



## CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** January 7, 2014  
**To:** Honorable Mayor & City Council  
**From:** Mahdi Aluzri, Assistant City Manager  
**Subject:** League Membership Dues for Calendar Year 2014 Including the Voluntary Surcharge  
**Attachments:** Invoice and Background information from the League of California Cities

---

### INTRODUCTION

This report transmits information on the annual League of California Cities membership dues for the City set at \$11,736 and the additional litigation surcharge of 10% (\$1,173.60). Unless the Council directs otherwise, staff intends to go ahead and include the voluntary surcharge payment with the annual membership fee.

### DISCUSSION

Like most of the approximately 485 cities in California, Beverly Hills is member of the League of California Cities, an organization that actively works in concert with cities, partners and coalition members in protecting local control through advocacy and education. The amount of membership dues are based on the City population and for Beverly Hills the annual fee for 2014 is \$11,736. The League was instrumental in the passing of proposition 1A and 22 which provided much needed protection of local revenue from being diverted to the State during fiscal crisis. This year the League is asking for an optional litigation surcharge of 10% to continue its effort to secure meaningful constitutional protection of city revenues.

Staff believes that the additional surcharge is well worth the investment and will result in greater returns through continued efforts of protecting local control.

### FISCAL IMPACT

The surcharge will result in an additional \$1,173.60 in dues for a total of \$12,909.60. The amount is covered in the Policy and Management Department FY13-14 budget.

Meeting Date: January 7, 2014

**RECOMMENDATION**

This report is for information only.



---

Jeff Kolin

Approved By

# **Attachment 1**

# INVOICE



1400 K Street, Sacramento, California 95814  
Phone: 916.658.8200; Fax: 916.658.8240  
[www.cacities.org](http://www.cacities.org)

---

To: City Manager  
City of Beverly Hills  
455 N. Rexford Drive  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Invoice: 136580

Terms: Jan. 31, 2014

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Dec. 6, 2013	Membership dues for calendar year 2014	\$11,736.00
	Optional litigation surcharge (10%)	\$1,173.60
	<b>Total Amount</b>	<b>\$12,909.60</b>
	City of Beverly Hills	
	Official Population 34,494	

---

## Strategic Priorities for 2014

- Provide new options for infrastructure investment and economic development;
- Expand reform of pension and other post-employment benefits (OPEB) policies to better contain long-term costs; and
- Build effective partnerships to help respond to growing community needs.

*Our mission is to expand and protect local control for cities through education and advocacy to enhance the quality of life for all Californians.*


---

League Membership - Your Best Investment

[www.cacities.org](http://www.cacities.org)

**Please make checks payable to  
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES  
and mail to the Sacramento address above.**

December 6, 2013



**TO:** City Managers and City Clerks in non-manager cities

**FROM:** Officers of the League of California Cities  
José Cisneros, President, and Treasurer of San Francisco  
Tony Ferrara, First Vice-President, and Mayor of Arroyo Grande  
Katherine Miller, Second Vice-President, and Council Member of Stockton  
Bill Bogaard, Past President, and Mayor of Pasadena  
Chris McKenzie, Executive Director

**SUBJECT:** League Dues for 2014 – No Increase!  
Voluntary Surcharge to Support Vital Litigation

Thank you for your City's membership in the League of California Cities. We understand the City's financial resources are precious and value your commitment to keep the League strong now, and into the future.

### **League Membership – A Great Investment**

Enclosed is your city's 2014 dues statement and related supporting documentation. The value your city derives from membership in the League of California Cities makes the payment of League dues a wise investment. Please review the enclosed customized "Return on Investment" report for your city. It reflects financial benefits your city enjoys as a direct result of the League's legislative and ballot measure advocacy. A strong and effective League is central to your city's strength and vitality. For the sixth consecutive year League dues remain unchanged. Coinciding with this period, the League also has experienced a reduction in revenue from conference registrations and from other major revenue sources. Like many cities, League revenues are 24 percent lower today than in 2007.

### **Annual Report – Benefits of Membership**

The League is the leading voice for California cities. Working in concert with cities, partners, and coalition members, protecting local control through advocacy and education remains the cornerstone of League activities. The enclosed 2013 Annual Report highlights significant strategies, activities and advocacy made possible because of continuing commitments from cities like yours.

### **Voluntary Litigation Surcharge – Defending Local Control**

The League and city officials have invested tremendous human and financial resources over the past decade to secure meaningful constitutional protection of city revenue sources. Proposition 1A and Proposition 22 represent the will of the voters and significant victories for local control. However, the work is not over. When legislation is enacted that erodes these revenue protections and other constitutional authority of cities, defending and enforcing these protections can require litigation as a last resort.

