



Chairperson, Belinda V. Faustinos, Los Angeles County

Vice Chairperson, Bob J. Archuleta, City of Pico Rivera

Board Members:

Ronald Bates, City of Pico Rivera

Christopher Gutierrez-Lohrman, Los Angeles County Board of Education

Santos H. Kreimann, Los Angeles County

Armando V. Moreno, Los Angeles County

Vicky Santana, Los Angeles County, Rio Hondo Community College

Thursday, July 19, 2012
Regular Meeting 5:00 p.m.
Council Chambers
6615 Passons Blvd.
Pico Rivera, California

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

1st PERIOD OF PUBLIC COMMENTS: (Speakers have three (3) minutes to make their remarks on agenda items only.)

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Minutes.

Recommendation:

- Approve special meeting of Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency minutes of April 26, 2012.

2. Report on AB 1484 Changes Affecting the Oversight Board.

Recommendation:

1. Listen to presentation by the Director of Finance regarding AB 1484 changes affecting the Oversight Board. Receive and file.

3. Update on Independent Legal Counsel and Insurance.

Recommendation:

1. Receive update on Independent Legal Counsel and Insurance for the Oversight Board and give direction accordingly.

4. County Agreement.

Recommendation:

1. Request staff to work with Los Angeles County to renegotiate the pass through agreement to eliminate continued debt accumulation by the Successor Agency.

5. Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule and Administrative Budget January through June 2013.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt the resolution of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency establishing the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) and approving the Administrative Budget.

Resolution No. _____ A RESOLUTION OF THE OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PICO RIVERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 34180 AND 34177, ESTABLISHING THE RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET FOR JANUARY THROUGH JUNE 2013

ADJOURNMENT:

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

I, Anna Jerome, Assistant City Clerk, for the City of Pico Rivera, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing notice was posted at the Pico Rivera City Hall bulletin board, the Pico Rivera Post Office and Pico Rivera Parks (Pico, Smith and Rivera) and distributed to members of the media on this the 16th, day of July, 2012.

Dated this 16th, day of July, 2012



Anna M. Jerome, CMC
Assistant City Clerk

SB343 NOTICE

In compliance with and pursuant to the provisions of SB343 any public writing distributed by the City Clerk to at least a majority of the City Council Members regarding any item on this regular meeting agenda will be available on the back table at the entrance of the Council Chamber at the time of the City Council meeting and at the counter of City Hall at 6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, California during normal business hours.



Thursday, April 26, 2012

A Special Meeting of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency was held in the Council Chamber, Pico Rivera City Hall, 6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, California.

Chairperson Faustinos called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Belinda Faustinos, Chairperson

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Minutes

Boardmember Kreimann had a question regarding clarification of the ROPS, and after a brief discussion the item in question was clarified.

Motion by Vice Chairperson Archuleta, seconded by Boardmember Bates to approve Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency minutes of April 12, 2012. Motion carries by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Kreimann, Faustinos

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Moreno

2. Oversight Board Counsel.

Director of Finance Matsumoto stated that after speaking with several law firms that it would be difficult to find a qualified independent attorney who knows governments who is not conflicted and does not represent another taxing entity. He stated the law firms are recommending using the counsel for the bodies that appointed the members.

Boardmember Bates added that staff does not feel strongly about this recommendation but strongly agrees that it will be difficult to find a good qualified independent counsel who knows this area of the law. He stated that there are some possible inherent

differences between the position of the county, the city, and other taxing agencies on different issues. The challenge he stated, is to find counsel that is really independent and who could give an honest evaluation when the process has been setup to put different perspectives in conflict and at different points.

Chairperson Faustinos stated that the county counsel has responded that they plan to address this issue and make recommendations but do not have any specific names at this time to submit.

Boardmembers further discussed other counsel options, Errors & Omission Insurance, what constitutes an enforceable negotiation, interest in hearing all sides of testimony and legal advice on both sides of the arguments, if any, maintaining integrity and neutrality, providing requested documentation and to look outside the immediate area for law firms that may not be conflicted but are familiar with redevelopment laws.

Chairperson Faustinos recommended tabling the recommendation from staff and to go back to the original direction that this Board made to staff to seek independent counsel prior to the next meeting.

