposition LA's Historic Cultural Neighborhood Connections	Downtown	Various	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	(Preliminary Recommendation on - final pending)	870,000 \$	1,108,023 \$	340,000	Curt Gibbs	CRA/ALA	Made a CRA/ALA match infilled to FY15-FY17 \$ is \$595,827 infilled, and includes other local/county sources	Yes	No
MTA Call for Projects (2011)	Mobility Transit Bike Hubs Adjacent to Expo Station in South LA	Downtown, South LA	Various	MTA	8/1/2010	2/1/2011	9/22/2011	(Preliminary Recommendation on - final pending)	1,600,000 \$	1,601,498 \$	450,359	Curt Gibbs/STY Chun	CRA/ALA	Award/match infilled to FY15-FY17 \$	Yes	No
Amount of CRA/ALA Match Recommended (Total Pending) \$ 41,352,544 \$ 7,222,000																
ARRA - Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Remediation	Jefferson Boulevard Mixed-Use Site	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cities	CA Water Resources Board	Rolling	Rolling		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 210,000	\$ 210,000		Den Weisman	CRA/ALA	Approval pending remediation workplan	No	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Bunker Hill Regional Connector Station Area	Downtown	Bunker Hill	Caltrans	12/6/2010	3/20/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000		Curt Gibbs	CRA/ALA		No	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Realizing the Economic and Community Development Potential of the Crenshaw Subarea	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cities	Caltrans	12/4/2009	4/1/2009		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000		Michelle Banks-Ondre	CRA/ALA		No	No
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	Development Potential of the Crenshaw Subarea	South LA	Crenshaw	Caltrans	12/4/2009	4/1/2009		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000		Cassyn Hill	CRA/ALA		No	No
Economic Development Administration (EDA) Grant	Midtown Crossing Public Improvement Project	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cities	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Not Awarded	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000		Monique Banks-Ondre	CRA/ALA		No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) PY34	API Neighborhood Cultural Heritage & Hospitality Edu & Training	Hollywood & Central	Mid Cities	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000					No	Yes
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) PY34	Yula Street Family Housing	Downtown	Crenshaw	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 1,625,784	\$ 1,625,784					No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) PY34	Crenshaw Vision Plan	Downtown	Crenshaw	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 14,600,000	\$ 14,600,000					No	No
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) PY34	Downtown LA Streetcar Environmental Review	Downtown	Central Industrial	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000					No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Central Avenue Jazz Park Expansion	Downtown	CO 9	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 3,322,239	\$ 3,322,239		VR Clips	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Arts District Park	Downtown	Central Industrial	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000		Jean Rohrer	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Fashion District Park	Downtown	City Center	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 4,999,990	\$ 4,999,990		Karen Yemmate	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	San Pedro Neighborhood Park	Harbor	Pacific Commons	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 2,182,285	\$ 2,182,285		Megan Hunter	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Piazza del Scoul	Hollywood & Central	Wilshire Center/Koreatown	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 4,639,873	\$ 4,639,873		Cassyn Hill	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Wilshire Center/Koreatown Central Park-Phase II	Hollywood & Central	Wilshire Center/Koreatown	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 1,618,683	\$ 1,618,683		Cecilia Sim	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Colden Avenue Pocket Park	South LA	Broadway Manchester	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000		Jennifer Barerra		Trust for Public Land	No	No
Proposition 84 - Statewide Park Development	Vermont Median Park (Phase II)	South LA	Western/Blacksburg/Vermont/Manchester	California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 4,965,790	\$ 4,965,790		Jennifer Barerra	CRA/ALA		No	No
Proposition 84 - Urban Greening Planning Grant	Wilmington Greening Plan (Plan)	Harbor	LA Harbor Industrial Center	California Strategic Growth Council	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Submitted Application (Pending)	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000		Megan Hunter	CRA/ALA		No	No
Amount of CRA/ALA Match Recommended (Total Pending) \$ 25,492,820 \$ 48,000																
Economic Development Administration (EDA) Grant	CleanTech Business Incubator	Downtown	Central Industrial	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Applications in Preparation	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000		Curt Gibbs	CRA/ALA		No	No
Economic Development Administration (EDA) Grant	Broad Museum Public Improvements	Downtown	Banker Hill	Department of Commerce	Rolling	Rolling		Applications in Preparation	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000		Curt Gibbs	CRA/ALA Co-Fundation (CRA/ALA Co-App)		No	No