*Our mission is to expand and protect local control for cities  
through education and advocacy to enhance the quality of life for all Californians.*

An example is the enactment last session of SB 7 (Steinberg) which severely undermines the constitutionally-protected powers of charter cities over public works contracts and opens the door to further legislative intrusion into charter city affairs. These concerns have led to the League's Legal Advocacy Committee (LAC) to unanimously recommend that the League strongly consider playing a key role in potential litigation brought by cities to challenge this legislation. The LAC consists of 24 city attorneys from across the state, representing large and smaller general law and charter cities. This type of legislation is an example of where the litigation surcharge will help the League when it becomes necessary to defend the protections granted to cities by the California Constitution.

Currently in *League of California Cities v. Matasantos*, the League is challenging the unconstitutional "claw-back" penalties in the AB 1484 budget trailer bill that put city sales and property tax revenues at risk as violating Proposition 1A and Proposition 22. A decision from the court is expected by early 2014. Although the case involves redevelopment dissolution, AB 1484 represents a continuing effort by the Legislature to weaken the hard-fought protections gained through Propositions 1A and 22. The outcome of this case is of importance to all California cities.

This vital defensive strategy is expensive, but essential. Implementing this strategy is conducted at greatly reduced cost and effort when the League coordinates efforts or serves as the lead plaintiff on behalf of member cities. The alternative would be for each city or *ad hoc* groupings of cities to initiate separate lawsuits. Through the League, cities can leverage their membership and resources to challenge the state whenever it attempts to weaken the important local revenue protections and authority California cities have worked so hard to achieve and maintain.

Recognizing the increasingly important role litigation serves for the League, the board of directors is again asking that each city consider paying an optional surcharge equal to ten percent of the League dues. Last year approximately 50 percent of member cities paid the optional surcharge, which help support vital on-going litigation.

The 2014 recommended surcharge is shown on the enclosed invoice. The recommended surcharge is optional; a city may pay the base dues and enjoy all the benefits of membership. However, the board of directors sincerely hopes you will support this funding option because of the tremendous value a coordinated strategy and united front brings to your city and all cities throughout the state.

### **Conclusion – California Cities Work Together**

Through the League, all cities and all city officials have the opportunity to help shape solutions to the issues of greatest importance to our cities and the state of California. Working together, we pursue those solutions most effectively. It is important for cities to act energetically, in unison, and with renewed focus to amplify our voice in key statewide policy matters.

The board of directors encourages your enthusiastic support of and participation in the League of California Cities in 2014. We look forward to continuing our fight together to protect local control and help you provide outstanding service to the residents of your great city.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact Norman Coppinger, Director of Administrative Services, at [ncoppinger@cacities.org](mailto:ncoppinger@cacities.org) or 916-658-8277.

Enclosures: Dues invoice  
Return on Investment Report  
2013 Annual Report

LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES

**LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP -- A GREAT INVESTMENT**

Customized Return on Investment Report  
December 2013

<b>BEVERLY HILLS</b>	<b>FY2005-06</b>	<b>FY2006-07</b>	<b>FY2007-08</b>	<b>FY2008-09</b>	<b>FY2009-10</b>	<b>FY2010-11</b>	<b>FY2011-12</b>	<b>FY2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>Total</b>
BEVERLY HILLS's Dues	10,937	11,394	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,736	104,483
VLF/Property Tax Swap <sup>(1)</sup>	115,959	290,612	555,160	1,031,721	1,364,662	1,411,524	1,346,636	1,388,994	1,606,728	9,111,997
Prop. 42 (local streets)	160,363	263,053	0	310,062	340,357	∅	∅	∅	∅	1,073,834
HUTA state taking blocked					583,623	∅	∅	∅	∅	583,623
HUTA and Prop. 42 protected by Prop. 22 <sup>(2)</sup>						816,335	1,011,863	848,255	1,060,260	3,736,714
Property Tax loan securitized / prohibited by Prop. 22 <sup>(3)</sup>					3,571,960					3,571,960
VLF shift prohibited by Prop. 22 <sup>(4)</sup>						147,247				147,247
SB89 VLF Shift							-127,784	-125,085	-127,471	-380,340
Redevelopment TI protected by Prop. 22						0				0
Redevelopment Disolution (net of ROPS) <sup>(5)</sup>							>>>	0	<<<	0
<b>Total Return</b>	<b>276,322</b>	<b>553,665</b>	<b>555,160</b>	<b>1,341,782</b>	<b>5,860,602</b>	<b>2,375,106</b>	<b>2,230,715</b>	<b>2,112,164</b>	<b>2,539,517</b>	<b>17,845,035</b>
<b>Rate of Return</b>	<b>25:1</b>	<b>49:1</b>	<b>47:1</b>	<b>114:1</b>	<b>499:1</b>	<b>202:1</b>	<b>190:1</b>	<b>180:1</b>	<b>216:1</b>	<b>171:1</b>

