

NEW ISSUE - BOOK-ENTRY ONLY

RATING:
Fitch: "AA+"
See "RATING" herein.

In the opinion of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, Bond Counsel, subject, however to certain qualifications described in this Official Statement, under existing law, the interest on the Bonds is exempt from California personal income taxes. Interest on the Bonds is not intended to be exempt from federal income taxation. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion regarding other federal or State tax consequences relating to the ownership or disposition of, or the accrual or receipt of interest on, the Bonds. See "TAX MATTERS" herein.



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1
(TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)**



\$36,095,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A
(Federally Taxable)

\$171,405,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B
(Federally Taxable – Green Bonds)

Dated: Date of Delivery

Due: September 1, as shown on inside cover

This cover page contains certain information for general reference only. It is not intended to be a summary of the security or terms of this issue. Investors must read the entire Official Statement to obtain information essential to making an informed investment decision.

The City and County of San Francisco, California (the "City") on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) (the "District") will be issuing Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A (Federally Taxable) (the "2017A Bonds") and Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B (Federally Taxable – Green Bonds) (the "2017B Bonds" and, together with the 2017A Bonds, the "2017 Bonds"). The 2017 Bonds are being issued on behalf of the District, which was established by the City, pursuant to a Fiscal Agent Agreement, dated as of November 1, 2017 (the "Fiscal Agent Agreement"), by and between the City and Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association, as fiscal agent (the "Fiscal Agent"), and will be secured as described herein. The 2017 Bonds are being issued to fund: (i) various capital improvements, (ii) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Train Box (as defined herein), (iii) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Salesforce Park (as defined herein), (iv) a debt service reserve fund, (v) capitalized interest for a portion of the interest on the 2017 Bonds, and (vi) costs of issuance, all as further described herein. See "THE FINANCING PLAN" herein.

The 2017 Bonds will be issued in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple in excess thereof, shall mature on September 1 in each of the years and in the amounts, and shall bear interest as shown on the inside front cover hereof. Interest on the 2017 Bonds shall be payable on each March 1 and September 1, commencing March 1, 2018 (each an "Interest Payment Date") to the Owner thereof as of the Record Date (as defined herein) immediately preceding each such Interest Payment Date. The 2017 Bonds, when issued, will be registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC"). DTC will act as securities depository of the 2017 Bonds. Individual purchases of the 2017 Bonds will be made in book-entry form only. Principal of and interest and premium, if any, on the 2017 Bonds will be payable by DTC through the DTC participants. See "THE BONDS - Book-Entry System" herein. Purchasers of the 2017 Bonds will not receive physical delivery of the 2017 Bonds purchased by them.

The 2017 Bonds are subject to redemption prior to maturity as described herein. See "THE 2017 BONDS" herein.

The 2017 Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The 2017 Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of or interest on the 2017 Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the 2017 Bonds.

The 2017 Bonds are offered when, as and if issued, subject to approval as to their legality by Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, Bond Counsel, and certain other conditions. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by the City Attorney, and by Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, Los Angeles, California, as Disclosure Counsel to the City with respect to the issuance of the 2017 Bonds. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the Underwriters by their counsel Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth, a Professional Corporation, Newport Beach, California. It is anticipated that the 2017 Bonds will be available for delivery through the facilities of DTC on or about November 9, 2017.

STIFEL

STINSON SECURITIES, LLC
Investment Banking

Dated: October 26, 2017

\$36,095,000
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1
(TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)
SPECIAL TAX BONDS, SERIES 2017A (FEDERALLY TAXABLE)

Serial Bonds \$8,125,000

<u>Maturity Date</u> <u>(September 1)</u>	<u>Principal</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Interest</u> <u>Rate</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>CUSIP[†]</u> <u>(Base No. 79772E)</u>
2018	\$100,000	1.500%	1.644%	99.883	AA7
2019	265,000	1.750	1.894	99.743	AB5
2020	300,000	2.000	2.189	99.486	AC3
2021	340,000	2.250	2.454	99.260	AD1
2022	380,000	2.500	2.654	99.306	AE9
2023	425,000	2.750	2.879	99.311	AF6
2024	470,000	3.000	3.079	99.515	AG4
2025	520,000	3.000	3.213	98.536	AH2
2026	580,000	3.250	3.393	98.915	AJ8
2027	630,000	3.250	3.463	98.237	AK5
2028	695,000	3.375	3.563	98.321	AL3
2029	755,000	3.500	3.693	98.162	AM1
2030	825,000	3.500	3.773	97.242	AN9
2031	890,000	3.625	3.843	97.676	AP4
2032	950,000	3.625	3.893	97.000	AQ2

\$6,090,000 3.750% Term Bonds due September 1, 2037 – Yield: 4.004% Price: 96.544 CUSIP No. 79772E AR0

\$21,880,000 4.000% Term Bonds due September 1, 2048 – Yield: 4.154% Price: 97.332 CUSIP No. 79772E AS8

[†] CUSIP® is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, managed by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC on behalf of The American Bankers Association. This data is not intended to create a database and does not serve in any way as a substitute for the CUSIP Services. CUSIP numbers have been assigned by an independent company not affiliated with the City and are included solely for the convenience of investors. None of the City, the Underwriters, or the Municipal Advisors, is responsible for the selection or uses of these CUSIP numbers, and no representation is made as to their correctness on the 2017 Bonds or as included herein. The CUSIP number for a specific maturity is subject to being changed after the issuance of the 2017 Bonds as a result of various subsequent actions including, but not limited to, refunding in whole or in part or as a result of the procurement of secondary market portfolio insurance or other similar enhancement by investors that is applicable to all or a portion of certain maturities of the 2017 Bonds.

\$171,405,000
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1
(TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)
SPECIAL TAX BONDS, SERIES 2017B
(FEDERALLY TAXABLE – GREEN BONDS)

Serial Bonds \$38,320,000

<u>Maturity Date</u> <u>(September 1)</u>	<u>Principal</u> <u>Amount</u>	<u>Interest</u> <u>Rate</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>CUSIP[†]</u> <u>(Base No. 79772E)</u>
2018	\$ 470,000	1.500%	1.594%	99.923	AT6
2019	1,240,000	1.750	1.844	99.832	AU3
2020	1,420,000	2.000	2.119	99.675	AV1
2021	1,605,000	2.250	2.384	99.513	AW9
2022	1,805,000	2.500	2.604	99.530	AX7
2023	2,005,000	2.750	2.839	99.524	AY5
2024	2,235,000	3.000	3.039	99.759	AZ2
2025	2,470,000	3.000	3.203	98.604	BA6
2026	2,710,000	3.250	3.333	99.367	BB4
2027	2,980,000	3.250	3.413	98.647	BC2
2028	3,250,000	3.375	3.513	98.764	BD0
2029	3,545,000	3.500	3.633	98.728	BE8
2030	3,855,000	3.500	3.733	97.640	BF5
2031	4,185,000	3.625	3.793	98.202	BG3
2032	4,545,000	3.625	3.813	97.883	BH1

\$28,500,000 3.750% Term Bonds due September 1, 2037 – Yield: 3.954% Price: 97.211 CUSIP No. 79772E BJ7

\$104,585,000 4.000% Term Bonds due September 1, 2048 – Yield: 4.104% Price: 98.185 CUSIP No. 79772E BK4

† CUSIP® is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, managed by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC on behalf of The American Bankers Association. This data is not intended to create a database and does not serve in any way as a substitute for the CUSIP Services. CUSIP numbers have been assigned by an independent company not affiliated with the City and are included solely for the convenience of investors. None of the City, the Underwriters, or the Municipal Advisors, is responsible for the selection or uses of these CUSIP numbers, and no representation is made as to their correctness on the 2017 Bonds or as included herein. The CUSIP number for a specific maturity is subject to being changed after the issuance of the 2017 Bonds as a result of various subsequent actions including, but not limited to, refunding in whole or in part or as a result of the procurement of secondary market portfolio insurance or other similar enhancement by investors that is applicable to all or a portion of certain maturities of the 2017 Bonds.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MAYOR

Edwin M. Lee

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS⁽¹⁾

London Breed, *Board President, District 5*

Sandra Lee Fewer, *District 1*

Mark Farrell, *District 2*

Aaron Peskin, *District 3*

Katy Tang, *District 4*

Jane Kim, *District 6*

Norman Yee, *District 7*

Jeff Sheehy, *District 8*

Hillary Ronen, *District 9*

Malia Cohen, *District 10*

Ahsha Safai, *District 11*

CITY ATTORNEY

Dennis J. Herrera

CITY TREASURER

José Cisneros

OTHER CITY AND COUNTY OFFICIALS

Naomi M. Kelly, *City Administrator*

Benjamin Rosenfield, *Controller*

Nadia Sesay, *Director of Public Finance*

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Bond Counsel

Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation
San Francisco, California

Disclosure Counsel

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP
Los Angeles, California

Special Tax Consultant

Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.
Sacramento, California

Co-Municipal Advisors

Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co., LLC
San Francisco, California

PFM Financial Advisors LLC
San Francisco, California

Fiscal Agent

Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association
Los Angeles, California

⁽¹⁾ The Board of Supervisors serves as the governing body for the District.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
General.....	1
Authority for the 2017 Bonds	1
Use of Proceeds	1
The District	2
The 2017 Bonds	2
“Green Bond” Designation	3
Security for the Bonds	3
Reserve Fund	3
Foreclosure Covenant	3
Teeter Plan	4
Limited Obligations	4
Further Information.....	4
SALESFORCE TRANSIT CENTER AND RELATED FACILITIES	4
Transbay Terminal History	4
Transbay Redevelopment Plan and Transit Center District Plan.....	5
Salesforce Transit Center.....	5
Train Box, Salesforce Park and Related Capital Improvements.....	6
Downtown Rail Extension	6
THE FINANCING PLAN	7
ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS	7
THE 2017 BONDS	8
Description of the 2017 Bonds	8
Redemption.....	8
The Fiscal Agent	11
Book-Entry System.....	11
2017B Bonds Designated as Green Bonds	12
Debt Service Schedule	14
SECURITY FOR THE BONDS	15
General.....	15
Limited Obligation.....	16
Teeter Plan	16
Special Tax Fund	16
Administrative Expense Fund.....	17
Bond Fund.....	18
Establishment of Improvement Fund.....	19
Reserve Fund	19
Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Taxes.....	20
Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure.....	23
No Obligation of the City Upon Delinquency	24
Parity Bonds.....	24
THE CITY	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
THE DISTRICT	26
Background	26
Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties)	29
Development Summary, Special Tax Levy, Assessed Values and Value to Lien Ratios	30
Conditioned Projects Under Construction	31
Property Valuation	31
Debt Service Coverage	32
Estimated Effective Tax Rate	34
Future Financings	34
Direct and Overlapping Debt	35
SPECIAL RISK FACTORS	35
Risks of Real Estate Secured Investments Generally	35
Disclosure to Future Property Owners	36
Parity Taxes and Special Assessments	36
Value to Lien Ratios	36
Insufficiency of Special Taxes	36
Tax Delinquencies	37
Maximum Term of Levy	37
Teeter Plan	37
Concentration of Property Ownership	37
Future Indebtedness	38
Seismic Risks	38
Hazardous Substances	38
Risk of Sea Level Changes and Flooding	39
Natural Disasters and Other Events	39
Millennium Tower	40
Bankruptcy and Foreclosure	40
Property Controlled by FDIC and Other Federal Agencies	41
Billing of Special Taxes	42
Collection of Special Taxes	43
Maximum Special Tax Rates	43
Initial Annual Adjustment Factor	43
Exempt Properties	43
California Constitution Article XIIC and Article XIID	44
Validity of Landowner Elections	44
Ballot Initiatives and Legislative Measures	46
No Acceleration	46
Limitations on Remedies	46
Limited Secondary Market	46
CONTINUING DISCLOSURE	47
TAX MATTERS	47
UNDERWRITING	47
LEGAL OPINION AND OTHER LEGAL MATTERS	48
NO LITIGATION	48
RATING	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
MUNICIPAL ADVISORS	49
MISCELLANEOUS	49
APPENDIX A – CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	A-1
APPENDIX B – AMENDED AND RESTATED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX	B-1
APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT	C-1
APPENDIX D – FORM OF BOND COUNSEL OPINION	D-1
APPENDIX E – FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE	E-1
APPENDIX F – BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM.....	F-1

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS OFFICIAL STATEMENT

The information set forth herein has been obtained from the City and other sources believed to be reliable. This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract with the purchasers of the 2017 Bonds. Estimates and opinions are included and should not be interpreted as statements of fact. Summaries of documents do not purport to be complete statements of their provisions. No dealer, broker, salesperson or any other person has been authorized by the City, the Municipal Advisor or the Underwriters to give any information or to make any representations other than those contained in this Official Statement in connection with the offering contained herein and, if given or made, such information or representations must not be relied upon as having been authorized by the City or the Underwriters.

This Official Statement does not constitute an offer to sell or solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any offer or solicitation of such offer or any sale of the 2017 Bonds by any person in any jurisdiction in which it is unlawful for such person to make such offer, solicitation or sale. The information and expressions of opinion herein are subject to change without notice, and neither delivery of this Official Statement nor any sale of the 2017 Bonds made thereafter shall under any circumstances create any implication that there has been no change in the affairs of the District or the City or in any other information contained herein, since the date hereof.

The Underwriters have provided the following sentence for inclusion in this Official Statement. The Underwriters have reviewed the information in this Official Statement in accordance with, and as part of, their responsibilities to investors under the federal securities laws as applied to the facts and circumstances of this transaction, but the Underwriters do not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of such information.

The 2017 Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The 2017 Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of or interest on the 2017 Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the 2017 Bonds.