ATTACHMENT E

CRA/LA ACTIVE GRANTS - AWARDED & PENDING



Grant	Project	City/Region	CRA Project Area	Source of Funds	Grant Notification Date	Application Due Date	Award Notification Date	Award Status	Original Application Amount	Amount Awarded	CRA/LA Match	CRA Contact	Lead Applicant	Commitment	Greater Grant #	Expendish #	Agency
Proposition 84 - Streetside Park Development	Budosen Little Tokyo Recreation Center/Park	Downtown		California Department of Parks and Recreation	1/15/2011	7/1/2011		Applications in Preparation	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	Karen Yasamoto	Little Tokyo Service Center		No	No	No
Proposition 84 - Urban Greening Project Grant	Events Adsett School Urban Greening (Project)	Downtown	Chinatown	California Strategic Growth Council	1/15/2011	TBD		Applications in Preparation	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	Bibiana Yang	CRA/LA		No	No	No
Proposition 84 - Urban Greening Project Grant	Ulyan Pierman Walkway (Project)	Harbor	Pacific Commons	California Strategic Growth Council	1/15/2011	TBD		Applications in Preparation	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Megan Hunter	CRA/LA		No	No	No
Proposition 84 - Urban Greening Project Grant	Vinagar Hill Parkway Restoration (Project)	Harbor	Pacific Commons	California Strategic Growth Council	1/15/2011	TBD		Applications in Preparation	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 25,000	Megan Hunter	CRA/LA		No	No	No
Proposition 84 - Urban Greening Project Grant	Monsieur Oscar Romero Plaza (Project)	Hollywood & Central	Westlake	California Strategic Growth Council	1/15/2011	TBD		Applications in Preparation	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 100,000	Kanyon Price	CRA/LA		No	No	No
Safe Routes to School Infrastructure	Cabrillo Avenue Elementary School	Harbor	Pacific Commons	Caltrans	5/5/2011	7/15/2011		Applications in Preparation	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	Megan Hunter	LADOT		No	No	No
Safe Routes to School - Non-Infrastructure	San Pedro School Safety Patrol (Gaffney St Schools)	Harbor		Caltrans	5/5/2011			Applications in Preparation	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -	Megan Hunter	CRA/LA		No	No	No
										\$ 14,175,000	\$ 145,000						
										Grant Total							

**MAJOR PROJECTS UNDER CRA/LA MANAGEMENT
WITH ENFORCEABLE OBLIGATIONS UNDER AB1X26**

This schedule includes major CRA/LA projects that have reached the threshold of ENFORCEABLE OBLIGATIONS under AB1x26, with active, fully executed agreements. It does **NOT** include projects that were approved by CRA/LA Board and City Council after June 30, 2011. These projects will either have to compete for funds generated by the City's remnant 30.68% share of net new property taxes as they become available, secure funding from other sources, or be abandoned.

Projects listed in Italics are being managed by CRA/LA, but do not include any future disbursements of CRA/LA funds. For these projects, CRA/LA funds have already been fully disbursed, or funding consists only of grant funds passed-through CRA/LA.