Director of Finance Matsumoto stated that in regard to counsel, the Board does not have to make a final determination at this point but may continue to look into the matter.

Motion by Boardmember Bates, seconded by Boardmember Moreno to continue the process set out at the prior meeting for selecting independent counsel, direct staff to work with the Chair on the selection of an attorney, and that one more option be brought back to the Oversight Board.

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Kreimann, Moreno, Faustinos

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

3. Errors and Omissions Insurance.

Director of Finance Matsumoto stated that the city's insurer confirmed that the city's appointees were covered by the city's insurance policy. The staff recommendation, he stated, is that the board members should ask the body that appointed them if they are already covered. County appointee board members indicated that they still want separate insurance and would prefer not to check with the county.

Motion by Vice Chairman Archuleta, seconded by Boardmember Moreno to continue from last meeting with getting three to four quotes for Errors and Omissions Insurance. Motion carries by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Kreimann, Moreno, Faustinos
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

4. Administrative Budget.

Jim Simons, RSG Consultant, working with the city stated that the Administrative Budget identifies the direct cost associated with the operation of the Pico Rivera Successor Agency. As required under the law, he stated, the Administrative Budget is being presented for approval. The law, he stated, establishes that the Administrative Budget must be reviewed and approved by the Oversight Board. Additionally, he stated, the law identifies an Administrative Allowance. This allowance, he stated, is determined as a percentage of the total cost that are identified on the ROPS, 5% in the first fiscal year or \$250,000 and the second year and every year thereafter is 3% or a minimum of \$250,000 a year. He further stated there is a question in the law as to whether or not the Administrative Allowance and the Administrative Budget is the same thing.

Boardmember Kreimann asked why there is a difference in the Administrative Budget and the ROP.

Director of Finance stated that the Administrative Budget is what the cost would actually be when looking at the various categories. He further stated that the city may be capped at the statutory minimum of \$250,000. In preparing the ROPS, he stated that he was not sure if the first year was 5% in 2011-2012 or 2012-2013 so he went with the higher number. The County Auditor Controller, he stated has confirmed that the first year is 2011-2012.

Boardmember Kreimann asked for further clarification with Director of Finance stating that the \$250,000 is for a 12 month period.

Chairperson Faustinos inquired if there are sufficient funds to cover the cost of the benefits and payroll taxes amount. Director of Finance Matsumoto stated that staff will recalculate the actual severance of those employees who were laid off due to the loss of redevelopment after they are off payroll.

Boardmember Moreno asked what the contracted services are for and if the contracted services includes the insurance premiums for property that is owned by the city or the redevelopment agency with Director of Finance Matsumoto stating it does not, that the city has contracted with RSG to provided assistance with administering the Successor Agency and all the filings that the city has to do and with the Oversight Board.

Boardmember Bates stated that there is money for legal services and special departmental expenses that can be reviewed for Errors & Omission Insurance that will be taken into consideration.

Boardmember Moreno asked if there is an attorney on board at this point with Mr. Matsumoto responding in the affirmative. Director Matsumoto clarified that this is the Successor Agency's budget not the Oversight Board.

Motion by Councilmember Bates, seconded by Vice Chairperson Archuleta to adopt the Resolution No. OB-01-12 of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency approving the Administrative Budget. Motion carries by the following roll call vote:

Resolution No. OB-01-12 A RESOLUTION OF THE OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PICO RIVERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 34177, APPROVING THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Kreimann, Moreno, Faustinos
NOES: None

5. Second Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule.

Director of Finance stated that at the prior Oversight Board meeting the ROPS were brought before the Board for May and June and also July through December. He stated that the Oversight Board wanted to take the minimum action possible so the May and June ROPS were approved and this is the second ROPS with a due date of April 27, 2012. He further stated that this due date is a matter of interpretation, and that the only date specified in the law is the due date for the first ROPS which was December 15, 2011 for a payment from the county, January 16, 2012. The second payment he stated will be June 1, 2012 and this will be the basis for the June 1 property taxes.