This Official Statement, including any supplement or amendment hereto, is intended to be deposited with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board through the Electronic Municipal Market Access (“EMMA”) website.

The City maintains a website with information pertaining to the City. However, the information presented therein is not incorporated into this Official Statement and should not be relied upon in making investment decisions with respect to the 2017 Bonds.

FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

Certain statements included or incorporated by reference in this Official Statement constitute “forward-looking statements” within the meaning of the United States Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Section 21E of the United States Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 27A of the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended. Such statements are generally identifiable by the terminology used such as “plan,” “expect,” “estimate,” “project,” “budget” or similar words.

The achievement of certain results or other expectations contained in such forward-looking statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors which may cause actual results, performance or achievements described to be materially different from any future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by such forward-looking statements. The City does not plan to issue any updates or revisions to the forward-looking statements set forth in this Official Statement.



Transbay Project Area

- Transit Center District Plan Area
- Coop Parcels
- Redevelopment Block
- [A/B/C] Completed/Conditioned Project within District
- [D] Conditioned Project to be Annexed into District
- Assessor's Block Number

3735

0 250 500
Scale in feet

July 2017

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1 (TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)

\$36,095,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A
(Federally Taxable)

\$171,405,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B
(Federally Taxable – Green Bonds)

INTRODUCTION

General

This Official Statement, including the cover page, the inside cover page and the Appendices hereto, is provided to furnish certain information in connection with the issuance and sale by the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”) of its City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A (Federally Taxable) (the “2017A Bonds”) and its City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B (Federally Taxable – Green Bonds) (the “2017B Bonds” and, together with the 2017A Bonds, the “2017 Bonds”). The 2017 Bonds and any Parity Bonds (as defined herein) are collectively referred to herein as the “Bonds.”

Authority for the 2017 Bonds

The 2017 Bonds will be issued by the City on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) (the “District”) pursuant to the provisions of a Fiscal Agent Agreement, dated as of November 1, 2017 (the “Fiscal Agent Agreement”), by and between the City and Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association, as fiscal agent (the “Fiscal Agent”), pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, as amended (Sections 53311 *et seq.* of the Government Code of the State of California) (the “Act”), and Resolution No. 247-17 adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City on June 13, 2017 and approved by Mayor Edwin M. Lee on June 22, 2017.

Use of Proceeds

The 2017 Bonds are being issued to fund: (i) various capital improvements, including street and sidewalk improvements in the vicinity of the transit building (the “Salesforce Transit Center,” formerly known as the Transbay Transit Center) and the development and improvement of adjacent open space, (ii) the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Train Box (as defined herein), (iii) the planning, design, engineering and construction of transit center’s rooftop park (“Salesforce Park,” formerly known as the Rooftop Park; as defined herein), (iv) a debt service reserve fund (the “Reserve Fund”), (v) capitalized interest for a portion of the interest on the 2017 Bonds, and (vi) costs of issuance, all as further described herein. See “THE FINANCING PLAN” herein.

The District

The District currently consists of approximately 13.3 gross acres located in downtown San Francisco immediately south of Market Street near the City’s new Salesforce Transit Center, designed to be a hub of transit connections serving regional commuters. At the time it established the District, the City also established a larger future annexation area (the “Future Annexation Area”) for the District; the benefit of a future annexation area is that properties can annex into the District with fewer procedural requirements that would otherwise be required under the Act.

In general, Special Taxes (defined herein) can only be levied on a property within the District if: (i) the property is a “Conditioned Project,” as defined in the Rate and Method; (ii) a Certificate of Occupancy (defined herein) has been issued for the property; and (iii) a Tax Commencement Authorization (defined herein) for the property has been executed by the City’s Director of the Office of Public Finance. See APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX” hereto. A Conditioned Project is a Development Project that is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities (as defined in the Rate and Method) through the District because it received a zoning bonus to exceed the height and floor-to-area ratios that would have otherwise been applicable under the City’s Planning Code. See “THE DISTRICT” herein.

Currently, only three Conditioned Projects in the District have received a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commencement Authorization: 350 Mission Street, also known as “Salesforce East;” 299 Fremont Street, also known as “Block 6” or “Solaire;” and 415 Mission Street, also known as “Salesforce Tower” (collectively, the “Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties)”). See “SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Concentration of Property Ownership” herein.

In addition to the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties), there are currently eight Conditioned Projects in the District and four Conditioned Projects in the Future Annexation Area planned for residential, commercial or mixed use that may become subject to the Special Tax as Taxable Buildings. There may also be future additional projects within the District that became Conditioned Projects. No assurance can be provided that any particular property will be annexed into the District, become a Conditioned Project and become a Taxable Building required to pay Special Taxes.

The 2017 Bonds

The 2017 Bonds will be issued in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple in excess thereof, shall mature on September 1 in each of the years and in the amounts, and shall bear interest as shown on the inside front cover hereof. Interest on the 2017 Bonds shall be payable on each March 1 and September 1, commencing March 1, 2018 (the “Interest Payment Dates”) to the Owner thereof as of the Record Date (as defined herein) immediately preceding each such Interest Payment Date, by check mailed on such Interest Payment Date or by wire transfer to an account in the United States of America made upon instructions of any Owner of \$1,000,000 or more in aggregate principal amount of 2017 Bonds delivered to the Fiscal Agent prior to the applicable Record Date. The 2017 Bonds, when issued, will be registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York (“DTC”). DTC will act as securities depository of the 2017 Bonds. Individual purchases of the 2017 Bonds will be made in book-entry form only. Principal of and interest and premium, if any, on the 2017 Bonds will be payable by DTC through the DTC participants. See “THE 2017 BONDS - Book-Entry System” herein. Purchasers of the 2017 Bonds will not receive physical delivery of the 2017 Bonds purchased by them.

“Green Bond” Designation

The City is designating the 2017B Bonds as “Green Bonds” (also known as “Climate Bonds”). The purpose of designating the 2017B Bonds as Green Bonds is to allow investors to invest directly in bonds which finance environmentally beneficial projects (“Green Projects”). The particular capital improvements that the City has defined as “Green Projects” in connection with the 2017B Bonds are part of the development of the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities, including the Train Box and Salesforce Park (each as defined herein). *The City will undertake reasonable efforts to ensure that any adjustment of capital expenditures or other actions taken with respect to the 2017B Bonds will not result in revision or withdrawal of the Climate Bonds Initiative (the “CBI”) certification described herein; however, there can be no guarantee that such adjustment or other action or a future revision to the CBI’s criteria for certifying bonds will not result in a withdrawal or revision of the CBI’s certification.* See “THE BONDS – 2017B Bonds Designated as Green Bonds” herein.

Security for the Bonds

The Bonds are secured by the pledge of Special Tax Revenues and all moneys deposited in the Bond Fund and, until disbursed as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in the Special Tax Fund. “Special Tax Revenues” means the proceeds of the Special Taxes received by the City, including any scheduled payments thereof and any Special Tax Prepayments, interest thereon and proceeds of the redemption or sale of property sold as a result of foreclosure of the lien of the Special Taxes to the amount of said lien and interest thereon, but shall not include any interest in excess of the interest due on the Bonds or any penalties collected in connection with any such foreclosure. “Special Taxes” means the special taxes levied by the Board of Supervisors within the District under the Act, the Ordinance and the Fiscal Agent Agreement. “Special Tax Prepayments” means the proceeds of any Special Tax prepayments received by the City, as calculated pursuant to the Rate and Method, less any administrative fees or penalties collected as part of any such prepayment. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – General” herein.

See the section of this Official Statement captioned “SPECIAL RISK FACTORS” for a discussion of certain risk factors which should be considered, in addition to the other matters set forth herein, in evaluating the investment quality of the 2017 Bonds.

Reserve Fund

The City, on behalf of the District, has established the Reserve Fund for the 2017 Bonds pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement to be funded at the Reserve Requirement (defined below). See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Reserve Fund” herein.

Foreclosure Covenant

The City, on behalf of the District, has covenanted for the benefit of the owners of the Bonds that, under certain circumstances described herein, the City will commence judicial foreclosure proceedings with respect to delinquent Special Taxes on property within the District, and will diligently pursue such proceedings to completion. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – The Special Taxes” and “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure” herein.

Teeter Plan

The District is currently on the City's "Teeter Plan." See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Teeter Plan" herein. Under the Teeter Plan, the City will maintain a tax loss reserve fund for the purpose of paying each taxing agency 100% of the amounts of secured taxes (including the Special Taxes of the District) levied on the tax bill irrespective of any delinquent taxes.

Limited Obligations

The 2017 Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The 2017 Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of or interest on the 2017 Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the 2017 Bonds.

Further Information

Brief descriptions of the 2017 Bonds, the security for the Bonds, special risk factors, the District, the City and other information are included in this Official Statement. Such descriptions and information do not purport to be comprehensive or definitive. The descriptions herein of the 2017 Bonds, the Fiscal Agent Agreement, resolutions and other documents are qualified in their entirety by reference to the forms thereof and the information with respect thereto included in the 2017 Bonds, the Fiscal Agent Agreement, such resolutions and other documents. All such descriptions are further qualified in their entirety by reference to laws and to principles of equity relating to or affecting generally the enforcement of creditors' rights. For definitions of certain capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined, and a description of certain terms relating to the 2017 Bonds, see APPENDIX C – "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT" hereto.

SALESFORCE TRANSIT CENTER AND RELATED FACILITIES

Transbay Terminal History

The City's former Transbay Terminal was built in 1939 at First and Mission Streets as the terminal for trains crossing the newly opened Bay Bridge. For the first time, San Francisco was directly linked by rail to the East Bay, Central Contra Costa County and even Sacramento. At the time, trucks and trains used the lower deck of the Bay Bridge, and automobiles operated in both directions on the upper deck.

In its heyday at the end of World War II, the Terminal's rail system served 26 million passengers annually. As automobile usage increased after the war ended and gas rationing was eliminated, the Terminal's use began to steadily decline. In 1958, the lower deck of the Bay Bridge was converted to automobile traffic only and the train tracks crossing the Bay Bridge were dismantled. In 1959, the inter-modal Transbay Terminal was converted into a bus-only facility. Regional commuter buses from the East Bay, Marin County and San Mateo County, local buses within the City and long-distance buses such as Greyhound used the Terminal.

In 1989, the Terminal suffered structural damage in the Loma Prieta earthquake that required its replacement. In 1999, San Francisco voters approved a ballot measure to extend the northern terminus of Caltrain, the commuter rail line serving the San Francisco peninsula, from its current location at 4th & King Streets to a new or rebuilt transit station at the site of the Terminal.

In 2001, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (the “TJPA”), a joint exercise of powers authority, was created by the City, the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, and Caltrans (ex officio) to develop a new regional transit hub to replace the Terminal.

In 2010, the Terminal was demolished to make way for the construction of the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities. A temporary terminal has served bus passengers in the meantime.

Transbay Redevelopment Plan and Transit Center District Plan

After the Loma Prieta earthquake, the Embarcadero Freeway connecting the Bay Bridge to the City’s northeastern waterfront Embarcadero was demolished, creating several blocks of land available for development. In 2003, the State donated to the City and the TJPA approximately 12 acres of developable land in the vicinity of the Terminal. The sale and development of these parcels help to finance a portion of the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities.

In 2005, the City established the Transbay Redevelopment Area encompassing portions of the area surrounding the Salesforce Transit Center, generally bounded by Mission Street and Harrison Street between Spear Street and Second Street. Tax increment generated in this approximately 40 acre Redevelopment Area helped to finance portions of the Salesforce Transit Center and ancillary neighborhood improvements. The Redevelopment Plan specifically laid out development parameters for most of the formerly-state owned parcels that once held the Embarcadero Freeway.

In 2012, the City adopted the Transit Center District Plan (the “TCDP”) to shape growth on the southern side of downtown San Francisco to respond to and support the construction of the Salesforce Transit Center. The TCDP provides policy recommendations to accommodate additional transit-oriented growth, sculpt the downtown skyline, improve streets and open spaces, and expand protection of historic resources. The TCDP encourages development around the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities by eliminating density caps and increasing certain height limits. The TCDP’s zoning changes were primarily focused on privately-owned parcels in the area along with a small number of formerly-state owned parcels owned by the TJPA. See “THE DISTRICT” herein.

Salesforce Transit Center

The Salesforce Transit Center is a five-story structure that will replace the former Transbay Terminal. The Salesforce Transit Center includes one above-grade bus level, the Salesforce Park (as defined below), concourse retail and circulation level, ground-floor, and the Train Box (as defined below). A new off-site bus storage facility and bus ramp will connect the Salesforce Transit Center with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The overall approved budget for the development of the Salesforce Transit Center is \$2.259 billion. Construction is underway and completion of Salesforce Transit Center is anticipated in late 2017, with transit operations expected to commence in Spring 2018.

The combined cost of the development of the Salesforce Transit Center and the extension of the Downtown Rail Extension (described below) is estimated to be approximately \$6 billion. The funding sources for both of these projects include land sales, property taxes, sales taxes, bridge tolls, development impact fees, a \$400 million American Recovery and Reinvestment Act grant and a \$171 million Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (“TIFIA”) loan.

Train Box, Salesforce Park and Related Capital Improvements

The District was formed to raise funds to finance certain public improvements for the benefit of the District, including the Salesforce Park and the Train Box, as well as other capital improvements relating to the development of the area around the Salesforce Transit Center.