1. Net gain in revenues by virtue of the VLF/Property Tax Swap. Growth in PropTax in Lieu of VLF versus estimated growth in VLF had it remained.
2. Prop. 22 ended the Legislature's ability to borrow or delay HUTA and Prop. 42 gas tax funds.
3. Prop. 22 ended the Legislature's ability to borrow local property taxes. The FY09-10 loan was securitized. Under Prop1A('04) another borrowing could have occurred in 3 years.
4. Prop. 22 ended the Legislature's ability to shift revenue allocations from the 0.65% state Vehicle License Fee.
5. Actual redevelopment TI from RPTTF returned to affected taxing agencies other than the city through Sept 2013.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

*Our mission is to expand and protect local control for cities through education and advocacy  
to enhance the quality of life for all Californians.*



# League of California Cities<sup>®</sup> 2013 Annual Report

*Setting Our Course*



# League of California Cities 2013 Annual Report



Stepping back to evaluate successes and challenges is part of planning for the future, especially for an organization like the League of California Cities® with a 115 year history. The League took this approach through its Task Force on Strategic Initiatives<sup>1</sup>, comprising city officials from its 16 regional divisions, City Managers' Department and City Attorneys' Department. The League Board of Directors formally adopted the Task Force's *Multi-Year Advocacy Strategies to Expand and Protect Local Control* in April 2013. This plan not only set the League's course for 2013 but also established a five-year, multi-faceted organizational roadmap.

The adopted strategy focuses on:

- Expanding the involvement of city officials who form the cornerstone of the League's political strength;
- Building and maintaining constructive relationships with legislators;
- Holding current and potential legislators accountable by publishing an annual legislative vote record and engaging legislators and candidates for open legislative seats during upcoming elections;
- Conducting outreach to the Governor and officials in his Administration;
- Partnering with other organizations representing local government and business interests, where possible, to protect local authority and expand funding options;
- Litigating to defend core local control and revenues; and
- Using the initiative process when necessary to protect or enhance local authority and funding.



November 2012 brought a class of legislators to the Capitol who were elected under redistricting, a top-two primary system and revised term limits that allow legislators to serve 12 years total either in one house or a combination of both. Nine are alumni of the League's prestigious California Civic Leadership Institute®, an educational program for local government elected officials who are interested in running for the Legislature. These developments may improve local accountability and provide an opportunity for legislators to cultivate deeper policy expertise, leading to better legislative outcomes for cities.

Starting in early January in an effort to strengthen relationships, individual city officials, the League's officers, members of the Board of Directors and lobbyists spent considerable time meeting with legislators, their staff and key Administration personnel. As elements of a longer-term League investment, the results of this work must be evaluated over a number of years.

<sup>1</sup> The Task Force met between late 2012 and early 2013.



## Legislative Advocacy

Overall, the League experienced a successful year. While dealing with hundreds of bills during the session, the League sponsored legislation, as well as stopped or obtained significant amendments to many others affecting local control and revenues.

Regrettably, Gov. Jerry Brown failed to veto some legislation opposed by the League. However, he approved 85 percent of the League-supported legislation that made it to his desk. In total, the Governor's actions matched the League's request 64 percent of the time on priority bills.

### Protecting Municipal Affairs

Consistent with its mission, the League vigilantly defends municipal authority to ensure that cities remain empowered to make decisions reflecting their local priorities. This is seldom an easy task. Legislation can be politically charged, backed by special interests and drafted without regard to local impacts. Battles this year covered issues that can be highly emotional, including big box stores, prevailing wages, public safety employee benefits, collective bargaining, contracting and homeless rights.

Whatever the issue, the League carefully takes positions that demonstrate the policies adopted by its diverse Policy Committees and Board of Directors. These positions incorporate the variety of circumstances in the state and consistently reflect local realities.

Several bills this session illustrated this dynamic. Positive outcomes for cities included the defeat of AB 667 (Hernández) and AB 1373 (Pérez) to preserve local authority and revenues. Negatives included the Governor's signature on SB 7 (Steinberg) and SB 311 (Padilla), which undermine charter city authority.

### Economic Development

Many legislators sponsored measures to address aspects of redevelopment dissolution. The League successfully advocated for AB 440 (Gatto) to restore "Polanco Act" brownfield authority to cities and counties. Another success came with the defeat on the Senate Floor of SB 673 (DeSaulnier), which would have stalled commercial development projects. The Governor also signed AB 576 (V. Manuel Pérez), a measure that will strengthen California's economy and business climate by creating a multi-agency team to reduce criminal tax evasion associated with the state's underground economy.