Boardmembers asked questions and held discussion regarding principle and interest, the city loan and sales tax loan, clarification regarding loan determination and draw down schedules, 1972 agreement enforceable loan and terms, difference in interest rate between 7% and 12%, when was debt obligation incurred, cited statutory Health & Safety Code 34171d(2), city's intent at time of loan agreement, what is an enforceable obligation, county's tax deferral loan, legitimate city loans, 67% county stipend, differences in the interpretation of the law, need for independent counsel and economic development of the city.

Boardmember Kreimann amended the motion to remove the payments of loans, line items 4 and 5, until the Board is able to review all the documentation in order to make a determination if the loan is part of the 1972 agreement and to recalculate the interest rate to reflect the 7% interest rate.

Director of Finance Matsumoto stated that the city's attorney was available to answer any questions that the Board may have.

City Attorney Scott Nichols stated that he has reviewed all the documents and looked at the statute. He stated the statute reads "loan agreement entered into" it doesn't say funded or loan made or money borrowed. He further stated that his interpretation of that, the plain meaning of the statute, is that you entered into the agreement to make a loan; it doesn't have anything to do when the loan is made. The 1972 agreement, he stated, was within the two year time limit, the loan agreement was entered into between the parties and in his opinion feels that it is sufficient to cover all the loans that were made. He further explained that there are two exceptions to the enforceable obligation. If the city agency agreements are deemed invalid, he stated, and there are two exceptions, the one is entered into at the time the bonds are issued and used to pay the bonds or security to pay the bonds. The other exception, he stated, which is the one the Board is talking about, is with a loan agreement entered into within two years of the formation of the agency. The debt, he stated, that the Board is talking about qualifies under that section. City Attorney Nichols read the statute from AB26.

Motion by Boardmember Bates, seconded by Vice Chairperson Archuleta to adopt the resolution of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency establishing the Second Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) subject to the approval by the Los Angeles County Auditor and the State Department of Finance, and bring back at a subsequent meeting with additional information including the information supplied by the Department of Finance or the

County Controller with the original principal of the amount, and the original date, and based upon the legal representation of City Attorney Scott Nichols. Motion failed.

Resolution No. OB-05-12 A RESOLUTION OF THE OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PICO RIVERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 34180, ESTABLISHING THE SECOND RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman
NOES: Kreimann, Moreno, Faustinos

Motion by Boardmember Kreimann, seconded by Boardmember Moreno to approve the ROPS with the additions that have been suggested and eliminate the payment of loan line items 4 and 5, but leave 4 and 5 as line items.

Director of Finance Matsumoto suggested approving the ROPS as is, subject to the approval by the Department of Finance and the Los Angeles County Controller, and direct staff to only pay the bonds, the administrative cost, and the insurance without further direction from the Oversight Board. Chairperson Faustinos added that the Oversight Board not authorize payment until such time that the Board has determined that a loan agreement was constituted.

Boardmember Bates made a substitute motion to add Chairperson Faustino's suggestion.

Boardmember Kreimann directed his comments to City Attorney Nichols stating that when the Board submits the ROP to the Department of Finance and they approve it, and the Auditor Controller approves it, at that point there will be a distribution. The obligation and the conditions that are being set are irrelevant, he stated, because it won't come back to the Board, because once we approve it, it moves forward. City Attorney Nichols stated that the ROPS is approved by the Board but it is reviewed by the Department of Finance and audited by the County Auditor Controller, so if the Board imposes a condition, your own condition on the ROPS it is valid. Mr. Nichols stated that it is really the Boards ROPS but is subject to review by other agencies. Boardmember Kreimann stated that the motion is that once it goes through the process, how does it get back to the Board to approve that particular payment. City Attorney Nichols stated when the ROPS is approved, the county if they have no questions, will then distribute the tax trust fund into the city's tax fund, but the Board has composed a

condition that staff is not authorized to spend any of the money for the city obligations. Other than the debt service payment, the administrative expenses and so forth, he stated, there is no authorization to make expenditures; the Board has the authority to do that.

Motion by Boardmember Bates, seconded by Vice Chairperson Archuleta to approve as is subject to the approval of the State Department of Finance and the County Auditor Controller of Los Angeles and direct staff to only pay the bonds, the administrative cost and insurance without further approval by this Oversight Board, based upon legal representation of City Attorney Nichols and that the Oversight Board not authorize payment until such time that the Board has determined that a loan agreement was constituted. Motion carries by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Faustinos
NOES: Kreimann
ABSTAIN: Moreno

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Faustinos adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m. There being no objection is was so ordered.