Major Categories (Total 86 projects, CRA/LA Investment \$322 million, Total Development Cost \$4.832 billion):

- Commercial (4 projects)
- Industrial (3 projects)
- Business Assistance (35 projects)
- Community and Public Facilities (9 projects)
- Public Infrastructure (10 projects)
- Mixed-Use (10 projects)
- Affordable Housing (15 projects)

Commercial (4 projects, \$340 million development cost, \$33.4 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **Midtown Crossing, CD 10** (795 construction jobs/800 permanent jobs)—Large big box retail center. Total development cost \$170 million. CRA/LA Investment \$16.3 million.
- **Vine Street Tower, CD 13** (347 construction jobs/483 permanent jobs)—Class A office building, 112,548 sf, LEED Gold. Goal to attract entertainment companies to Hollywood. Total development cost \$57 million. CRA/LA Investment \$4.6 million.
- **Slauson/Central Retail Plaza, CD 9** (145 construction jobs/248 permanent jobs)—Retail center largest serving South LA. Total development cost \$26 million. CRA/LA Investment \$6 million.
- **District Square Retail Project, CD 10** (430 construction jobs/600 permanent jobs)—Retail shopping center. Total development cost \$87 million. CRA/LA Investment \$6.5 million.

Industrial (3 projects, \$41.4 million development cost, \$5.4 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **812 E. 59th Street Industrial Rehabilitation, CD9** (16 construction jobs, 74 permanent jobs) – remediation and rehabilitation of an existing industrial property. Total development cost is \$5.9 million. CRA/LA Investment is \$892,000.
- **CleanTech Business Incubator, CD 14** (80 construction jobs/250 permanent jobs)—Business incubator to encourage and facilitate innovation and commercialization of clean technologies. Total development cost \$28 million. CRA/LA Investment \$2 million.
- **6800 Avalon Industrial Rehabilitation, CD 9** (21 construction jobs, 120 permanent jobs)—Acquisition, rehabilitation, and expansion of existing industrial property. Total development cost \$7.5 million. CRA/LA Investment \$2.5 million.

Business Assistance

- There are 10 approved Business Assistance Programs and 35 active façade improvement projects with \$3 million of CRA/LA investment.

Community and Public Facilities (9 projects, \$206.7 million development cost, \$67.1 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **Wattstar Theater & Education Center, CD 15** (128 construction jobs, 28 permanent jobs) Development of a movie theater and educational center in Watts. Total development cost is \$25 million. CRA/LA investment is \$4 million.
- **Warner Grand Theater, CD 15** – (2 construction jobs) Completion of facility analysis and improvements to existing historic theater in San Pedro. Total development cost is \$400,000. CRA/LA investment is \$400,000.
- **Broad Museum, CD 9** (700 construction jobs, 35 permanent jobs) Construction of public parking garage, public plaza and Broad Museum. Total development cost is \$152 million. CRA/LA investment is \$52 million.
- **Reseda Park Swimming Pool Replacement, CD 3** (22 construction jobs, 5 permanent jobs) Provide funds to rehabilitate swimming pool for community use. Total development cost is \$4.8 million. CRA/LA investment is \$2.2 million.
- **CIS Job Readiness / Training Center, CD 7** (9 construction jobs, 22 permanent jobs) Construction of a job readiness center. Total development cost is \$1.7 million. CRA/LA investment is \$200,000.
- **Engine House 18 Exceptional Children's Foundation, CD 8** (2 construction jobs, 5 permanent jobs) Develop property into an adult art center for developmentally disabled. Total development cost is \$1.5 million. CRA/LA investment is \$500,000.
- **Orchard Gables, CD 4** (10 construction jobs) Rehabilitation of a historic structure for community facility. Total development cost is \$1.9 million. CRA/LA investment is \$1.9 million.
- **Lankershim Historic Train Depot, CD4** (22 construction jobs, 5 permanent jobs) Rehabilitation of historic train depot for Metro offices and community-oriented uses. Total development cost is \$3.6 million. CRA/LA investment is \$1.1 million.
- **Venice Hope Recreation Center, CD9** (73 construction jobs, 80 permanent jobs) Construction of recreation and child care center in South Park. Total development cost \$15.8 million. CRA/LA investment is \$4 million.