Train Box. The core and shell of the two below-grade levels of the Salesforce Transit Center, collectively referred to as the “Train Box,” were built to accommodate the Downtown Rail Extension that will extend the Caltrain rail tracks from 4th & King Streets to the Salesforce Transit Center. The bottom level will be the Train Station Platform and have three passenger platforms that will accommodate six train tracks for Caltrain and California High Speed Rail. The lower concourse is one level below grade and will serve as the passenger connection between the transit center building ground floor and train station platform. Space will be provided in the concourse for retail, ticketing and bike storage. A portion of the proceeds of the 2017 Bonds are expected to be used to finance a portion of the Train Box.

Salesforce Park. The Salesforce Transit Center’s roof will be a 5.4 acre 1,400-foot long public elevated park (the “Salesforce Park”) that includes, an outdoor amphitheater, gardens, trails, open grass areas, and children’s play space, as well as a restaurant and cafe. The Salesforce Park will serve as a “green roof” or “living” roof for the Salesforce Transit Center. It will shade much of the ground-level sidewalk when the sun is strongest and provide biological habitat for flora and fauna and public open space for transit passengers, neighborhood residents, and employees. It also acts as insulation for interior spaces, moderating heat build-up in warm weather and retaining heat during cooler weather. Unlike asphalt paving or dark colored roofing surfaces, planting on the green roof cools the surrounding environment and improves air quality by acting as a carbon sink. As a biological organism itself, the park will help to capture and filter the exhaust in the area and help to improve the air quality of the neighborhood. A portion of the proceeds of the 2017 Bonds are expected to be used to finance a portion of the Salesforce Park.

Related Capital Improvements. Capital improvements to be undertaken within the District include improvements to streetscapes, enhancements to the transportation infrastructure, and the development and improvement of open spaces. A portion of these improvements are expected to be financed with proceeds of the 2017 Bonds.

Downtown Rail Extension

In addition to the development of the Salesforce Transit Center, the Caltrain rail tracks will be extended from their current San Francisco terminus at 4th & King Streets to a new underground terminus beneath the Salesforce Transit Center to accommodate both Caltrain and California High Speed Rail (the “Downtown Rail Extension”). As of the date of this Official Statement, the Downtown Rail Extension has not fully secured funding. The TJPA is currently exploring funding options.

THE FINANCING PLAN

The 2017 Bonds are being issued to fund: (i) various capital improvements, including street and sidewalk improvements in the vicinity of the Salesforce Transit Center and the development and improvement of open space, (ii) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Train Box (as defined herein), (iii) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Salesforce Park (as defined herein), (iv) a Reserve Fund, (v) capitalized interest for a portion of the interest on the 2017 Bonds, and (vi) costs of issuance.

More specifically, proceeds of the 2017A Bonds are expected to be used to finance street and sidewalk improvements in the vicinity of the Salesforce Transit Center and the development and improvement of open space. Proceeds of the 2017B Bonds are expected to be used to finance: (i) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Train Box and (ii) a portion of the planning, design, engineering and construction of the Salesforce Park. See “SALESFORCE TRANSIT CENTER AND RELATED FACILITIES” herein.

ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

The estimated sources and uses of funds is set forth below:

	<u>2017A Bonds</u>	<u>2017B Bonds</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Sources of Funds</u>			
Principal Amount	\$36,095,000.00	\$171,405,000.00	\$207,500,000.00
Discount	(929,425.55)	(3,171,032.10)	(4,100,457.65)
Total Sources	\$35,165,574.45	\$168,233,967.90	\$203,399,542.35
<u>Uses of Funds</u>			
Deposit to 2017A Improvement Account	\$31,165,181.98	-	\$ 31,165,181.98
Deposit to Allocated Bond Proceeds Account	-	\$149,236,351.57	149,236,351.57
Deposit to Reserve Fund	2,672,605.83	12,691,453.15	15,364,058.98
Deposit to Bond Fund ⁽¹⁾	906,431.88	4,305,114.17	5,211,546.05
Deposit to Costs of Issuance Fund ⁽²⁾	421,354.76	2,001,049.01	2,422,403.77
Total Uses	\$35,165,574.45	\$168,233,967.90	\$203,399,542.35

⁽¹⁾ Represents capitalized interest deposited into the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account and the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account, as applicable. Capitalized interest is funded for a portion of the interest on the 2017 Bonds through September 1, 2018, because Salesforce Tower will not be subject to the Special Tax levy until Fiscal Year 2018-19.

⁽²⁾ Includes Underwriters' discount, fees and expenses for Bond Counsel, Disclosure Counsel, Municipal Advisors, the Special Tax Consultant, the Fiscal Agent and its counsel, costs of printing the Official Statement, and other costs of issuance of the 2017 Bonds.

THE 2017 BONDS

Description of the 2017 Bonds

The Bonds will be issued as fully registered bonds, in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple in excess thereof within a single maturity and will be dated and bear interest from the date of their delivery, at the rates set forth on the inside cover page hereof. The Bonds will be issued in fully registered form, without coupons. The 2017 Bonds will mature on September 1 in the principal amounts and years as shown on the inside cover page hereof.

The 2017 Bonds will bear interest at the rates set forth on the inside cover page hereof, payable on the Interest Payment Dates in each year. Interest on all Bonds shall be calculated on the basis of a 360-day year composed of twelve 30-day months. Each Bond shall bear interest from the Interest Payment Date next preceding the date of authentication thereof unless (i) it is authenticated on an Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from such date of authentication, or (ii) it is authenticated prior to an Interest Payment Date and after the close of business on the Record Date preceding such Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from such Interest Payment Date, or (iii) it is authenticated on or before the Record Date preceding the first Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from the Dated Date; provided, however, that if at the time of authentication of a 2017 Bond, interest is in default thereon, such Bond shall bear interest from the Interest Payment Date to which interest has previously been paid or made available for payment thereon.

Interest on the Bonds (including the final interest payment upon maturity or earlier redemption), is payable on the applicable Interest Payment Date by check of the Fiscal Agent mailed by first class mail to the registered Owner thereof at such registered Owner's address as it appears on the registration books maintained by the Fiscal Agent at the close of business on the Record Date preceding the Interest Payment Date, or by wire transfer to an account located in the United States of America made on such Interest Payment Date upon written instructions of any Owner of \$1,000,000 or more in aggregate principal amount of Bonds delivered to the Fiscal Agent prior to the applicable Record Date, which instructions shall continue in effect until revoked in writing, or until such Bonds are transferred to a new Owner. "Record Date" means the fifteenth day of the calendar month next preceding the applicable Interest Payment Date, whether or not such day is a Business Day. The interest, principal of and any premium on the Bonds are payable in lawful money of the United States of America, with principal and any premium payable upon surrender of the Bonds at the Principal Office of the Fiscal Agent. All Bonds paid by the Fiscal Agent pursuant this Section shall be canceled by the Fiscal Agent.

Redemption

Optional Redemption. The 2017A Bonds maturing on or after September 1, 2028 are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturities, on any date on and after September 1, 2027, in whole or in part, at a redemption price equal to the principal amount of the 2017A Bonds to be redeemed, together with accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

The 2017B Bonds maturing on or after September 1, 2028 are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturities, on any date on and after September 1, 2027, in whole or in part, at a redemption price equal to the principal amount of the 2017B Bonds to be redeemed, together with accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Mandatory Sinking Fund Redemption. The Term Bonds are subject to mandatory redemption in part by lot, from sinking fund payments made by the City from the Bond Fund, at a redemption price equal to the principal amount thereof to be redeemed, together with accrued interest to the redemption date, without premium, in the aggregate respective principal amounts all as set forth in the following table:

2017A Bonds Maturing September 1, 2037

Sinking Fund Redemption Date (September 1)	Principal Amount Subject to Redemption
2033	\$1,035,000
2034	1,120,000
2035	1,245,000
2036	1,300,000
2037 (maturity)	1,390,000

2017A Bonds Maturing September 1, 2048

Sinking Fund Redemption Date (September 1)	Principal Amount Subject to Redemption
2038	\$1,490,000
2039	1,595,000
2040	1,685,000
2041	1,830,000
2042	1,935,000
2043	2,045,000
2044	2,185,000
2045	2,320,000
2046	2,465,000
2047	2,100,000
2048 (maturity)	2,230,000

2017B Bonds Maturing September 1, 2037

Sinking Fund Redemption Date (September 1)	Principal Amount Subject to Redemption
2033	\$4,905,000
2034	5,280,000
2035	5,650,000
2036	6,110,000
2037 (maturity)	6,555,000

2017B Bonds Maturing September 1, 2048

Sinking Fund Redemption Date (September 1)	Principal Amount Subject to Redemption
2038	\$ 7,025,000
2039	7,530,000
2040	8,085,000
2041	8,610,000
2042	9,210,000
2043	9,840,000
2044	10,475,000
2045	11,150,000
2046	11,860,000
2047	10,090,000
2048 (maturity)	10,710,000

Provided, however, if some but not all of the Term Bonds have been redeemed pursuant to optional redemption or Redemption from Special Tax Prepayments, the total amount of all future Sinking Fund Payments shall be reduced by the aggregate principal amount of Term Bonds so redeemed, to be allocated among such Sinking Fund Payments on a *pro rata* basis in integral multiples of \$5,000 as determined by the Fiscal Agent, notice of which determination (which shall consist of a revised sinking fund schedule) shall be given by the City to the Fiscal Agent.

Redemption from Special Tax Prepayments. Special Tax Prepayments and any corresponding transfers from the Reserve Fund shall be used to redeem 2017 Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date for which notice of redemption can timely be given, among series and maturities as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, at a redemption price (expressed as a percentage of the principal amount of the 2017 Bonds to be redeemed), as set forth below, together with accrued interest to the date fixed for redemption:

<u>Redemption Date</u>	<u>Redemption Price</u>
Any Interest Payment Date on or before March 1, 2025	103%
On September 1, 2025 and March 1, 2026	102
On September 1, 2026 and March 1, 2027	101
On September 1, 2027 and any Interest Payment Date thereafter	100

Notice of Redemption. The Fiscal Agent shall cause notice to be sent at least thirty (30) days but not more than sixty (60) days prior to the date fixed for redemption, to the Securities Depositories, to one or more Information Services, and to the respective registered Owners of any Bonds designated for redemption, at their addresses appearing on the Bond registration books in the Principal Office of the Fiscal Agent; but such mailing shall not be a condition precedent to such redemption and failure to send or to receive any such notice, or any defect therein, shall not affect the validity of the proceedings for the redemption of such Bonds. Such notice shall state the redemption date and the redemption price and, if less than all of the then Outstanding Bonds are to be called for redemption shall state as to any Bond called in part the principal amount thereof to be redeemed, and shall require that such Bonds be then surrendered at the Principal Office of the Fiscal Agent for redemption at the said redemption price, and shall state that further interest on such Bonds will not accrue from and after the redemption date. The cost of mailing any such redemption notice and any expenses incurred by the Fiscal Agent in connection therewith shall be paid by the City from amounts in the Administrative Expense Fund.

The City has the right to rescind any notice of the optional redemption of Bonds by written notice to the Fiscal Agent on or prior to the date fixed for redemption. Any notice of redemption shall be cancelled and annulled if for any reason funds will not be or are not available on the date fixed for redemption for the payment in full of the Bonds then called for redemption, and such cancellation shall not constitute a default under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The City and the Fiscal Agent have no liability to the Owners or any other party related to or arising from such rescission of redemption. The Fiscal Agent shall send notice of such rescission of redemption in the same manner as the original notice of redemption was sent under this Section.

Partial Redemption. Whenever provision is made in the Fiscal Agent Agreement for the redemption of less than all of the Bonds, unless otherwise directed by the City, the Fiscal Agent shall select the Bonds to be redeemed, from all Bonds or such given portion thereof not previously called for redemption, among series and maturities so as to maintain substantially the same debt service profile for the Bonds as in effect prior to such redemption, and by lot within a maturity.

In connection with a redemption under “Redemption from Special Tax Prepayments” above, the City shall deliver to the Trustee a certificate of an Independent Financial Consultant to the effect that, for each Fiscal Year after the proposed redemption, the maximum amount of the Special Taxes that, based on Taxable Parcels following the related Special Tax Prepayment, may be levied for such Fiscal Year under the Ordinance, the Agreement and any Supplemental Agreement shall be at least 110% of the total Annual Debt Service of the remaining Outstanding Bonds following such Special Tax Prepayment and redemption for the Bond Year that commences in such Fiscal Year.

Purchase of Bonds in Lieu of Redemption. In lieu of redemption under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, moneys in the Bond Fund or other funds provided by the City may be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent for purchase of Outstanding Bonds, upon the filing with the Fiscal Agent of an Officer’s Certificate requesting such purchase, at public or private sale as and when, and at such prices (including brokerage and other charges) as such Officer’s Certificate may provide, but in no event may Bonds be purchased at a price in excess of the principal amount thereof, plus interest accrued to the date of purchase and any premium which would otherwise be due if such Bonds were to be redeemed in accordance with the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Any Bonds purchased shall be treated as Outstanding Bonds under this Fiscal Agent Agreement, except to the extent otherwise directed by the Finance Director.

The Fiscal Agent

Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association has been appointed as the Fiscal Agent for all of the 2017 Bonds under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. For a further description of the rights and obligations of the Fiscal Agent pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, see APPENDIX C – “SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT” hereto.

Book-Entry System

The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York (“DTC”), will act as securities depository for the Bonds. The Bonds will be registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC’s partnership nominee), and will be available to ultimate purchasers in the denomination of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof, under the book-entry system maintained by DTC. Ultimate purchasers of Bonds will not receive physical certificates representing their interest in the Bonds. So long as the Bonds are registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of DTC, references herein to the Owners shall mean Cede & Co., and shall not mean the ultimate purchasers of the Bonds. Payments of the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds will be made directly to DTC, or its nominee, Cede & Co., by the Fiscal Agent, so long as DTC or Cede & Co. is the registered owner of the Bonds. Disbursements of such payments to DTC’s Participants

is the responsibility of DTC and disbursements of such payments to the Beneficial Owners is the responsibility of DTC's Participants and Indirect Participants. See APPENDIX F – "BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM" hereto.