AYES: Archuleta, Bates, Gutierrez-Lohrman, Kreimann, Moreno, Faustinos
NOES: None

Chairperson, Belinda Faustinos

ATTEST:

Anna M. Jerome, Assistant City Clerk

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct report of the proceedings of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency special meeting dated April 26, 2012 and approved by the Oversight Board on July 19, 2012.

Anna M. Jerome, Assistant City Clerk



To: Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera
Redevelopment Agency

From: Director of Finance

Meeting Date: July 19, 2012

Subject: REPORT ON AB 1484 CHANGES AFFECTING THE
OVERSIGHT BOARD

Recommendation:

Listen to presentation by the Director of Finance regarding AB 1484 changes affecting the Oversight Board. Receive and file.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Discussion:

On June 28, 2012, the Governor of California signed AB 1484 which changed and clarified several areas in the Dissolution Act. Some of the provisions affect the Oversight Board, and the Director of Finance will provide a brief summary of those changes.

Michael Matsumoto
Director of Finance

MM



To: Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera
Redevelopment Agency

From: Director of Finance

Meeting Date: July 19, 2012

Subject: UPDATE ON INDEPENDENT LEGAL COUNSEL AND
INSURANCE

Recommendation:

Receive update on Independent Legal Counsel and Insurance for the Oversight Board and give direction accordingly.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Discussion:

At the April 26, 2012 Oversight Board Meeting, the Oversight Board requested the Director of Finance work with the Oversight Board Chair to look into Independent Legal Counsel and Insurance for the Oversight Board.

Insurance

We solicited bids from five insurance carriers, but only one provided a quote. The Successor Agency is in the process of binding coverage, and we anticipate coverage will be obtained by the end of July.

Independent Legal Counsel

At the request of the Oversight Board, we inquired of several firms regarding qualified independent counsel. Several law firms informed us that many of the large firms will be conflicted because they represent one of the taxing entities. Likely we would have to use a smaller law firm or a law firm serving outside of the Los Angeles area. One option

suggested was to have each Board Member consult with the attorney for the body that appointed them.

With the adoption of AB 1484, there may be less need for independent counsel because many ambiguities in the law have been resolved. AB 1484 provides that Oversight Boards have the right to request independent counsel, but we want to point out that this Successor Agency does not have sufficient revenues to cover the statutory minimum for administrative costs.



Michael Matsumoto
Director of Finance

MM



To: Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera
Redevelopment Agency

From: Director of Finance

Meeting Date: July 19, 2012

Subject: COUNTY AGREEMENT

Recommendation:

Request staff to work with Los Angeles County to renegotiate the pass through agreement to eliminate continued debt accumulation by the Successor Agency.

Fiscal Impact:

The goal is to revise the operation of the Successor Agency to eliminate continued future borrowing.

Discussion:

On June 28, 2011, the Governor of California signed ABx1 26 which dissolves all California redevelopment agencies unless certain payments were made that reduce the State's deficit. Effective February 1, 2012, all redevelopment agencies in California were dissolved, and the City is now acting as the Successor Agency to manage and curtail the operation of the dissolved Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency.

The purpose of the Dissolution Act is to wind down the affairs of the Redevelopment Agency. Health and Safety Codes Section 34177(h) directs the Successor Agency to expeditiously wind down the affairs of the Redevelopment Agency.

Currently, the Successor Agency continues to increase debt each year. Under existing agreements, the County continues to loan money under the deferral obligations and the City continues to loan sales tax. These loans solve the cash flow problem, but the Successor Agency continues to increase outstanding debt.

OVERSIGHT BOARD AGENDA MEMO – MTG. OF 7/19/12

Renegotiate County Agreement

Page 2

Health and Safety Code Section 34181(e) provides the Oversight Board with the power to determine when contracts should be renegotiated or terminated. The Oversight Board may request the County renegotiate the Pass Through Agreement with the Successor Agency to achieve fiscal stability without continuing to incur debt.