Public Infrastructure (10 projects, \$256.9 million development cost, \$49.45 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **Sun Valley EDA Public Improvements Project, CD 6** (21 construction jobs, 45 permanent jobs) Construct and upgrade existing public infrastructure in heavily industrial part of Sun Valley. Total project cost is \$4.2 million. CRA/LA investment is \$1.5 million.
- **Sylmar Traffic Medians, CD 7** (12 construction jobs) Improvements in Sylmar Business Improvement District. Total development cost is \$2.5 million. CRA/LA is \$2.5 million.
- **Bringing Back Broadway, CD 14** (3 construction jobs) *Funding for building lighting and glass block replacement along Broadway. Total development cost \$1.1 million. No CRA/LA funds.*
- **Downtown Streetcar, CD 14 & 9** (540 construction jobs, 45 permanent jobs) Funding for development of Los Angeles Streetcar and environmental review. Total development cost estimated at \$125 million. CRA/LA investment is \$10 million.
- **Cesar Chavez Corridor Streetscape, CD 1** (50 construction jobs, 3 permanent jobs) Improvements along Cesar Chavez in Chinatown through Metro grant. Total project cost is \$5.6 million. CRA/LA investment \$2.3 million.
- **Figueroa Corridor Prop 1C, CD8 & 9** (206 construction jobs, 110 permanent jobs) Development of housing and streetscape improvements to Figueroa, 11th, Washington, Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, as well as public improvements of Gilbert Lindsay Park, Exposition Park, Washington Blvd Courthouse Park. Total development cost is \$100 million. CRA/LA investment is \$18 million.

- **Crenshaw Corridor Prop 1C, CD8 & 10** (66 construction jobs) Improvements to Crenshaw Boulevard funded through Prop 1C. Total development cost is \$14 million. CRA/LA investment \$4,033,008.
- **Bunker Hill Sidewalk Repairs and Improvements, CD9** (2 construction jobs) Sidewalk repair and tree planting in Bunker Hill Project Area. Total project cost is \$1.5 million. CRA/LA investment is \$1.5 million.
- **Adams Streetscape Improvements, CD 10** (5 construction jobs) Major streetscape improvements along Adams Boulevard. Total project cost is \$1 million. CRA/LA investment \$150,000.
- **Reseda Streetscape Improvements, CD3** (10 construction jobs) Streetscape improvements/beautification project along 13 medians on Sherman Way in Reseda between Lindley Avenue and Wilbur Avenue. Total project cost is \$2 million. CRA/LA investment is \$2 million.

Mixed-Use (15 projects, \$3.663 billion development cost, \$117.6 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **Sunset Gordon Mixed-Use, CD 13** (1,152 construction jobs, 100 permanent jobs) This high-rise, mixed-use development will transform a surface parking lot and former Spaghetti Factory restaurant into a project that features For-Sale condominiums, of which a portion are affordable, as well as Commercial Creative Office Space, Neighborhood Serving Retail, and a public park. Total development cost estimated at \$190 million. CRA/LA investment is \$13 million.
- **Wilshire Vermont Mixed-Use, CD 10** (857 construction jobs, 250 permanent jobs) The Vermont consists of new construction of 464 multi-family units in two high rise towers, which bridge over 41,000 square feet of retail space. The project has 159 underground parking spaces for public access and retail parking; and 754 parking spaces in five levels above ground to service the residents. The project will provide an 11,860 square foot public plaza/park area, which will front along Wilshire Boulevard. Total development cost estimated at \$164 million. CRA/LA investment is \$17.5 million.
- **Grand Avenue Mixed-Use, CD 9** (12,796 construction jobs, 5,900 permanent jobs) Development of mixed income housing and commercial projects on Parcels M, L and Q in Bunker Hill Project Area. Total development cost estimated at \$2 billion. CRA/LA investment is \$50 million.
- **Grand Central Market, CD9** (85 construction jobs, 50 permanent jobs) *Restructure existing Operating Agreement to allow for future investment of \$12 million for improvements to market, residential development and theater. Total development cost estimated at \$12 million. No additional CRA/LA investment.*
- **Los Angeles Sports and Entertainment District, CD 9** (8,600 construction jobs, 9,700 permanent jobs) *Is an active mixed use project. Delivered elements include Staples' Center, LA Live; Convention Center Hotel, Convention Center Expansion, Figueroa Central, Figueroa South, 717 Tower; FIDM, and Olympic North. Development investment for remaining elements is expected to be approximately \$1 billion. CRA/LA investment is \$5 million.*
- **NoHo Senior Artists Colony, CD 4** (229 construction jobs, 8 permanent jobs) Mixed-use development with 126 units for seniors (27 very low income and 99 market rate units) and commercial space. First project of its type in the United States with a professional 76-seat theater and company-in-residence (Road Theatre Company) that will also provide programming for residents. Total development cost expected to be \$42 million. CRA/LA investment of \$6.6 million.
- **MacArthur Park Metro Development, CD 1** (214 construction jobs, 3 permanent jobs) This mixed-use Transit-Oriented Development project on MTA owned land will be developed in two phases. Phase A includes affordable rental units for large families, as well as commercial retail space and parking. During peak hours, a portion of the parking spaces will be reserved for transit riders. Total development cost is \$35 million. CRA/LA investment is \$1.4 million.
- **One Santa Fe, CD9** (910 construction jobs, 30 permanent jobs) Construction of mixed use, mixed income housing project with 350 market rate units, 88 affordable units and 75,000 square feet of commercial. Total development cost is \$149 million. CRA/LA investment is \$4 million.
- **Rossllyn Hotel, CD9** (163 construction jobs, 11 permanent jobs) *Renovation of historic 264-unit hotel for affordable housing and active ground floor commercial. Total development cost expected to be \$39 million. CRA/LA investment of \$5 million.*