2017B Bonds Designated as Green Bonds

General. The City is designating the 2017B Bonds as "Green Bonds" (also known as "Climate Bonds"). The purpose of designating the 2017B Bonds as Green Bonds is to allow investors to invest directly in bonds that finance environmentally beneficial projects ("Green Projects"). The particular capital improvements that the City has defined as "Green Projects" in connection with the 2017B Bonds are part of the development of the Salesforce Transit Center, a facility that is projected to achieve LEED Gold certification due to its sustainable design features, and its related facilities, including the Train Box and Salesforce Park (each as defined herein). The Train Box was built to accommodate the planned Downtown Rail Extension, described herein. The 5.4 acre Salesforce Park is expected to serve as a "green roof" for the Salesforce Transit Center and absorb carbon dioxide from bus exhaust, absorb and filter stormwater, and provide a habitat for local wildlife.

The terms "Green Project," "Green Bonds" and "Climate Bonds" are neither defined in, nor related to, provisions in the Resolution or the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Owners of the 2017B Bonds do not have any security other than as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement nor do such owners of the Green Bonds assume any specific project risk related to any of the projects funded thereby.

Climate Bonds Initiative and Certification. The CBI is an international, investor-focused non-profit organization working to focus the global bond market on climate change solutions through the development and promotion of an efficient Green Bond market. The CBI has established and manages the Climate Bonds Standard (the "Climate Bonds Standard") under which the 2017B Bonds have been certified, in accordance with the "Low Carbon Land Transport Criteria" under the Climate Bonds Standard. The certification of the 2017B Bonds reflects only the views of the CBI and no assurance can be provided that CBI standards with respect to the Green Projects identified herein will not change. The explanation of the significance of this certification may be obtained from the CBI. The City has provided certain information and materials to the CBI, including information concerning the Salesforce Transit Center. The City covenants in the Fiscal Agent Agreement to spend proceeds of the 2017B Bonds on the Salesforce Transit Center. The City expects to spend the proceeds of the Green Bonds specifically on the Train Box and Salesforce Park. As part of the certification process, Stifel, Nicolaus & Co. Incorporated, one of the underwriters for the Bonds, retained Sustainalytics U.S., Inc., a subsidiary of Sustainalytics Holding, B.V, Netherlands (collectively, "Sustainalytics"), to provide a verification that the 2017B Bonds are aligned with the Climate Bonds Standard.

The certification of the 2017B Bonds as Climate Bonds by the CBI is based solely on the Climate Bond Standard and does not, and is not intended to make any representation or give any assurance with respect to any other matter relating to the 2017B Bonds or any project, including but not limited to this Official Statement, the transaction documents, the City or the management of the City.

The certification of the 2017B Bonds as Climate Bonds by the CBI was addressed solely to the City and is not a recommendation to any person to purchase, hold or sell the 2017B Bonds and such certification does not address the market price or suitability of the 2017B Bonds for a particular investor. The certification also does not address the merits of the decision by the City or any third party to participate in any project and does not express and should not be deemed to be an expression of an opinion as to the City or any aspect of any project (including, but not limited, to the financial viability of any project) other than with respect to conformance with the Climate Bond Standard.

The 2017B Bonds will not constitute “exempt facility bonds” issued to finance “green building and sustainable design projects” within the meaning of Section 142(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

In issuing or monitoring, as applicable, the certification, the CBI has assumed and relied upon and will assume and rely upon the accuracy and completeness in all material respects of the information supplied or otherwise made available to the CBI. The CBI does not assume or accept any responsibility to any person for independently verifying (and it has not verified) such information or to undertake (and it has not undertaken) any independent evaluation of any project or the City. In addition, the CBI does not assume any obligation to conduct (and it has not conducted) any physical inspection of a project. The certification may only be used with the 2017B Bonds and may not be used for any other purpose without the CBI’s prior written consent.

The certification does not and is not in any way intended to address the likelihood of timely payment of interest when due on the 2017B Bonds and/or the payment of principal at maturity or any other date. The certification may be withdrawn at any time in the CBI’s sole and absolute discretion and there can be no assurance that such certification will not be withdrawn.

The CBI is not a licensed broker-dealer or a nationally recognized statistical ratings organization. Certification by the CBI is not a recommendation to buy, sell or hold securities, and such certification may be subject to revision or withdrawal, including, without limitation, if the City’s future capital expenditures from the proceeds of the 2017B Bonds vary from the anticipated expenditures reviewed by the CBI. The City will undertake reasonable efforts to ensure that any adjustment of capital expenditures or other actions taken with respect to the 2017B Bonds will not result in revision or withdrawal of the CBI’s certification; however, there can be no guarantee that such adjustment or other action or a future revision to the CBI’s criteria for certifying bonds will not result in a withdrawal or revision of the CBI’s certification.

The Fiscal Agent Agreement does not restrict the use of proceeds of the 2017A Bonds or future issuances of bonds to the financing of Green Projects and, in the future, the City, on behalf of the District, may issue additional bonds which are not designated as Green Bonds or certified by the CBI. The repayment obligations with respect to the 2017B Bonds are not conditioned on the completion of any particular project or the satisfaction of any condition relating to the status of the 2017B Bonds as Green Bonds or the certification of such bonds by the CBI. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS.”

Pursuant to the Continuing Disclosure Certificate, the City will provide to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board’s (“MSRB”) Electronic Municipal Market Access website (“EMMA”) an annual report with a statement confirming that, during the most recent fiscal year, proceeds of the 2017B Bonds were spent only on the Green Projects identified herein. In addition, under the Continuing Disclosure Certificate, within 10 days after the City receives a written statement from the Climate Bonds Initiative to the effect that the 2017B Bonds are no longer certified in accordance with the “Low Carbon Land Transport Criteria” under the Climate Bonds Standard, the City will post, or cause to be posted, notice of such written statement on EMMA. See APPENDIX E – FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE.”

Debt Service Schedule

The following is the debt service schedule for the 2017 Bonds, assuming no redemptions other than mandatory sinking fund redemptions.

Year Ending (September 1)	2017A Bonds ⁽¹⁾			2017B Bonds ⁽¹⁾			Total Annual Debt Service
	Principal	Interest	Total	Principal	Interest	Total	
2018	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 195,893.48	\$ 295,893.48	\$ 470,000.00	\$ 932,149.16	\$ 1,402,149.16	\$ 1,698,042.64
2019	265,000.00	1,357,531.26	1,622,531.26	1,240,000.00	6,449,850.00	7,689,850.00	9,312,381.26
2020	300,000.00	1,352,893.76	1,652,893.76	1,420,000.00	6,428,150.00	7,848,150.00	9,501,043.76
2021	340,000.00	1,346,893.76	1,686,893.76	1,605,000.00	6,399,750.00	8,004,750.00	9,691,643.76
2022	380,000.00	1,339,243.76	1,719,243.76	1,805,000.00	6,363,637.50	8,168,637.50	9,887,881.26
2023	425,000.00	1,329,743.76	1,754,743.76	2,005,000.00	6,318,512.50	8,323,512.50	10,078,256.26
2024	470,000.00	1,318,056.26	1,788,056.26	2,235,000.00	6,263,375.00	8,498,375.00	10,286,431.26
2025	520,000.00	1,303,956.26	1,823,956.26	2,470,000.00	6,196,325.00	8,666,325.00	10,490,281.26
2026	580,000.00	1,288,356.26	1,868,356.26	2,710,000.00	6,122,225.00	8,832,225.00	10,700,581.26
2027	630,000.00	1,269,506.26	1,899,506.26	2,980,000.00	6,034,150.00	9,014,150.00	10,913,656.26
2028	695,000.00	1,249,031.26	1,944,031.26	3,250,000.00	5,937,300.00	9,187,300.00	11,131,331.26
2029	755,000.00	1,225,575.02	1,980,575.02	3,545,000.00	5,827,612.50	9,372,612.50	11,353,187.52
2030	825,000.00	1,199,150.02	2,024,150.02	3,855,000.00	5,703,537.50	9,558,537.50	11,582,687.52
2031	890,000.00	1,170,275.02	2,060,275.02	4,185,000.00	5,568,612.50	9,753,612.50	11,813,887.52
2032	950,000.00	1,138,012.52	2,088,012.52	4,545,000.00	5,416,906.26	9,961,906.26	12,049,918.78
2033	1,035,000.00	1,103,575.00	2,138,575.00	4,905,000.00	5,252,150.00	10,157,150.00	12,295,725.00
2034	1,120,000.00	1,064,762.50	2,184,762.50	5,280,000.00	5,068,212.50	10,348,212.50	12,532,975.00
2035	1,245,000.00	1,022,762.50	2,267,762.50	5,650,000.00	4,870,212.50	10,520,212.50	12,787,975.00
2036	1,300,000.00	976,075.00	2,276,075.00	6,110,000.00	4,658,337.50	10,768,337.50	13,044,412.50
2037	1,390,000.00	927,325.00	2,317,325.00	6,555,000.00	4,429,212.50	10,984,212.50	13,301,537.50
2038	1,490,000.00	875,200.00	2,365,200.00	7,025,000.00	4,183,400.00	11,208,400.00	13,573,600.00
2039	1,595,000.00	815,600.00	2,410,600.00	7,530,000.00	3,902,400.00	11,432,400.00	13,843,000.00
2040	1,685,000.00	751,800.00	2,436,800.00	8,085,000.00	3,601,200.00	11,686,200.00	14,123,000.00
2041	1,830,000.00	684,400.00	2,514,400.00	8,610,000.00	3,277,800.00	11,887,800.00	14,402,200.00
2042	1,935,000.00	611,200.00	2,546,200.00	9,210,000.00	2,933,400.00	12,143,400.00	14,689,600.00
2043	2,045,000.00	533,800.00	2,578,800.00	9,840,000.00	2,565,000.00	12,405,000.00	14,983,800.00
2044	2,185,000.00	452,000.00	2,637,000.00	10,475,000.00	2,171,400.00	12,646,400.00	15,283,400.00
2045	2,320,000.00	364,600.00	2,684,600.00	11,150,000.00	1,752,400.00	12,902,400.00	15,587,000.00
2046	2,465,000.00	271,800.00	2,736,800.00	11,860,000.00	1,306,400.00	13,166,400.00	15,903,200.00
2047	2,100,000.00	173,200.00	2,273,200.00	10,090,000.00	832,000.00	10,922,000.00	13,195,200.00
2048	2,230,000.00	89,200.00	2,319,200.00	10,710,000.00	428,400.00	11,138,400.00	13,457,600.00
Total	\$36,095,000.00	\$28,801,418.66	\$64,896,418.66	\$171,405,000.00	\$137,194,017.92	\$308,599,017.92	\$373,495,436.58

⁽¹⁾ Special Taxes may only be levied on any individual parcel in the District for a maximum term of 30 years, thus, the levy on 350 Mission Street and 299 Fremont Street will terminate in 2046 before the final maturity of the 2017 Bonds. The 2017 Bonds have been structured to maintain projected coverage of 110%, notwithstanding the termination of the levy on such parcels. See "SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Maximum Term of Levy" herein. Amounts shown are net of \$906,431.88 capitalized interest relating to the 2017A Bonds and net of \$4,305,114.17 capitalized interest relating to the 2017B Bonds.

SECURITY FOR THE BONDS

General

The Bonds will be secured by a first pledge pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement of all of the Special Tax Revenues and all moneys deposited in the Bond Fund (including the Special Tax Prepayments Account) and, until disbursed as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in the Special Tax Fund. The Special Tax Revenues and all moneys deposited into such funds (except as otherwise provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) are dedicated to the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the Bonds as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement and in the Act until all of the Bonds have been paid and retired or until moneys or Federal Securities have been set aside irrevocably for that purpose under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. “Special Tax Revenues” means the proceeds of the Special Taxes received by the City, including any scheduled payments thereof and any Special Tax Prepayments, interest thereon and proceeds of the redemption or sale of property sold as a result of foreclosure of the lien of the Special Taxes to the amount of said lien and interest thereon, but shall not include any interest in excess of the interest due on the Bonds or any penalties collected in connection with any such foreclosure.

The Special Taxes are to be apportioned, levied and collected according to the Rate and Method on Parcels developed with Taxable Buildings. In general, Special Taxes can only be levied on a property within the District if: (i) the property is a “Conditioned Project,” as defined in the Rate and Method; (ii) a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued for the property; and (iii) a Tax Commencement Authorization for the property has been executed by the City’s Director of the Office of Public Finance.

A Conditioned Project is a Development Project that is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities through the District, because it received a zoning bonus to exceed the height and floor-to-area ratios that would have otherwise been applicable under the City’s Planning Code.

See APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX” hereto.

The 2017 Bonds and all Related Parity Bonds shall be secured by a first pledge of all moneys deposited in the Reserve Fund. The moneys in the Reserve Fund are dedicated to the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the 2017 Bonds and all Related Parity Bonds as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement and in the Act until all of the 2017 Bonds and all Related Parity Bonds have been paid and retired or until moneys or Federal Securities have been set aside irrevocably for that purpose.

The 2017A Bonds are secured by a first pledge of all moneys deposited in the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account. The 2017B Bonds are secured by a first pledge of all moneys deposited in the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account.