Michael Matsumoto

Director of Finance

MM



To: Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera
Redevelopment Agency

From: Director of Finance

Meeting Date: July 19, 2012

Subject: RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE AND
ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET JANUARY THROUGH JUNE
2013

Recommendation:

Adopt the resolution of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency establishing the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) and approving the Administrative Budget.

Fiscal Impact:

The full fiscal impact is unknown, but funding is needed to cover obligations through June 2013. The primary obligation is the June 1, 2013 bond payment of \$1,117,725.

Discussion:

On June 28, 2011, the Governor of California signed ABx1 26 which dissolves all California redevelopment agencies unless certain payments were made that reduce the State's deficit. Effective February 1, 2012, all redevelopment agencies in California were dissolved, and the City is now acting as the Successor Agency to manage and curtail the operation of the dissolved Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency.

Requirement

Health and Safety Code Section 34177(l) requires the Successor Agency to prepare a ROPS showing all the obligations of the former Redevelopment Agency and the sources of funds for the repayments, and the ROPS was approved by the City as Successor Agency June 26, 2012. According to the newly adopted Health and Safety Code Section 34177(m), the ROPS must be approved by the Oversight Board by September 1, 2012. Also, the ROPS

OVERSIGHT BOARD AGENDA MEMO – MTG. OF 7/19/12

Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule

Page 2

was submitted to the County Administrative Officer, the County Auditor-Controller, and the State Department of Finance at the same time it is being presented to the Oversight Board.

Health and Safety Code Section 34177(j) requires the Successor Agency to prepare an Administrative Budget and submit it to the Oversight Board for approval. The Administrative Budget is for a six month period. While there may not be funding for all of the administrative costs, these costs are included on the ROPS.

The items on the ROPS are substantially the same as those included on the prior ROPS approved by the Oversight Board on April 26, 2012; however, line item #4 was revised to correct for an error in the interest rate used. The Department of Finance approved the ROPS for July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012, and the County paid the Successor Agency \$1,326,982.

If the property taxes are similar to the June 1, 2012 payment, the \$1,327,000 that we should receive on January 2, 2013 should cover 1) the June 1, 2013 bond payment of \$1,117,725 and 2) \$209,275 of other items (perhaps a portion of the administrative costs).



Michael Matsumoto
Director of Finance

MM

Attachment 1: Resolution establishing the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) and Administrative Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PICO RIVERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 34180 AND 34177, ESTABLISHING THE RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET FOR JANUARY THROUGH JUNE 2013

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2011, the Governor of California signed ABx1 26 which added Health and Safety Code Section 34169; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34177(l), successor agencies are required to adopt recognized obligation payment schedules every six months; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34177(l), the recognized obligation payment schedules are designed to cover six month periods; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34177(j), successor agencies are required to submit an administrative budget to the Oversight Board; and

WHEREAS, the State Department of Finance approved the prior recognized obligation payment schedule; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34177(m), the Oversight Board must establish the recognized obligation payment schedule by September 1, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the recognized obligation payment schedule is needed, so the County can properly disburse property taxes on January 2, 2013;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Pico Rivera Redevelopment Agency, California as follows:

SECTION 1. The Oversight Board establishes the recognized obligation payment schedule (Attachment A) subject to the approval of the State Department of Finance and the County of Los Angeles.

SECTION 2. Staff are directed to post the recognized obligation payment schedule on the website and submit the recognized obligation payment schedule as required by law.

SECTION 3. The Oversight Board approves the Administrative Budget (Attachment B) that is also included on the recognized obligation payment schedule..

SECTION 4. The City Clerk of the City of Pico Rivera shall attest to the passage of this Resolution and it shall be in full force and effect.

Resolution No. _____
Page 2 of 2

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of July 2012.