- **Florence Mills Block, CD 9** (176 construction jobs, 13 permanent jobs) Provide acquisition and predevelopment financing to affordable mixed use housing project. Total development cost expected to be \$32 million. CRA/LA investment of \$3.1 million.

Affordable Housing (15 projects, \$321.5 million development cost, \$42.3 million CRA/LA assistance)

- **Gateways Apartments, CD 9** (156 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs)—Affordable housing project in Central City East subarea with 107 units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals. Total Development Cost: \$28,553,695 / CRA/LA Investment: \$1,000,000.
- **Dunbar Village, CD 9** (158 construction jobs/15 permanent jobs)—Rehabilitation of all three historic buildings, preserving long-term affordability and contributing to the revitalization of Central Avenue. Total Development Cost: \$29,340,179 / CRA/LA Investment: \$2,352,840.
- **Figueroa Senior Apartments, CD 9** (66 construction jobs/2 permanent jobs)—Development of 34 affordable senior apartments by Meta Housing. Total Development Cost: \$10,658,810 / CRA/LA Investment: \$700,000.
- **Gateways Transitional Housing, CD 13** (11 construction jobs/1 permanent jobs) Development of 18-bed transitional housing facility. Total Development Cost: \$3,076,640 / CRA/LA Investment: \$547,000.
- **Selma Community Housing, CD 13** (161 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs)— Development of 66 units of affordable housing by Abode Communities on a site owned by the Los Angeles Unified School District. Total Development Cost: \$ 24,892,479 / CRA/LA Investment: \$3,805,000.
- **Jefferson Boulevard & 5th Avenue Apartments, CD 10** (85 construction jobs/2 permanent jobs)— Jefferson Boulevard & 5th Avenue Apartments. Total Development Cost: \$15,399,588 / CRA/LA Investment: \$3,350,000.
- **Pacific Avenue Arts Colony, CD 15** (117 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs)— This proposed rental housing development by Meta Housing Corporation will create 48 affordable family units, one unrestricted management unit, along with other amenities such as a pocket theater, artist's studio space and activities areas. On-site arts programming will be provided. Total Development Cost: \$17,826,487 / CRA/LA Investment: \$3,380,000.
- **Osborne Apartments, CD 7** (117 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs)— Osborne Intergenerational Housing is a new construction affordable development serving very low-income and low-income residents. The project will serve a mix of large families and seniors in side-by-side buildings with distinct amenities for each resident population. The 60-unit project consists of 42 senior one-bedroom apartment units in one building and 18 two-story townhomes for large families. Total Development Cost: \$18,100,000 / CRA/LA Investment: \$4,000,000.
- **5555 Hollywood Boulevard, CD 4** (267 construction jobs/16 permanent jobs)—*Mixed use project contains affordable senior rental housing units above ground-level retail space. Total Development Cost: \$ 41,530,249 / CRA/LA Investment: \$4,680,000.*
- **Caroline Severance Manor, CD 1** (220 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs) 85 affordable family units. Approx. 56% of the units will be for supportive housing. The larger units will be in one structure along with the child care facility; smaller units will be in a second structure. Total Development Cost: \$34,062,980 / CRA/LA Investment: \$800,000.
- **Boyle Hotel, CD 14** (121 construction jobs/9 permanent jobs)— *constructed in 1889, the historic Boyle Hotel houses very low-income residents, including musicians that perform in the adjacent Mariachi Plaza. The hotel was acquired by the East LA Community Corporation (ELACC) in 2007. This project will rehabilitate the historic hotel with 31 efficiency and one-bedroom units, and build an additional 20 large family dwelling units. The project will also renovate 4,000 sf of ground floor commercial space in the hotel. Total Development Cost: \$22,370,000 / CRA/LA Investment: \$3,000,000.*
- **Canby Woods, CD 3** (157 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs) Continued construction of a 98-unit affordable senior housing development in Reseda; construction commenced in July 2011 and is approximately 25% complete. Total Development Cost: \$24,236,814 / CRA/LA Investment: \$6,300,000.
- **Sherman Village, CD 3** (161 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs) Continued construction of a 73-unit affordable family housing development in Reseda; construction commenced in March 2011 and is

