

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD
REQUEST FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACTION
For Inclusion on Board Agenda

_____ Resolution or Ordinance (Blue) _____ *Waiver of First Requested*
 x Recommendations of Boards, Commissions & Committees (Green)
_____ Other Business (Pink)

TO: PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: Scott Niehaus, Village Manager

DATE: August 25, 2019 (COW)(B of T) September 5, 2019

TITLE: Long Range Plan (LRP) Reserve Fund – Policy Options

SUBMITTED BY: Timothy Sexton, Director of Finance

BACKGROUND/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The Finance and Administration Committee reviewed the attached memo at their meeting on August 14, 2019. The Committee prefers Option 1 – Mirror Policy on Year-End Revenues Over Expenditures (Waterfall) because it will help pay down pension liabilities and provide some flexibility for the future if needed.

The Finance and Administration Committee voted 5-1 to recommend that the Village Board of Trustees approve the proposed distribution of the \$1.15 million balance in the LRP Fund through the Waterfall (per Year-End General Fund Reserve Maintenance Policy) for the 2019 LRP amount.

Review (as necessary):

Village Attorney X _____	Date _____
Finance Director X  _____	Date <u>8/28/19</u>
Village Manager X _____	Date _____

NOTE: All materials must be submitted to and approved by the Village Manager's Office by 12:00 noon, Wednesday, prior to the Agenda Distribution.



MEMORANDUM

To: Finance and Administration Committee
 From: Timothy Sexton, Director of Finance
 Date: July 12, 2019
 Subject: Long Range Plan (LRP) Reserve Fund – Policy Options

At the September 2018 F&A Committee meeting, staff introduced the discussion on the use of the funds in the LRP Reserve Fund. There were a number of potential options that were outlined, and at that time the Committee recommendation was to put all of the funds in the LRP, up through the 2018 amount, through the waterfall. This resulted in \$1,257,528 being put through the waterfall, with the Building Reserve Fund and the Pensions each receiving \$628,764.

Including the amount of Revenues over Expenditures from 2016 through 2018, and last year's LRP amount, over \$9.9 million has been put into the waterfall, with the \$3.4 million being put into the Building Reserve Fund, and \$2.4 million being distributed directly to the Pension Funds. This has resulted in lower annual contributions to the pension funds of approximately \$120,000 each year for the next 20 years.

	YE 2016 Waterfall	YE 2017 Waterfall	2017&2018 LRP Distribution	YE 2018 Waterfall	Cumulative
Emergency Revenue	\$ 1,786,727.45	\$ 46,312.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,833,039.95
Building Pension	\$ 1,119,422.67	\$ 920,634.43	\$ 628,764.00	\$ 750,000.00	\$ 3,418,821.10
	\$ 1,119,422.67	\$ 920,634.43	\$ 628,764.00	\$ 750,000.00	\$ 3,418,821.10
	\$ 5,276,282.00	\$ 1,920,000.01			\$ 9,953,810.01
	YE 2016 Waterfall	YE 2017 Waterfall	2017&2018 LRP Distribution	YE 2018 Waterfall	Total
IMRF: 20%	\$ 23,884.53	\$ 184,126.89	\$ 125,752.80	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 483,764.22
Police Pension: 40%	\$ 47,769.07	\$ 368,253.77	\$ 251,505.60	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 967,528.44
Fire Pension: 40%	\$ 47,769.07	\$ 368,253.77	\$ 251,505.60	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 967,528.44
					\$ 2,418,821.09

The Committee requested that these policy options be brought back again in 2019 for the \$1.15 million that was expected to be put into the LRP Reserve Fund for fiscal year 2019. It should also be noted that preliminary 2020 budget estimates are that \$887,608 will be put into this Reserve Fund for 2020.

The following information will highlight the pros and cons of the various options for consideration, that were discussed with the Committee last year. Staff is seeking a recommendation to the Village Board on the use of the \$1.15 million that will go into the LRP Reserve Fund for 2019.

Option 1 - Mirror Policy on Year-End Revenues Over Expenditures (Waterfall)

- Run the LRP funds through the waterfall, just as we do any revenues over expenditures at the end of the year
 - The F&A Committee had previously recommended a policy, which the Board adopted, related to any revenues over expenditures available at the end of a fiscal year.
 - As the Emergency Reserve Fund and the Revenue Stabilization Fund are filled, the LRP funds would be split 50%/50% between the Building Reserve Fund and the Pension Funds.