“Related Parity Bonds” means any series of Parity Bonds for which (i) the Proceeds are deposited into the Reserve Fund so that the balance therein is equal to the Reserve Requirement following issuance of such Parity Bonds and (ii) the related Supplemental Agreement specifies that the Reserve Fund shall act as a reserve for the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, such series of Parity Bonds.

Amounts in the 2017A Improvement Account, the Allocated Bonds Account, the Administrative Expense Fund, and the Costs of Issuance Fund are not pledged to the repayment of the Bonds. The Project is not pledged to the repayment of the Bonds, nor are the proceeds of any condemnation or insurance award received by the City with respect to the Project.

Limited Obligation

The Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of or interest on the Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the Bonds.

Teeter Plan

The Board of Supervisors of the City adopted the “Alternative Method of Distribution of Tax Levies and Collections and of Tax Sale Proceeds” (the “Teeter Plan”), as provided for in Section 4701 *et seq.* of the California Revenue and Taxation Code, in 1993 pursuant to Resolution No. 830-93. The Teeter Plan provides for the allocation and distribution of property tax levies and collections and of tax sale proceeds.

By Resolution No. 245-17, the Board of Supervisors extended the Teeter Plan to the allocation and distribution of Special Taxes of the District. Under the Teeter Plan, the City will maintain a tax loss reserve fund for the purpose of paying each taxing agency 100% of the amounts of secured taxes (including the Special Taxes of the District) levied on the tax bill irrespective of any delinquent taxes.

The District is the only community facilities district in the City that is currently participating in the City’s Teeter Plan. The City has the power to unilaterally discontinue the Teeter Plan or remove the District from the Teeter Plan. The Teeter Plan may also be discontinued by petition of two-thirds (2/3) of the participant taxing agencies. The City has the power to include additional taxing agencies on the Teeter Plan.

Special Tax Fund

Special Tax Fund. Pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, there is established a “Special Tax Fund” to be held by the Fiscal Agent, to the credit of which the Fiscal Agent will deposit amounts received from or on behalf of the City consisting of Special Tax Revenues and amounts transferred from the Administrative Expense Fund and the Bond Fund. The City has agreed in the Fiscal Agent Agreement that it will promptly remit any Special Tax Revenues received by it to the Fiscal Agent for deposit by the Fiscal Agent to the Special Tax Fund. Notwithstanding the foregoing,

(i) any Special Tax Revenues constituting the collection of delinquencies in payment of Special Taxes shall be separately identified by the Finance Director and shall be disposed of by the Fiscal Agent first, for transfer to the Bond Fund to pay any past due debt service on the Bonds; second, without preference or priority for transfer to (a) the Reserve Fund to the extent needed to increase the amount then on deposit in the Reserve Fund up to the then Reserve Requirement and (b) the reserve account for any Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds to the extent needed to increase the amount then on deposit in such reserve account up to the amount then required to be on deposit therein (and in the event the collection of delinquencies in payment of Special Taxes are not sufficient for the purposes of this clause, such amounts shall be applied to the Reserve Fund and any other reserve accounts ratably based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds); and third, to be held in the Special Tax Fund for use as described in below under “- Disbursements”; and

(ii) any proceeds of Special Tax Prepayments shall be separately identified by the Finance Director and shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent as follows (as directed in writing by the Finance Director): (a) that portion of any Special Tax Prepayment constituting a prepayment of costs of the Project shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent to the Improvement Fund and (b) the remaining Special Tax Prepayment shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent in the Special Tax Prepayments Account established pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Moneys in the Special Tax Fund shall be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and Owners of the Bonds, shall be disbursed as provided below and, pending disbursement, shall be subject to a lien in favor of the Owners of the Bonds.

Disbursements from the Special Tax Fund. At least seven (7) days prior to each Interest Payment Date or redemption date, as applicable, the Fiscal Agent will withdraw from the Special Tax Fund and transfer the following amounts in the following order of priority:

(i) to the Bond Fund an amount, taking into account any amounts then on deposit in the Bond Fund and any expected transfers from the Improvement Fund, the Reserve Fund and any reserve account for Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account, the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account and the Special Tax Prepayments Account to the Bond Fund such that the amount in the Bond Fund equals the principal (including any sinking payment), premium, if any, and interest due on the Bonds on such Interest Payment Date or redemption date, and any past due principal or interest on the Bonds not theretofore paid from a transfer described in clause second of subparagraph (ii) above under “- *Special Tax Fund*,” and

(ii) without preference or priority (a) to the Reserve Fund an amount, taking into account amounts then on deposit in the Reserve Fund, such that the amount in the Reserve Fund is equal to the Reserve Requirement, and (b) to the reserve account for any Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, taking into account amounts then on deposit in such reserve account, such that the amount in such reserve account is equal to the amount required to be on deposit therein (and in the event that amounts in the Special Tax Fund are not sufficient for the purposes of this paragraph, such amounts shall be applied to the Reserve Fund and any other reserve accounts ratably based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds).

Each calendar year, following the transfers pursuant to the preceding paragraph for the March 1 Interest Payment Date occurring in such calendar year, when amounts (including investment earnings) have been accumulated in the Special Tax Fund sufficient to make the transfers pursuant to the preceding paragraph for the September 1 Interest Payment Date occurring in such calendar year, the Finance Director, during the period up to but not including December 10 of such calendar year, may in his or her sole discretion direct in writing the disposition of moneys in the Special Tax Fund in excess of the amounts needed for such September 1 Interest Payment Date as follows: (i) direct the Fiscal Agent to transfer money to the Improvement Fund (or the accounts therein) for payment or reimbursement of the costs of the Project, (ii) direct the Fiscal Agent to transfer money to the Administrative Expense Fund, in an amount not to exceed the amount included in the Special Tax levy for Administrative Expenses for such Fiscal Year and (iii) direct the Fiscal Agent to transfer money for any other lawful purpose.

Administrative Expense Fund

The Fiscal Agent will transfer from the Special Tax Fund and deposit in the Administrative Expense Fund established under the Fiscal Agent Agreement an amount equal to the amount specified in an Officer’s Certificate to be used to pay an Administrative Expense or a Cost of Issuance. Amounts deposited in the Administrative Expense Fund are not pledged to the repayment on the Bonds.

Bond Fund

The Bond Fund is established under the Fiscal Agent Agreement as a separate fund to be held by the Fiscal Agent. Moneys in the Bond Fund will be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the Owners of the Bonds, and shall be disbursed for the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the Bonds as provided below.

Capitalized Interest Accounts. Within the Bond Fund there is established a separate account designated as the “2017A Capitalized Interest Account” to be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and the Owners of the 2017A Bonds. Amounts on deposit in the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account will be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent solely for the payment of interest on the 2017A Bonds.

Within the Bond Fund there is established as a separate account designated as the “2017B Capitalized Interest Account” to be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and the Owners of the 2017B Bonds. Amounts on deposit in the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account will be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent solely for the payment of interest on the 2017B Bonds.

Flow of Funds for Payment of Principal and Interest. At least ten (10) days before each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall notify the Finance Director in writing as to the principal and premium, if any, and interest due on the Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date (whether as a result of scheduled principal of and interest on the Bonds, optional redemption of the Bonds or a mandatory sinking fund redemption). On each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall withdraw from the Bond Fund and pay to the Owners of the Bonds the principal of, and interest and any premium, due and payable on such Interest Payment Date on the Bonds. Notwithstanding the foregoing, amounts in the Bond Fund as a result of a transfer of the collections of delinquent Special Taxes will be immediately disbursed by the Fiscal Agent to pay past due amounts owing on the Bonds.

At least five (5) days prior to each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall determine if the amounts then on deposit in the Bond Fund are sufficient to pay the debt service due on the Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date. If amounts in the Bond Fund are insufficient for such purpose, the Fiscal Agent promptly will notify the Finance Director by telephone (and confirm in writing) of the amount of the insufficiency.

If amounts in the Bond Fund are insufficient for the purpose set forth in the preceding paragraph with respect to any Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent will do the following:

(i) Withdraw from the Reserve Fund, in accordance with the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement, to the extent of any funds or Permitted Investments therein, amounts to cover the amount of such Bond Fund insufficiency related to the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds. Amounts so withdrawn from the Reserve Fund shall be deposited in the Bond Fund.

(ii) Withdraw from the reserve funds, if any, established under a Supplemental Agreement related to Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, to the extent of any funds or Permitted Investments therein, amounts to cover the amount of such Bond Fund insufficiency related to such Parity Bonds. Amounts so withdrawn from the reserve fund shall be deposited in the Bond Fund.

If, after the foregoing transfers and application of such funds for their intended purposes, there are insufficient funds in the Bond Fund to make the payments provided for in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, the Fiscal Agent shall apply the available funds first to the payment of interest on the Bonds, then to the payment of principal due on the Bonds other than by reason of sinking payments, if any, and then to

payment of principal due on the Bonds by reason of sinking payments. Each such payment shall be made ratably to the Owners of the Bonds based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds, if there are insufficient funds to make the corresponding payment for all of the then Outstanding bonds, subject to the restrictions on the uses of any funds as set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Any sinking payment not made as scheduled shall be added to the sinking payment to be made on the next sinking payment date.

Any failure by the Fiscal Agent to provide the notices required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement will not alter the obligation of the City to make the scheduled payments from amounts in the Bond Fund.

Special Tax Prepayments Account. Within the Bond Fund a separate account will be held by the Fiscal Agent, designated the “Special Tax Prepayments Account.” Moneys in the Special Tax Prepayments Account will be transferred by the Fiscal Agent to the Bond Fund on the next date for which notice of redemption of Bonds can timely be given under the Fiscal Agent Agreement and will be used (together with any amounts transferred for the purpose) to redeem Bonds on the redemption date selected in accordance with the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Establishment of Improvement Fund

The Improvement Fund is established as a separate fund under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and within the Improvement Fund there is established a 2017A Improvement Account and an Allocated Bond Proceeds Account, to be held by the Fiscal Agent and to the credit of which fund and account deposits shall be made as required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Moneys in the Improvement Fund will be disbursed, except as otherwise provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement upon completion of the Project, for the payment or reimbursement of the costs of the Project.

Disbursements from the 2017A Improvement Account and the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account will be made by the Fiscal Agent upon receipt of an Officer's Certificate which shall: (i) set forth the amount required to be disbursed, the purpose for which the disbursement is to be made (which shall be for payment of a Project cost or to reimburse expenditures of the City or any other party for Project costs previously paid), and the person to which the disbursement is to be paid; (ii) certify that no portion of the amount then being requested to be disbursed was set forth in any Officers Certificate previously filed requesting disbursement; and (iii) certify that all disbursements from the Improvement Fund are in compliance with the Joint Community Facilities Agreement, dated as of as of December 1, 2014, between the City and the TJPA, as amended from time to time. Because the 2017B Bonds have been designated as Green Bonds, proceeds of the 2017B Bonds in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account shall be spent only on Project costs of the Salesforce Transit Center. In the event that any moneys in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account are not spent on Project costs at the Salesforce Transit Center, the City shall, within thirty (30) days after such expenditure, provide written notice of such expenditure to The Climate Bonds Initiative in accordance with the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Reserve Fund

The District has established a Reserve Fund for the benefit of the 2017 Bonds and any related Parity Bonds pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement to be funded at the Reserve Requirement. “Reserve Requirement” means, as of the date of issuance of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds, an amount equal to the lesser of (i) Maximum Annual Debt Service on the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds between the date of such calculation and the final maturity of such Bonds or (ii) one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of average Annual Debt Service on the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds between the date of such calculation and the final maturity of such Bonds and (iii) 10% of the original principal amount of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds (or, if the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds have more than a *de minimis* amount of original issue discount or premium, 10% of the issue price

of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds); provided that, with respect to the issuance of any Related Parity Bonds, if the Reserve Fund would have to be increased by an amount greater than ten percent (10%) of the stated principal amount of the Related Parity Bonds (or, if the Related Parity Bonds have more than a *de minimis* amount of original issue discount or premium, of the issue price of such Related Parity Bonds), then the Reserve Requirement shall be such lesser amount as is determined by a deposit of such ten percent (10%); and provided that accrued interest on any Related Parity Bonds deposited with the Fiscal Agent upon delivery of such Related Parity Bonds shall be excluded for purposes of the calculation of the Reserve Requirement.

The City shall have the right at any time to direct the Fiscal Agent to release funds from the Reserve Fund, in whole or in part, by tendering to the Fiscal Agent: (i) a Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument, and (ii) an opinion of Bond Counsel stating that neither the release of such funds nor the acceptance of such Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument will cause interest on the 2017 Bonds or any Related Parity Bonds the interest on which is excluded from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes to become includable in gross income for purposes of federal income taxation. See APPENDIX C – “SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT” hereto.

Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Taxes

The following is a brief summary of certain provisions of the Rate and Method. This summary does not purport to be comprehensive and reference should be made to the full Rate and Method attached hereto as Appendix B.

Certain Definitions. All capitalized terms not defined in this section have the meanings set forth in the Rate and Method attached hereto as Appendix B.

“Administrator” means the Director of the Office of Public Finance who shall be responsible for administering the Special Tax according to the Rate and Method.

“Affordable Housing Project” means a residential or primarily residential project, as determined by the Zoning Authority, within which all Residential Units are Below Market Rate Units.

“Building” means a permanent enclosed structure that is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project.

“Certificate of Occupancy” means the first certificate, including any temporary certificate of occupancy, issued by the City to confirm that a Building or a portion of a Building has met all of the building codes and can be occupied for residential and/or non-residential use. For purposes of the Rate and Method, “Certificate of Occupancy” shall not include any certificate of occupancy that was issued prior to January 1, 2013 for a Building within the District; however, any subsequent certificates of occupancy that are issued for new construction or expansion of the Building shall be deemed a Certificate of Occupancy and the associated Parcel(s) shall be categorized as Taxable Parcels if the Building is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project and a Tax Commencement Authorization has been provided to the Administrator for the Building.