ATTACHMENT F

approximately 50% complete. Total Development Cost: \$24,802,844 / CRA/LA Investment: \$4,400,000.

- **Kittridge Family Housing, CD 3** (172 construction jobs/3 permanent jobs) Development of a 77-unit affordable family housing development; Developer closed escrow on project site in November 2011 and is projected to commence construction within 12 months. Total Development Cost: \$26,588,378 / CRA/LA Investment: \$4,000,000.

Project Areas:

Laurel Canyon; North Hollywood; Pacoima/Panorama City; Adelante Eastside; Monterey Hills; Reseda/Canoga Park; East Hollywood/Beverly Normandie; Hollywood; Mid City Corridors; Pico Union 1; Pico Union 2; Westlake; Wilshire Center/Koreatown; Bunker Hill; Central Industrial; Chinatown; City Center; CD9 Corridors; Little Tokyo; Broadway/Manchester; Crenshaw; Exposition/University Park; Normandie 5; Vermont/Manchester; Watts; Watts Corridors; Western/Slauson; Beacon Street; Pacific Corridor; and LA Harbor Industrial Center

RESOLUTION

A resolution confirming that the City of Los Angeles will serve as the successor agency to The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California, under Part 1.85 of the California Redevelopment Law.

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Los Angeles, by the adoption of a Resolution on April 15, 1948, established The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California (CRA/LA) pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law (CRL) contained in the California Health & Safety Code (Section 33000 *et. seq.*) (Council File No. 32417); and

WHEREAS, CRA/LA has, since its establishment, taken various actions to, among other things, eliminate blight, develop housing opportunities for persons and families of low and moderate-income, provide assistance for community-serving commercial projects and create employment opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the California State Legislature, in conjunction with its adoption of the 2011-2012 State budget, passed Assembly Bill 1x 26 (AB 26) on June 15, 2011 and the Governor signed the bill on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, AB 26 amended various provisions of the CRL and added Parts 1.8 and 1.85 thereto which, among other things, immediately suspended most of the powers and authorities of redevelopment agencies and provides for their dissolution as of October 1, 2011; and