### Preserving Ballot Advocacy Authority

Partnering with the California State Association of Counties and other local government groups, the League helped obtain significant amendments to SB 594 (Hill), a gut-and-amend measure that would have restricted organizations like the League from advocating and spending non-public funds on ballot measures. The bill passed after amendments were made that embody the League's commitment to transparency and disclosure and retained the ability to be active in state ballot measure campaigns to protect local funds and services.

### Land Use and Housing

The elimination of the tax-increment finance tool created significant challenges for local governments. Signed by the Governor, League-sponsored SB 684 (Hill) helps cities by clarifying that existing outdoor advertising in former redevelopment areas can continue. In addition, the Governor signed several positive housing bills for cities this year. With the signing of AB 639 (John A. Pérez), voters will be able to consider a measure to provide flexibility for \$600 million in unspent veterans' housing bond authority.



## Strong Membership

The League's strength derives from its membership. With 97 percent of California cities participating in 2013, the organization is powerful. At the 2013 League General Assembly, 359 cities registered voting delegates to cast ballots on resolutions at the 2013 League General Assembly. In addition, approximately 250 cities helped the League shape state-wide policy affecting cities as members of one of the League's eight standing policy committees. Looking ahead to 2014, the League expects a number of non-member cities to rejoin.



## Goals Set for 2014

The League Board of Directors met Nov. 6 – 8 with the leadership of the Divisions, Departments, Policy Committees and Caucuses to establish and adopt the following 2014 League Strategic Goals:

- Provide New Options for Infrastructure Investment and Economic Development;
- Expand Reform of Pension and Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Policies to Better Contain Long-Term Costs; and
- Build Effective Partnerships to Help Respond to Growing Community Needs.

The enactment of AB 532 (Gordon) means unused Housing Trust Fund Program money will remain available to California's most needy residents. Working collaboratively with Assembly Member Luis Alejo on AB 325, the League achieved a compromise that resulted in less risk of legal challenges on affordable housing projects for cities.



### Public Safety

The League effectively advocated on public safety issues this year. Since the implementation of realignment, county jails have had to house more offenders who previously would have been incarcerated in state prison. Signed by the Governor, League-supported AB 986 (Bradford) is a positive step toward restoring a meaningful deterrent for offenders under post-release community supervision, without sending them back to state prison. The League supported the Governor's effort to accommodate state prisoners at additional facilities rather than release them to comply with federal court overcrowding reduction thresholds.

Additionally, the League also helped re-buff several legislative efforts to establish a statewide regulatory scheme for medical marijuana, which contained insufficient protections for local authority and public safety safeguards.



## Legal Advocacy

### Redevelopment Litigation

Originally filed on behalf of member cities in the Sacramento County Superior Court in September 2012, *League of California Cities v. Ana Matosantos, et al.*, challenged AB 1484 (2012), the redevelopment dissolution "clean-up" bill. The court in July 2013 declined to rule on the case's merits because the State Department of Finance had yet to invoke the law's clawback penalties. The League filed a motion for reconsideration. The court granted the League's motion and ordered additional briefing with new evidence, which has been completed. A ruling is expected on the matter by early 2014.

### Legal Advocacy Committee

Member cities may request League support in cases in which they are parties if statewide interests are at stake. Between November 2012 and October 2013, the League's Legal Advocacy Committee reviewed 52 cases and approved "friend of the court" participation in 45 cases. The committee also reviewed and made recommendations in eight requests for formal review and input from the California Attorney General regarding questions on which formal opinions will be prepared.




## Education

Nearly 4,000 city officials participated in League programming in person or via webinar in 2013. The League launched its first mobile app to help the more than 1,700 attendees from 389 cities effectively navigate the 2013 Annual Conference & Expo in Sacramento. Two of this year's premiere events sold out for the first time since the Great Recession: the New Mayors and Council Members' Academy, and the City Managers' Department Meeting. The City Attorneys' Spring Conference also had record attendance.



## Communications

Keeping member cities apprised of developments in Sacramento is a crucial League function. This work involves a variety of channels including the website ([www.cacities.org](http://www.cacities.org)), the almost-daily e-newsletter *CA Cities Advocate*, the *Local News Round-Up* (a daily collection of articles of interest to cities), *Western City* magazine, Facebook, Twitter and professional Listservs. The League will expand its use of video and social media platforms in 2014 to communicate its positions on legislation and other policy proposals, inform the membership and continue telling the city story.



1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 658-8200 | [www.cacities.org](http://www.cacities.org)

 [www.facebook.com/leagueofcacities](http://www.facebook.com/leagueofcacities)

 Follow @CaCities and @CaCitiesLearn