“Conditioned Project” means a Development Project that is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities through the District.

“CPC” means the Capital Planning Committee of the City and County of San Francisco, or if the Capital Planning Committee no longer exists, “CPC” shall mean the designated staff member(s) within the City and/or TJPA that will recommend issuance of Tax Commencement Authorizations for Conditioned Projects within the District.

“Development Project” means a residential, non-residential, or mixed-use development that includes one or more Buildings, or portions thereof, that are planned and entitled in a single application to the City.

“Initial Annual Adjustment Factor” means, as of July 1 of any Fiscal Year, the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate published by the Office of the City Administrator’s Capital Planning Group and used to calculate the annual adjustment to the City’s development impact fees that took effect as of January 1 of the prior Fiscal Year pursuant to Section 409(b) of the Planning Code, as may be amended from time to time. If changes are made to the office responsible for calculating the annual adjustment, the name of the inflation index, or the date on which the development fee adjustment takes effect, the Administrator shall continue to rely on whatever annual adjustment factor is applied to the City’s development impact fees in order to calculate adjustments to the Base Special Taxes. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Base Special Taxes shall, in no Fiscal Year, be increased or decreased by more than four percent (4%) of the amount in effect in the prior Fiscal Year.

“IPIC” means the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, or if the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee no longer exists, “IPIC” shall mean the designated staff member(s) within the City and/or TJPA that will recommend issuance of Tax Commencement Authorizations for Conditioned Projects within the District.

“Taxable Building” means, in any Fiscal Year, any Building within the CFD that is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project, and for which a Certificate of Occupancy was issued and a Tax Commencement Authorization was received by the Administrator on or prior to June 30 of the preceding Fiscal Year. If only a portion of the Building is a Conditioned Project, as determined by the Zoning Authority, that portion of the Building shall be treated as a Taxable Building for purposes of the Rate and Method.

“Taxable Parcel” means, within a Taxable Building, any Parcel that is not exempt from the Special Tax pursuant to law or the Rate and Method. If, in any Fiscal Year, a Special Tax is levied on only Net New Square Footage in a Taxable Building, only the Parcel(s) on which the Net New Square Footage is located shall be Taxable Parcel(s) for purposes of calculating and levying the Special Tax pursuant to the Rate and Method.

“Tax Commencement Authorization” means a written authorization issued by the Administrator upon the recommendations of the IPIC and CPC in order to initiate the levy of the Special Tax on a Conditioned Project that has been issued a Certificate of Occupancy.

“Zoning Authority” means either the City Zoning Administrator, the Executive Director of the San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, or an alternate designee from the agency or department responsible for the approvals and entitlements of a project in the District. If there is any doubt as to the responsible party, the Administrator shall coordinate with the City Zoning Administrator to determine the appropriate party to serve as the Zoning Authority for purposes of this RMA.

General. A Special Tax applicable to each Taxable Parcel in the District shall be levied and collected according to the tax liability determined by the Administrator through the application of the appropriate amount or rate for Square Footage of a Taxable Parcel, as described below. All Taxable Parcels in the District shall be taxed for the purposes, to the extent, and in the manner provided in the Rate and Method, including property subsequently annexed to the District unless a separate Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Tax is adopted for the Future Annexation Area.

In general, Special Taxes can only be levied on a property within the District if: (i) the property is a “Conditioned Project,” as defined in the Rate and Method, (ii) a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued for the property and (iii) a Tax Commencement Authorization for the property has been executed by the City’s Director of the Office of Public Finance. Special Taxes cannot be levied on: (i) undeveloped property within the District or (ii) any parcel that has not met the conditions specified in the first sentence of this paragraph.

See APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX” hereto.

Summary of Special Tax Rates. The following table summarizes the Special Tax Rates determined in accordance with the Rate and Method.

Fiscal Year 2017-18				
Base Special Tax Rate⁽¹⁾				
Building Height In stories	For-Sale Residential Per Square Foot	Rental Residential Per Square Foot	Office/Hotel Per Square Foot	Retail Per Square Foot
1-5	\$5.51	\$5.18	\$4.04	\$3.72
6-10	5.87	5.38	4.16	3.72
11-15	7.17	5.44	4.71	3.72
16-20	7.49	5.47	4.84	3.72
21-25	7.73	5.53	4.97	3.72
26-30	7.91	5.59	5.10	3.72
31-35	8.05	5.65	5.23	3.72
66-40	8.19	5.70	5.36	3.72
41-45	8.32	5.76	5.49	3.72
46-50	8.48	5.83	5.62	3.72
> 50	8.61	5.88	5.74	3.72

Source: Special Tax Consultant.

⁽¹⁾ Once a parcel becomes a Taxable Parcel pursuant to the Rate and Method, there is an annual 2% increase. For parcels not yet categorized as Taxable Parcels, there is an annual adjustment that is based on the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate published by the Office of the City Administrator’s Capital Planning Group, capped at an annual adjustment of up to 4% increase or decrease. See APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX” hereto.

Maximum Special Tax. Upon issuance of a Tax Commencement Authorization and the first Certificate of Occupancy for a Taxable Building within a Conditioned Project that is not an Affordable Housing Project, the Administrator shall coordinate with the Zoning Authority to determine the Square Footage of each Land Use on each Taxable Parcel. The Administrator shall then apply the steps set forth in the Rate and Method to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the next succeeding Fiscal Year for each Taxable Parcel in the Taxable Building.

For a discussion of changes to the Maximum Special Tax under the Rate and Method, see APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX” hereto.

Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure

General. In the event of a delinquency in the payment of any installment of Special Taxes, the City is authorized by the Act to order institution of an action in the Superior Courts of the State to foreclose any lien therefor. In such action, the real property subject to the Special Taxes may be sold at a judicial foreclosure sale. The ability of the City to foreclose the lien of delinquent unpaid Special Taxes may be limited in certain instances and may require prior consent of the property owner in the event the property is owned by or in receivership of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the "FDIC") or other similar federal agencies. See "SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Bankruptcy and Foreclosure" and "SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Tax Delinquencies." Such judicial foreclosure proceedings are not mandatory.

There could be a default or a delay in payments to the owners of the Bonds pending prosecution of foreclosure proceedings and receipt by the City of foreclosure sale proceeds, if any, and subsequent transfer of those proceeds to the City. Special Taxes may be levied on all property within the District up to the maximum amount permitted under the Rate and Method to provide the amount required to pay debt service on the Bonds, however, the Special Tax levy on property used for private residential purposes may not increase by more than 10% above the amount that would have been levied in that Fiscal Year as a consequence of delinquencies or defaults by the owners of any other parcels in the District.

Under current law, a judgment debtor (property owner) has at least 120 days from the date of service of the notice of levy in which to redeem the property to be sold. If a judgment debtor fails to redeem and the property is sold, his only remedy is an action to set aside the sale, which must be brought within 90 days of the date of sale. If, as a result of such an action a foreclosure sale is set aside, the judgment is revived, the judgment creditor is entitled to interest on the revived judgment and any liens extinguished by the sale are revived as if the sale had not been made (Section 701.680 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California).

Covenant to Foreclose. Under the Act, the City covenants in the Fiscal Agent Agreement with and for the benefit of the Owners of the Bonds that it will order, and cause to be commenced as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and thereafter diligently prosecute to judgment (unless such delinquency is theretofore brought current), an action in the superior court to foreclose the lien of any Special Tax or installment thereof not paid when due as provided in the following two paragraphs. The Finance Director shall notify the City Attorney of any such delinquency of which the Finance Director is aware, and the City Attorney shall commence, or cause to be commenced, such proceedings.

On or about September 1 of each Fiscal Year, the Finance Director shall compare the amount of Special Taxes theretofore levied in the District to the amount of Special Tax Revenues theretofore received by the City, and:

(A) **Individual Delinquencies.** If the Finance Director determines that (i) any single parcel subject to the Special Tax in the District is delinquent in the payment of Special Taxes in the aggregate amount of \$40,000 or more or (ii) any single parcel subject to the Special Tax in the District is delinquent in the payment of three or more installments of Special Taxes, then the Finance Director shall send or cause to be sent a notice of delinquency (and a demand for immediate payment thereof) to the property owner within 45 days of such determination, and (if the delinquency remains uncured) foreclosure proceedings shall be commenced by the City within 90 days of such determination.

(B) **Aggregate Delinquencies.** If the Finance Director determines that the total amount of delinquent Special Tax for the prior Fiscal Year for the entire District, (including the total of delinquencies under subsection (A) above), exceeds 5% of the total Special Tax due and payable for the prior Fiscal Year, the Finance Director shall notify or cause to be notified property owners who are then delinquent in the

payment of Special Taxes (and demand immediate payment of the delinquency) within 45 days of such determination, and shall commence foreclosure proceedings within 90 days of such determination against each parcel of land in the District with a Special Tax delinquency.

The Finance Director and the City Attorney, as applicable, are authorized to employ counsel to conduct any such foreclosure proceedings. The fees and expenses of any such counsel (including a charge for City staff time) in conducting foreclosure proceedings shall be an Administrative Expense.

No Obligation of the City Upon Delinquency

The City is under no obligation to transfer any funds of the City into the Special Tax Fund or any other funds or accounts under the Fiscal Agent Agreement for the payment of the principal of or interest on the Bonds if a delinquency occurs in the payment of any Special Taxes, other than Special Tax Revenues. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure,” for a discussion of the City’s obligation to foreclose Special Tax liens upon delinquencies, and “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Reserve Fund,” for a discussion of the Reserve Fund securing the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds.

Parity Bonds

The City may issue Parity Bonds in addition to the 2017 Bonds under a Supplemental Agreement entered into by the City and the Fiscal Agent. Any such Parity Bonds shall be secured by a lien on the Special Tax Revenues and funds pledged for the payment of the Bonds under the Fiscal Agent Agreement on a parity with all other Bonds Outstanding under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The principal amount of the 2017 Bonds and any Parity Bonds shall not exceed \$1.4 billion (although Parity Bonds that constitute refunding bonds under the Act will not count against this \$1.4 billion limit). The City may issue such Parity Bonds, on a parity basis with the 2017 Bonds, subject to the following specific conditions precedent:

(A) *Compliance.* The City shall be in compliance with all covenants set forth in this Agreement and all Supplemental Agreements, and issuance of the Parity Bonds shall not cause the City to exceed the District’s \$1.4 billion limitation on debt.

(B) *Same Payment Dates.* The Supplemental Agreement providing for the issuance of such Parity Bonds shall provide that interest thereon shall be payable on Interest Payment Dates, and principal thereof shall be payable on September 1 in any year in which principal is payable on the Parity Bonds (provided that there shall be no requirement that any Parity Bonds pay interest on a current basis).

(C) *Separate Funds; Reserve Fund or Reserve Account.* The Supplemental Agreement providing for the issuance of such Parity Bonds may provide for the establishment of separate funds and accounts.

The Supplemental Agreement providing for issuance of the Parity Bonds shall provide for one of the following:

(i) a deposit to the Reserve Fund in an amount necessary such that the amount deposited therein shall equal the Reserve Requirement following issuance of the Parity Bonds;

(ii) a deposit to a reserve account for the Parity Bonds (and such other series of Parity Bonds identified by the City) in an amount defined in such Supplemental Agreement, as long as such Supplemental Agreement expressly declares that the Owners of such Parity Bonds will have no interest in or claim to the

Reserve Fund and that the Owners of the Bonds covered by the Reserve Fund will have no interest in or claim to such other reserve account; or

(iii) no deposit to either the Reserve Fund or another reserve account as long as such Supplemental Agreement expressly declares that the Owners of such Parity Bonds will have no interest in or claim to the Reserve Fund or any other reserve account. The Supplemental Agreement may provide that the City may satisfy the reserve requirement for a series of Parity Bonds by the deposit into the reserve account established pursuant to such Supplemental Agreement of an irrevocable standby or direct-pay letter of credit, insurance policy, or surety bond issued by a commercial bank or insurance company as described in the Supplemental Agreement.

(D) *Value.* The CFD Value shall be at least three (3) times the sum of: (i) the aggregate principal amount of all Bonds then Outstanding, plus (ii) the aggregate principal amount of the series of Parity Bonds proposed to be issued, plus (iii) the aggregate principal amount of any fixed assessment liens on the parcels in the District subject to the levy of Special Taxes, plus (iv) a portion of the aggregate principal amount of any and all other community facilities district bonds then outstanding and payable at least partially from special taxes to be levied on parcels of land within the District (the “Other District Bonds”) equal to the aggregate outstanding principal amount of the Other District Bonds multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount of special taxes levied for the Other District Bonds on parcels of land within the District, and the denominator of which is the total amount of special taxes levied for the Other District Bonds on all parcels of land against which the special taxes are levied to pay the Other District Bonds (such fraction to be determined based upon the maximum special taxes which could be levied in the year in which maximum annual debt service on the Other District Bonds occurs), based upon information from the most recent available Fiscal Year.

(E) *Coverage.* For each Fiscal Year after issuance of the Parity Bonds, the maximum amount of the Special Taxes that, based on Taxable Parcels as of the date of issuance of such Parity Bonds, may be levied for such Fiscal Year under the Ordinance, the Agreement and any Supplemental Agreement for each respective Fiscal Year, shall be at least 110% of the total Annual Debt Service of the then Outstanding Bonds and the proposed Parity Bonds for each Bond Year that commences in each such Fiscal Year, and the aggregate Special Tax Prepayments that could occur after the issuance of the Parity Bonds shall be not less than the principal amount of the Outstanding Bonds and the proposed Parity Bonds. “Bond Year” means the one-year period beginning on September 2nd in each year and ending on September 1 in the following year, except that the first Bond Year shall begin on the related Closing Date and shall end on September 1, 2018.