WHEREAS, Part 1.85 designates the city or county or city and county that created the redevelopment agency to be the "successor agency" to the dissolved redevelopment agency unless it adopts a resolution thereby electing not to be the successor agency and files a copy of such resolution with the County Auditor-Controller no later than one month prior to the effective date of that part; and

WHEREAS, the date of dissolution of redevelopment agencies was extended to February 1, 2012, and the filing date for resolutions electing not to become the successor entity was extended to January 13, 2012 as a result of the stay issued by the California Supreme Court in *California Redevelopment Association, et. al. v. Matosantos, et al.* (Case No. S1914861) and the Court's upholding of the constitutionality of AB 26; and

WHEREAS, the successor agency, under Part 1.85, is generally tasked with winding down the affairs of the former redevelopment agency, making payments and carrying out the enforceable obligations of the former redevelopment agency, disposing of agency assets and properties and remitting the proceeds and other unencumbered funds to the County Auditor-Controller for distribution to local taxing entities; and

WHEREAS, the successor agency, under Part 1.85, is vested with all of the authority, rights, powers, duties, and obligations of the former redevelopment agency under the CRL; and

WHEREAS, the successor agency, under Part 1.85, is required to become the employer of all employees of the redevelopment agency as of the date of its dissolution, subject to the terms and conditions of applicable collective bargaining agreements; and

WHEREAS, the successor agency's liability, acting under the authority provided by Part 1.85, is limited to the total amount of property taxes it receives under Part 1.85 and the value of the assets transferred to it as the successor agency to the dissolved redevelopment agency; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is desirous of the City becoming the successor agency, but only if the City is not subject to financial obligations or liabilities of CRA/LA or otherwise that are above and beyond the limitation on liability set forth in Section 34173(e) of Part 1.85 and the City does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution, to pledge any of its general fund revenues or other assets to make any of the payments required of a successor agency or to meet any of its other obligations under Part 1.85; and

WHEREAS, the City of Cerritos and the Cerritos Redevelopment Agency and a number of other cities and redevelopment agencies filed an action in Sacramento County Superior Court seeking to enjoin the implementation of most of the provisions of AB 26 and challenging the legality of the statute on various constitutional grounds (*City of Cerritos et. al. v. State of California, et. al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court No. 34-2011-80000952); and

WHEREAS, the City Council does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution or by the taking of any actions authorized hereby, to waive any of its constitutional and/or legal rights it has in regards to AB 26, and, therefore, reserves all of its rights to join the litigation filed by the City of Cerritos and/or to otherwise challenge the validity of any or all provisions of AB 26 and Parts 1.8 and 1.85 of the California Health & Safety Code in any administrative or judicial proceeding and/or repeal this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution or by taking any action authorized hereby, to waive its right to amend or repeal this Resolution should the City be required to fund obligations or liabilities of the former CRA/LA from general fund revenues above and beyond the funds provided under Part 1.85.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. The City, pursuant to Part 1.85 of the California Health & Safety Code, hereby confirms that it will serve as the successor entity to CRA/LA contingent on its

financial obligations and liabilities being limited as set forth in Section 34173(e) of the CRL.

2. The City Administrative Officer is directed to file a copy of this Resolution with the County Auditor-Controller by January 13, 2012.
3. The City Administrative Officer is hereby authorized to execute any documents and to take such other actions as necessary for the City to serve as the successor agency to CRA/LA.
4. The City Council does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution and authorizing actions hereby, to, in any way acknowledge the legal validity or enforceability of AB 26 or waive its rights to challenge the validity or enforceability of AB 26 and, therefore, reserves its rights to challenge the validity of any and all provisions of AB 26 in any administrative or judicial proceeding.
5. Should a court of competent jurisdiction determine that AB 26 is unconstitutional or otherwise illegal, and, therefore, invalid and unenforceable, as of the date that judgment, order or decree becomes final and non-appealable, this Resolution shall be deemed repealed and of no further force and effect.

RESOLUTION

A resolution adopted pursuant to Section 34173(d)(1) of the California Health & Safety Code indicating the City of Los Angeles' election not to serve as the successor agency to The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California.