ATTEST:

OVERSIGHT BOARD

Anna Jerome, Assistant City Clerk

Belinda Faustinos, Chairperson

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE JANUARY TO JUNE 2013
Approved June 26, 2012 - Per AB 26 - Section 34167 and 34169 (*)

Project Name / Debt Obligation	Payee	Description	Source of Payment	Total Outstanding Debt or Obligation	Total Due During Fiscal Year	Payments by month						Total	
						Jan13	Feb	Mar	April	May	June 2013		
1) 2001 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds	U.S. Bank	Bonds issued to fund projects	Property Tax & Sales Tax	58,693,350.00	3,348,075.00								
2) Loan from Low and Mod Hsg.	Low and Mod. Housing Fund	5/2010 loan for SERAF	Property Tax	1,667,786.00	0.00								
3) Loan from Low and Mod Hsg.	Low and Mod. Housing Fund	5/2011 loan for SERAF	Property Tax	343,368.00	0.00								
4) City Loan entered into on 18-Dec-1972	City of Pico Rivera	Loan for Redevelopment *	Property Tax ***	42,360,508.00	1,925,478.00	962,739.00							\$ 962,739.00
5) City Loan entered into on 18-Dec-1972	City of Pico Rivera	Sales Tax Loan - for CRA Bond coverage	Property Tax ***	52,144,199.00	2,890,428.00	1,445,214.00							\$ 1,445,214.00
6) Administrative Budget	City of Pico Rivera	Payroll and other administrative costs	Property Tax	250,000.00	250,000.00	41,667.00		41,666.00	41,667.00				\$ 41,666.00
7) Retiree Medical Obligations	Employees and retirees	Unfunded Retiree Medical Obligations **	Property Tax	151,750.00	0.00								\$ -
8) Unfunded Pension Obligations	CalPERS	Unfunded Pension Obligations	Property Tax	403,550.00	0.00								\$ -
9) Insurance and maintenance - Agency	CJPIA and others	Insurance and maintenance - Agency pro	Property Tax	600,000.00	60,000.00	5,000.00		5,000.00	5,000.00				\$ 5,000.00
10) Deferral of Pass Through Payments	County	Deferral of Pass Through Payments	Property Tax	80,000,000.00	0.00								\$ -
11)													\$ -
12)													\$ -
13)													\$ -
14)													\$ -
15)													\$ -
16)													\$ -
17)													\$ -
18)													\$ -
19)													\$ -
20)													\$ -
21)													\$ -
22)													\$ -
23)													\$ -
24)													\$ -
25)													\$ -
26)													\$ -
27)													\$ -
28)													\$ -
29)													\$ -
Totals - This Page				\$ 236,614,513.00	\$ 8,473,981.00	\$ 2,454,620.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 46,666.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 1,164,391.00	\$ 3,805,678.00	
Totals - Page 2				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Totals - Page 3				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Totals - Page 4				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Totals - Other Obligations				\$ 132,000,000.00	\$ 5,400,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,700,000.00	\$ 2,700,000.00	
Grand total - All Pages				\$ 368,614,513.00	\$ 13,873,981.00	\$ 2,454,620.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 46,666.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 46,667.00	\$ 3,864,391.00	\$ 6,505,678.00	

* The City Loan balance was reduced to correct for errors in the interest rate (proper rate was 7%).
 ** The Retiree Medical Obligations were reduced to correct for an error in prior ROPs amounts.
 *** Though the City loans are shown, there has not been sufficient money to make the 1/1/12 or 7/1/12 payments. We do not anticipate sufficient money to make the 1/1/13 payments.
 **** Several obligations do not have set repayment schedules, so no amounts are listed for the months covered by this statement. At some point, the repayment terms will have to be determined.

PICO RIVERA SUCCESSOR AGENCY
 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET
 For 2012-13

<u>Expense Category</u>	<u>Six Months January - June 2013 Proposed</u>
<u>Salaries & Wages</u>	
Salaries	83,600
Benefits and payroll taxes	41,376
TOTAL	124,976
<u>Maintenance & Operation</u>	
Postage	5,000
Departmental Supplies	12,000
Printing & Duplicating	5,000
Special Dept Expense	12,000
Contracted Services	120,000
Legal Services	60,000
TOTAL	214,000
<u>Capital Outlay</u>	
Furniture & Equipment	-
TOTAL	-
<u>In excess of \$250,000 Statutory Minimum</u>	(88,976)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	250,000

Proposed Sources of Payments H&S Code 34177

Administrative Cost Allowance - unable to determine how much we will receive.
 County Deferral
 Property Tax Trust Fund
 City of Pico Rivera