Pros:

- Consistent with existing policy and thought process regarding year-end revenues over expenditures
- Pays down unfunded liability of pension funds
- Provides long term funding for aging building infrastructure

Cons:

- Somewhat inflexible in terms of application to other possible expenses that may merit consideration

Option 2 – Pay Down Pension Liabilities

- Put all of the LRP funds towards unfunded pension liabilities.
 - From the April 11, 2018 S&P rating for Lombard:
 - “In our opinion, a credit weakness is Lombard's large pension and OPEB obligation, without a plan in place that we think will sufficiently address it. Lombard's combined required pension and actual OPEB contributions totaled 14.4% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2016. Of that amount, 13.5% represented required contributions to pension obligations, and 0.9% represented OPEB payments. The village made 100% of its annual required pension contribution in 2016.”
 - Current Lombard unfunded pension liabilities and funded status:
 - IMRF - \$13.8 million; 83.3%
 - Police Pension - \$31.7 million; 68.8%
 - Fire Pension - \$19.9 million; 76.1%
 - Total unfunded pension liabilities : \$65.4 million

Pros:

- Could provide possible benefit in terms of bond rating. The Village's Financial Advisor, Speer Financial, has given the opinion that this use would have the most potential positive impact on the Village's bond rating.

- Will have modest impact on structural budget expenses. It is estimated that paying \$1.15 million into the pension funds would reduce future year payments to the pension funds by at least \$57,000 per year
- Will also have a modest impact on smoothing out large fluctuations in the future. A lower unfunded liability will result in lower level of fluctuation.

Cons:

- However, once the funds have been paid to the Pension Funds, they are completely unavailable for any other Village use, and therefore this is the most rigid option.

Option 3 – Apply to DuComm Facility Expenses/Remaining Amount for Another Option

- Set it aside to pay for the Village’s share of the costs of the new DuComm facility
 - DuComm opened a new facility in 2018.
 - The Village is obligated to cover its share of the costs for the new facility.
 - The Village’s share is \$701,484 to be repaid over the next 14 years.
 - An option for the LRP funds is to use a portion of the funds to cover this capital cost for this new DuComm facility; the additional remaining LRP funds can then be used for one of the other purposes listed here.

Pros:

- Would decrease the annual amount of structural budget expenses for DuComm by approximately \$50,000 per year for 14 years.

Cons:

- Does not provide any benefit to bond rating status, depending on other option chosen.

Option 4 – Keep in Reserve and Earmark for Potential LPFC Payment Under Settlement Agreement

- Keep in reserve for a potential payment to the LPFC as obligated under the LPFC’s restructuring, in which the Village would loan the funds to the TIF and then be repaid from the TIF when funds are available
 - Total amount of TIF pledged is \$3.7 million plus 5.5% interest.
 - If this amount is not paid in full by September 30, 2027, then the Village has to pay to the LPFC 50% of the outstanding principal plus any accrued but unpaid interest.
 - The ability of the TIF to cover these payments depends on the development that may occur in the TIF boundaries over the next several years.
 - The maximum potential liability, which assumes no TIF is generated in future years (highly unlikely), is \$1.85 million for half the principal, and accrued interest of \$1.85 million, for a total of \$3.7 million. This is not a likely scenario, just a worst case scenario.
 - The TIF runs through 2040, so the ability to repay these funds in the future is very high.

Pros:

- Provides time for the Village to assess performance of TIF district and ability to make required LPFC payment

Cons:

- Does not provide any immediate benefits to other funds
- The impact on the bond rating status is uncertain

Option 5 – Status Quo/Do Nothing

- Do nothing right now; keep the funds in the LRP Reserve and look at it again next year.

Pros:

- Provides maximum flexibility

Cons:

- Does not provide any immediate benefits to other funds or bond rating status
- Leaves funds vulnerable to “other expenses” identified in future years that may not be in line with current strategic plan

Recommendation

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the F&A Committee for the application of the \$1.15 million that will be put into the LRP Reserve Fund in 2019. Specifically, the F&A Committee should make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding which option they prefer. Staff would then come back to the Committee next fall to offer an update on the expected 2020 PFE amount and seek recommendation on how to apply those funds. Currently, the 2020 PFE amount is anticipated to be \$887,608, but that could change depending on various factors. This would allow the most flexibility in determining the use of those funds next year.