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Los Angeles, by the adoption a Resolution on April 15, 1948, established The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California (CRA/LA) pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law (CRL) contained in the California Health & Safety Code (Section 33000 *et. seq.*) (Council File No. 32417); and

WHEREAS, CRA/LA has, since its establishment, taken various actions to, among other things, eliminate blight, develop housing opportunities for persons and families of low and moderate-income, provide assistance for community-serving commercial projects and create employment opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the California State Legislature, in conjunction with its adoption of the 2011-2012 State budget, passed Assembly Bill 1x 26 (AB 26) on June 15, 2011 and the Governor signed the bill on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, AB 26 amended various provisions of the CRL and added Parts 1.8 and 1.85 thereto which, among other things, immediately suspended most of the powers and authorities of redevelopment agencies and provides for their dissolution as of October 1, 2011; and

WHEREAS, AB 26 also designates the city or county or city and county that created the redevelopment agency to be the "successor agency" to the dissolved redevelopment agency unless it adopts a resolution thereby electing not to be the successor agency and files a copy of such resolution with the County Auditor-Controller no later than one month prior to the effective date of Part 1.85; and

WHEREAS, the successor agency, under AB 26, is generally tasked with winding down the affairs of the former redevelopment agency, making payments on and carrying out enforceable obligations of the former redevelopment agency, disposing of agency assets and properties and remitting the proceeds and other unencumbered funds to the County Auditor-Controller for distribution to local taxing entities; and

WHEREAS, the deadline date upon which a city, county or city and county have to elect not to serve as the successor entity and submit a duly authorized resolution to the County Auditor-Controller was extended to January 13, 2012 as a result of the stay issued by the California Supreme Court in *California Redevelopment Association, et al.*

v. Ana Matosantos, et. al. (Case No. S1914861), and the Court's upholding the constitutionality of AB 26; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of Parts 1.8 and 1.85 do not provide the City with sufficient protection against claims and liabilities as the successor agency to the CRA/LA which could result in the expenditure of City funds to meet former CRA/LA debts, liabilities and other obligations; and

WHEREAS, the City of Cerritos and the Cerritos Redevelopment Agency and a number of other cities and redevelopment agencies filed an action in Sacramento Superior Court seeking to enjoin the implementation of most of the provisions of AB 26 and challenging the legality of provisions of the statute on various constitutional grounds (*City of Cerritos, et. al. v. State of California, et. al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court No. 34-2011-80000952); and

WHEREAS, the City Council does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution or by the taking of any actions authorized hereby, to waive any of its constitutional and/or legal rights it has in regards to AB 26, and, therefore, reserves all of its rights to join the litigation filed by the City of Cerritos and/or to otherwise challenge the validity of any or all provisions of AB 26 in any administrative or judicial proceeding and/or repeal this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council does not intend, by adoption of this Resolution or by taking any action provided hereby, to waive any of its rights under Part 1.85 to adopt a resolution electing to become the successor agency.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. The City, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 34173(d)(1), hereby elects not to serve as the successor entity to CRA/LA.
2. The City Administrative Officer is directed to file a copy of this Resolution with the County Auditor-Controller by January 13, 2012.
3. The City Council does not intend, by adopting this Resolution and authorizing actions hereby, to, in any way, acknowledge the legal validity or enforceability of AB 26 or waive its rights to challenge the validity or enforceability of AB 26 and therefore reserves its rights to challenge the validity of any and all provision of AB 26 in any administrative or judicial proceeding.
4. The City Council further does not intend, by adopting this Resolution and authorizing actions thereto, to waive any of its rights under Part 1.85 to adopt a resolution electing to become the successor agency.
5. Should a court of competent jurisdiction determine that AB 26 is unconstitutional or otherwise illegal, and, therefore, invalid and

unenforceable, as of the date that judgment, order or decree becomes final and non-appealable, this Resolution shall be deemed repealed and of no further force or effect.