(F) *Certificates.* The City shall deliver to the Fiscal Agent an Officer’s Certificate certifying that the conditions precedent to the issuance of such Parity Bonds set forth in subsections (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) above have been satisfied.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City may issue Refunding Bonds as Parity Bonds without the need to satisfy the requirements of clauses (D) or (E) above, and, in connection therewith, the Officer’s Certificate in clause (F) above need not make reference to clauses (D) and (E). The City is not prohibited from issuing any other bonds or otherwise incurring debt secured by a pledge of the Special Tax Revenues subordinate to the pledge under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

THE CITY

The City is the economic and cultural center of the San Francisco Bay Area and northern California. The limits of the City encompass over 93 square miles, of which 49 square miles are land, with the balance consisting of tidelands and a portion of the San Francisco Bay (the “Bay”). The City is located at the northern tip of the San Francisco Peninsula, generally bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the Bay and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to the east, the entrance to the Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge to the north, and San Mateo County to the south. Silicon Valley is about a 40-minute drive to the south, and the Napa and Sonoma “wine country” is about an hour’s drive to the north. The City’s 2017 population was approximately 874,228. See APPENDIX A – “CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO” hereto.

THE DISTRICT

Background

The District was established pursuant to the following proceedings:

Resolution of Intention to Establish: On July 15, 2014, the Board of Supervisors of the City adopted Resolution No. 247-14 stating its intent to form the District under the Act.

Resolution of Intention to Incur Debt: On July 15, 2014, the Board of Supervisors of the City adopted Resolution No. 246-14, in which it declared its intention to incur bonded indebtedness on behalf of the District in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion.

Resolution of Formation; Resolution Declaring Necessity for Bonded Indebtedness: On September 23, 2014, after holding a noticed public hearing, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution Nos. 350-14 and 351-14, forming the District and, subject to approval by the qualified electors, approving the levy of special taxes within the District according to the Rate and Method, an appropriations limit for the District not to exceed \$300,000,000 and bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion. The Mayor approved these resolutions on September 29, 2014.

Election: On December 29, 2014, an election was held within the District pursuant to the Act at which the qualified landowner electors approved the levy of special taxes according to the Rate and Method, incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion and the appropriations limit. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS,” “THE DISTRICT” herein and APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX.”

Ordinance: On January 13, 2015, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 1-15, levying special taxes in the District. The Mayor approved the Ordinance on January 20, 2015.

In addition to the three Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties), there are currently eight additional Conditioned Projects in the District and four Conditioned Projects in the Future Annexation Area planned for residential, commercial or mixed use that may become subject to the Special Tax. In general, Special Taxes can only be levied on a property within the District if: (i) the property is a “Conditioned Project,” as defined in the Rate and Method, (ii) a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued for the property and (iii) a Tax Commencement Authorization for the property has been executed by the City’s Director of the Office of Public Finance.

Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) have received a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commencement Authorization. Together, they contribute 100% of the Special Tax Revenues (as defined herein) levied by the Board of Supervisors of the City. See “THE DISTRICT” and “SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Concentration of Property Ownership” herein.

The following table sets forth the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) contributing to the Special Tax and the current Conditioned Projects in various stages of planning and development. Taxable square footage is presented on the table for Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) contributing to the Special Tax and preliminary estimated gross square footage provided for all other projects.

From time to time, additional properties in the District or the Future Annexation Area may become Conditioned Projects because they receive zoning bonuses to exceed certain height limits and floor-to-area ratios established pursuant to the City’s Planning Code. No assurance can be provided that any particular property will be annexed into the District, become a Conditioned Project and become subject to Special Taxes as a Taxable Building.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

Table 1
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)
Completed and Conditioned Projects⁽¹⁾

Projects⁽²⁾	Street Address	Office (sq. ft.)	Retail (sq. ft.)	Hotel (sq. ft.)	Residential (sq. ft.)	Residential (type)	Building Stories	Expected Completion Date⁽¹⁾	First Fiscal Year of Special Tax Levy
A – Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties)/Completed Projects Subject to the Special Tax									
Solaire	299 Fremont Street	-	7,204	-	288,937	Rental	32	Completed	2016-17
Salesforce East	350 Mission Street	47,645	4,355	-	-	-	30	Completed	2016-17
Salesforce Tower	415 Mission Street	1,413,397	6,789	-	-	-	61	2018	2018-19
Subtotal		1,461,042	18,348	-	288,937				
B – Conditioned Projects Under Construction Within the District									
41 Tehama	41 Tehama Street	-	700	-	386,365	Rental	31	2018	-
181 Fremont	181 Fremont Street	482,000	1,800	-	135,000	For sale	66	2018	-
Block 5/Park Tower	250 Howard Street	766,745	8,642	-	-	-	43	2019	-
Block 8	250 Fremont Street	-	17,320	-	346,632	Rental	56	2019	-
- Rental portion		-	-	-	232,421	For sale			-
- For sale		-	6,754	-	297,329	Rental	42	2019	-
Block 9	500 Folsom Street	-	9,332	-	307,865	For sale	39	2020	-
Block 1	160 Folsom Street	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal		1,248,745	44,548	-	1,705,612				
C – Conditioned Projects Not yet Under Construction Within the District									
Block 4 ⁽³⁾	200 Main Street	-	10,000	-	222,362	Rental/For sale	47	2022	-
Parcel F ⁽³⁾	550 Howard Street	287,200	-	181,920	382,225	For sale	62	2024	-
Subtotal		287,200	10,000	181,920	604,587				
D – Conditioned Projects to be Annexed into the District									
75 Howard ⁽⁴⁾	75 Howard Street	-	5,824	-	264,300	For sale	20	2020	-
555 Howard ⁽⁴⁾	555 Howard Street	-	2,600	213,000	145,600	For sale	36	2021	-
524 Howard ⁽⁴⁾	524 Howard Street	-	1,470	-	300,052	Rental	48	2020	-
Oceanwide Center ⁽⁴⁾	50 First Street/526 Mission Street	1,006,606	1,141	266,182	771,704	Rental	54/60	2022	-
Subtotal		1,006,606	11,035	479,182	1,481,656				
Grand Total		4,003,593	83,931	661,102	4,080,792				

Footnotes on next page.

Footnotes for Table 1.

Source: San Francisco Planning Department; Special Tax Consultant

(1) All projects include preliminary estimates and are subject to change until project completion.

(2) A “Conditioned Project” means a Development Project that, pursuant to Section 424 of the Planning Code, is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities through the District and, therefore, is subject to the levy of the Special Tax when Buildings (or portions thereof) within the Development Project become Taxable Buildings

(3) Project is not yet entitled.

(4) Project is entitled.

Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties)

Three properties in the District, which are developed for office, retail and residential use, have received a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commencement Authorization and constitute the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties). The Special Tax will be levied on the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) based on all or a portion of the square footage of each building, not on the building’s assessed valuation. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS,” above. The following Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) were required to join the District as part of their project entitlements.

350 Mission Street (Salesforce East). The building located at 350 Mission Street is a 30-story LEED® Platinum-certified office tower completed in 2015 containing approximately 420,000 square feet of floor area. The Special Tax was first levied for this building in Fiscal Year 2016-17. The lobby features a cantilever with 90 feet of glass panels that slide open and closed - adjoining the lobby to the street. The lobby includes a cafe and restaurant, amphitheater seating, and space that can be configured for pop-up events. A commissioned work of digital art in the lobby animates a 70-by-38-foot LED screen that is visible from the street.

A Conditioned Project is a Development Project that is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities (as defined in the Rate and Method) through the District because it received a zoning bonus to exceed the height and floor-to-area ratios that would have otherwise been applicable under the City’s Planning Code. The Special Tax for 350 Mission Street is calculated based solely on the square footage of three floors that allowed a zoning bonus, which constitutes a Conditioned Project under the Rate and Method. However, the Special Tax levy is secured by the full 350 Mission Street parcel. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure” herein.

Salesforce, a global cloud computing company (publically traded as CRM on the New York Stock Exchange), is currently the only tenant in the building. Kilroy Realty Corp, a privately held real estate investment trust, is the current owner of the 350 Mission Street property.

299 Fremont Street (Solaire). The buildings located at 299 Fremont Street include a 32-story residential tower and 7 townhomes with a total of 409 rental units marketed as Solaire. The Special Tax was first levied for these buildings in Fiscal Year 2016-17. All of the residential units are intended to serve as rental housing with unit sizes ranging from the 422 square foot studio units to 1,562 square foot, two-bedroom, two-and-a-half bath units. Amenities include a fitness center, community room and kitchen, media room, game room, yoga studio, and a roof deck lounge and spa. The buildings were completed in February 2017 and opened in March 2017. The residential tower contains 7,204 square feet of retail space on the ground floor. Solaire also includes affordable housing that is not subject to the Special Tax. The owner is Block 6 Joint Venture, LLC, an affiliate of Golub Real Estate Corporation.

The total leasable square feet in the buildings is 296,141. As of July 2017, 261,947 square feet of such total leasable area had been leased. The levy of the Special Tax is not contingent upon the leasing of space. The forgoing leasing information has been obtained from sources the City believes to be reliable, however, the City has not independently verified such leasing information.

415 Mission Street (Salesforce Tower). The building located at 415 Mission Street contains a diverse mix of office and retail uses. The Special Tax for this building will be levied beginning in Fiscal Year 2018-19. The building is currently the tallest in the City with a top roof height of 970 feet and an overall height of 1,070 feet, and the second-tallest west of the Mississippi River. The building has 61 floors with 13-foot high ceilings and 10-foot high continuous clear glass. The building is LEED® Core and Shell Pre-Certified Platinum and contains a number of environmentally friendly features. Importantly, the building is located next to the Salesforce Transit Center with access to Muni, AC Transit and Golden Gate Transit, is one block from BART and three blocks from freeway access. Hines, a privately held, global real estate, management and investment firm, and Boston Properties, a self-managed real estate investment trust traded on the New York Stock Exchange, co-own the 415 Mission Street property. The total leasable square feet in the building is 1,420,186. As of July 2017, approximately 1,146,918 square feet (approximately 81%) of such total leasable area had been leased with occupancy expected to begin in December 2018. Salesforce.com, inc. purchased the naming rights for the building and has leased over half of the building as of the date of this Official Statement. The levy of the Special Tax is not contingent upon the leasing of space in the building. The forgoing leasing information has been obtained from sources the City believes to be reliable, however, the City has not independently verified such leasing information.

Development Summary, Special Tax Levy, Assessed Values and Value to Lien Ratios

The following table sets forth a summary of the development of the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) and related Special Tax levy for Fiscal Year 2017-18, Special Tax Levy for Fiscal Year 2018-19, assessed values and value-to-lien ratios. Pursuant to the Act and the Rate and Method, the principal amount of the Bonds is not allocable among the parcels in the District based on the value of the parcels. A downturn of the economy or other market factors may depress assessed values and hence the value-to-lien ratios. See “SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Value to Lien Ratios” herein.

**Table 2
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)**

Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) Development Summary, Assessed Values and Value to Lien Ratios

Building and Land Use Category	Taxable Square Feet	FY 2017-18 Special Tax Levy	FY 2018-19 Special Tax Levy	Percent of FY 2018-19 Levy	Allocable Share of 2017 Bonds⁽¹⁾	FY 2017-18 Assessed Value⁽²⁾	Value -to- Lien Ratio
350 Mission (Salesforce East)⁽³⁾							
Office	47,645	\$ 238,344	\$243,111	2.3%	\$4,857,848	--	--
Retail	4,355	15,890	16,207	0.2%	323,859	--	--
Subtotal	52,000	\$ 254,234	\$259,318	2.5%	\$5,181,707	\$ 382,127,715	73.75
299 Fremont Street (Solaire)							
Rental Residential	288,937	\$1,596,696	\$1,628,630	15.7%	\$32,543,335	--	--
Retail	7,204	26,285	26,810	0.3%	535,724	--	--
Subtotal	296,141	\$1,622,980	\$1,655,440	15.9%	\$33,079,059	\$ 146,494,358	4.43
415 Mission Street (Salesforce Tower)							
Office	1,413,397	--	\$8,443,303	81.3%	\$168,714,379	--	--
Retail	6,789	--	26,266	0.3%	524,855	--	--
Subtotal	1,420,186	--	\$8,469,569	81.6%	\$169,239,234	\$ 560,824,799	3.31
Total	1,768,327	\$1,877,214	\$10,384,327	100.0%	\$207,500,000	\$1,089,446,872	5.25

Footnotes on next page.

Footnotes for Table 2.

Source: San Francisco Assessor’s Office, San Francisco Planning Department and Special Tax Consultant.

(1) Allocated based on the share of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Special Tax levy.

(2) As of January 1, 2017. The Fiscal Year 2017-18 Assessed Value for Salesforce Tower does not reflect final building completion.

(3) The Special Tax for 350 Mission Street is calculated based solely on the square footage of three floors, which constitutes a Conditioned Project under the Rate and Method. In the event of delinquencies in the payment of Special Taxes, the entire building is subject to foreclosure.

Conditioned Projects Under Construction

The following table lists Conditioned Projects that may receive a Certificate of Occupancy and Tax Commencement Authorization this calendar year and become subject to the Special Tax beginning in fiscal year 2018-19. The City provides no assurance, however, that any such development will be completed as expected.

**Table 3
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)
Conditioned Projects Under Construction**

<u>Project Address</u>	<u>Planned Development</u>	<u>Expected Certificate of Occupancy Date</u>	<u>Estimated FY 2018-19 Special Tax</u>	<u>FY 2017-18 Assessed Value⁽¹⁾</u>
41 Tehama Street	310,124 sq. ft.	November 2017	\$1,821,299	\$166,059,750
181 Fremont Street	<u>503,040 sq. ft.</u>	December 2017	<u>\$3,323,939</u>	<u>\$326,413,888</u>
Total	813,164 sq. ft.		\$5,145,237	\$492,473,638

Source: San Francisco Planning Department; San Francisco Assessor’s Office; Special Tax Consultant.

(1) Values reflect in-process construction values as of the January 1, 2017 lien date, assuming 62% completion of 41 Tehama and 70% completion of 181 Fremont Street is according to the San Francisco Assessor’s Office.

Property Valuation

In Fiscal Year 2016-17, the Special Taxes were levied in the District for the first time on the first two parcels to receive both a Certificate of Occupancy and Tax Commencement Authorization (Salesforce East and Solaire). The Fiscal Year 2016-17 levy on these two parcels was \$1,840,406. The assessed value of the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) for Fiscal Year 2017-18 is \$284,469,574 for land and \$804,977,298 for structures, for a total assessed valuation of \$1,089,446,872. This reflects the partial construction value as of the January 1, 2017 lien date for Salesforce Tower.

Debt Service Coverage

The following table sets forth debt service coverage with respect to the 2017 Bonds, assuming Special Taxes are collected when levied.

Under the Rate and Method, the Initial Annual Adjustment Factor is used to increase the Base Special Tax each July 1, and, subject to the limits described in the next paragraph, is equal to the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate (the "AICCIE"), as of July 1 of the applicable Fiscal Year, published by the Office of the City Administrator's Capital Planning Group and used to calculate the annual adjustment to the City's development impact fees that took effect as of January 1 of the prior Fiscal Year pursuant to the City's Planning Code. The Base Special Tax rates are used to calculate the Maximum Special Tax for each Taxable Parcel in a Taxable Building for the first Fiscal Year in which the Building is a Taxable Building. See APPENDIX B – "AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX."

Since the District's formation, the AICCIE has been 4.5% for Fiscal Year 2014-15, 5.0% for Fiscal Year 2015-16, 5.0% for Fiscal Year 2016-17, 5.0% for Fiscal Year 2017-18 and 5.75% for Fiscal Year 2018-19. Despite the actual AICCIE, the maximum Special Tax cannot be increased or decreased by more than 4.0% of the maximum Special Tax calculated for the prior Fiscal Year. As a result of the 4.0% limit on adjustments to the Special Tax, the Initial Annual Adjustment Factor has been 4.0% in each of these Fiscal Years. Once the Special Tax is levied on a Taxable Building, the maximum Special Tax escalates at 2.0% each year for the 30 years that it may be levied on taxable square footage.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

The actual Initial Annual Adjustment Factor applied when calculating the maximum Special Tax levied on the Salesforce Tower in Fiscal Year 2018-19 is 4.0%.

<u>Year Ending⁽¹⁾</u>	<u>Total 2017 Bonds Debt Service⁽²⁾</u>	<u>Projected Special Tax Revenue⁽³⁾</u>	<u>Projected Debt Service Coverage⁽⁴⁾</u>
2018	\$ 1,698,043	\$ 1,877,214	110.6%
2019	9,312,381	10,384,327	111.5
2020	9,501,044	10,592,014	111.5
2021	9,691,644	10,803,854	111.5
2022	9,887,881	11,019,931	111.4
2023	10,078,256	11,240,330	111.5
2024	10,286,431	11,465,136	111.5
2025	10,490,281	11,694,439	111.5
2026	10,700,581	11,928,328	111.5
2027	10,913,656	12,166,894	111.5
2028	11,131,331	12,410,232	111.5
2029	11,353,188	12,658,437	111.5
2030	11,582,688	12,911,605	111.5
2031	11,813,888	13,169,838	111.5
2032	12,049,919	13,433,234	111.5
2033	12,295,725	13,701,899	111.4
2034	12,532,975	13,975,937	111.5
2035	12,787,975	14,255,456	111.5
2036	13,044,413	14,540,565	111.5
2037	13,301,538	14,831,376	111.5
2038	13,573,600	15,128,004	111.5
2039	13,843,000	15,430,564	111.5
2040	14,123,000	15,739,175	111.4
2041	14,402,200	16,053,958	111.5
2042	14,689,600	16,375,038	111.5
2043	14,983,800	16,702,538	111.5
2044	15,283,400	17,036,589	111.5
2045	15,587,000	17,377,321	111.5
2046	15,903,200	17,724,867	111.5
2047	13,195,200	14,745,725	111.8
2048	13,457,600	15,040,639	111.8
Total	\$373,495,437	\$416,415,461	

Totals may not add due to rounding.

⁽¹⁾ Projected Special Tax Revenues are presented for the fiscal year ending on June 30 of each year; debt service is presented for the bond year ending September 1 of each year.

⁽²⁾ Represents the combined debt service on the 2017A Bonds and 2017B Bonds net of capitalized interest funding a portion of interest on each series.

⁽³⁾ Projected Special Tax Revenues reflects the sum of the maximum annual Special Tax of the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties), assuming a Special Tax levy on (i) 350 Mission Street and 299 Fremont Street beginning in Fiscal Year 2016-17 and escalating thereafter at 2% annually through Fiscal Year 2045-46, and (ii) 415 Mission Street beginning in Fiscal Year 2018-19 and escalating thereafter at 2% annually through Fiscal Year 2047-48. Actual maximum Special Tax Revenues may increase as additional parcels become subject to the Special Tax levy upon receiving a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commencement Authorization. Assumes no further Taxable Buildings receive a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commencement Authorization.

⁽⁴⁾ Represents projected Special Tax Revenues divided by the total annual debt service for the 2017A Bonds and 2017B Bonds. Capitalized interest is funded for a portion of the interest on the 2017 Bonds through September 1, 2018, because Salesforce Tower will not be subject to the Special Tax levy until Fiscal Year 2018-19.

Estimated Effective Tax Rate

The following table sets forth an illustrative Fiscal Year 2018-19 tax bill for a Taxable Property in the District.

Table 4
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)
Fiscal Year 2018-19 – Illustrative Tax Bill

		<u>Salesforce East</u>	<u>Solaire</u>	<u>Salesforce Tower</u>
<u>Assessed Value</u> ⁽¹⁾				
Land Value		\$ 54,789,490	\$ 26,155,285	\$203,524,799
Improvement & Other Value		327,338,225	120,339,073	357,300,000
Total Assessed Value		\$382,127,715	\$146,494,358	\$560,824,799
<u>Ad Valorem Tax Rate</u>				
Base Tax Rate	1.0000%	\$ 3,821,277	\$ 1,464,944	\$ 5,608,248
Other <i>Ad Valorem</i> Property Taxes	<u>0.1723%</u>	658,406	252,410	966,301
Total Ad Valorem Taxes	1.1723%	\$ 4,479,683	\$ 1,717,353	\$ 6,574,549
<u>Direct Charges</u>				
GTR Rincon Hill CBD		\$ 54,766	\$ 28,980	\$ 138,805
SF Bay RS Parcel Tax		12	12	12
SF USD Facility District		37	37	37
SFF CCD Parcel Tax		99	99	99
SF – Teacher Support		244	244	244
Transbay CFD No. 2014-1 ⁽²⁾		\$ 259,318	\$ 1,655,440	\$ 8,469,569
Total Direct Charges		\$314,476	\$ 1,684,811	\$ 8,608,766
Total Taxes and Direct Charges		\$ 4,794,159	\$ 3,402,165	\$ 15,183,315
Percentage of Assessed Value		1.25%	2.32%	2.71%

Source: San Francisco Treasurer and Tax Collector's Office; San Francisco Assessor's Office; Special Tax Consultant.

Footnotes on next page.

⁽¹⁾ Reflects assessed value as of the January 1, 2017 lien date. The Fiscal Year 2017-18 assessed value for Salesforce Tower reflects its partial construction value.

⁽²⁾ Reflects the Fiscal Year 2018-19 maximum Special Tax.

Future Financings

The City is authorized to issue on behalf of the District bonded indebtedness, including the 2017 Bonds, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion. The City anticipates issuing Parity Bonds on behalf of the District, subject to the conditions set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in the amount of approximately \$600 million over the next five years. See SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Parity Bonds” herein.

Direct and Overlapping Debt

The following table details the direct and overlapping debt currently encumbering property within the District.

Table 5
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)
Direct and Overlapping Debt

2016-17 Assessed Valuation: \$541,951,140 (Land and Improvements)

<u>DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT:</u>	<u>% Applicable</u>	<u>Debt 7/1/17</u>
Bay Area Rapid Transit District General Obligation Bonds	0.084%	\$ 747,565
San Francisco City and County General Obligation Bonds	0.259	5,359,525
San Francisco Unified School District General Obligation Bonds	0.259	2,696,099
San Francisco Community College District General Obligation Bonds	0.259	640,904
City of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1	100.	(1)
TOTAL DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT		\$9,444,093

(1) Excludes Mello-Roos Act bonds to be sold.

Ratios to 2016-17 Assessed Valuation:

Direct Debt	%
Total Direct and Overlapping Tax and Assessment Debt.....	1.74%
Combined Total Debt	3.74%

Source: California Municipal Statistics.

SPECIAL RISK FACTORS

The following is a discussion of certain risk factors which should be considered, in addition to other matters set forth herein, in evaluating the investment quality of the 2017 Bonds. This discussion does not purport to be comprehensive or definitive. The occurrence of one or more of the events discussed herein could adversely affect the ability or willingness of property owners in the District to pay their Special Taxes when due. Such failures to pay Special Taxes could result in the inability of the City to make full and punctual payments of debt service on the 2017 Bonds. In addition, the occurrence of one or more of the events discussed herein could adversely affect the value of the property in the District.

Risks of Real Estate Secured Investments Generally

The Bondowners will be subject to the risks generally incident to an investment secured by real estate, including, without limitation, (i) adverse changes in local market conditions, such as changes in the market value of real property in the vicinity of the District, the supply of or demand for competitive properties in such area, and the market value of residential properties and/or sites in the event of sale or foreclosure, (ii) changes in real estate tax rates and other operating expenses, government rules (including, without limitation, zoning laws and restrictions relating to threatened and endangered species) and fiscal policies and (iii) natural disasters (including, without limitation, earthquakes, subsidence and floods), which may result in uninsured losses, or natural disasters elsewhere in the country or other parts of the world affecting supply of building materials that may cause delays in construction. The occurrence of one or more of the events discussed herein could adversely affect the ability or willingness of property owners in the District to pay their Special Taxes when due.

Disclosure to Future Property Owners

Pursuant to Section 53328.3 of the Act, the City has recorded a Notice of Special Tax Lien. The sellers of property within the District are required to give prospective buyers a Notice of Special Tax in accordance with Sections 53340.2 and 53341.5 of the Act. While title companies normally refer to the Notice of Special Tax Lien in title reports, there can be no guarantee that such reference will be made or the seller's notice given or, if made and given, that a prospective purchaser or lender will consider such Special Tax obligation in the purchase of a property or the lending of money thereon. Failure to disclose the existence of the Special Taxes could affect the willingness and ability of future owners of land within the District to pay the Special Taxes when due.

Parity Taxes and Special Assessments

The Special Taxes and any penalties thereon will constitute a lien against the parcels of land on which they will be annually imposed until they are paid. Such lien is on a parity with all special taxes and special assessments levied by other agencies and is coequal to and independent of the lien for general property taxes regardless of when they are imposed upon the same property. The Special Taxes have priority over all existing and future private liens imposed on the property. The City, however, has no control over the ability of other agencies to issue indebtedness secured by special taxes or assessments payable from all or a portion of the property within the District. In addition, the landowners within the District may, without the consent or knowledge of the City, petition other public agencies to issue public indebtedness secured by special taxes or assessments. Any such special taxes or assessments may have a lien on such property on a parity with the Special Taxes. See "THE DISTRICT – Direct and Overlapping Debt."

Value to Lien Ratios

Value-to-lien ratios have traditionally been used in land-secured bond issues as a measure of the "collateral" supporting the willingness of property owners to pay their special taxes and assessments (and, in effect, their general property taxes as well). The value-to-lien ratio is mathematically a fraction, the numerator of which is the value of the property as measured by assessed values or appraised values (in this case, Fiscal Year 2017-18 Assessed Values) and the denominator of which is the "lien" of the assessments or special taxes. A value to lien ratio should not, however, be viewed as a guarantee for credit-worthiness. Land values are sensitive to economic cycles. Assessed values may not reflect the current market value of property. A downturn of the economy or other market factors may depress land values and lower the value-to-lien ratios. Further, the value-to-lien ratio cited for a bond issue is an average. Individual parcels in a community facilities district may fall above or below the average, sometimes even below a 1:1 ratio. (With a ratio below 1:1, the property value is less than its allocable share of debt.) Although judicial foreclosure proceedings can be initiated rapidly, the process can take several years to complete, and the bankruptcy courts may impede the foreclosure action. No assurance can be given that, should a parcel with delinquent Special Taxes be foreclosed upon and sold for the amount of the delinquency, any bid will be received for such property or, if a bid is received, that such bid will be sufficient to pay all delinquent Special Taxes. Finally, local agencies may form overlapping community facilities districts or assessment districts. Local agencies typically do not coordinate their bond issuances. Debt issuance by another entity could dilute value to lien ratios.

Insufficiency of Special Taxes

Under the Rate and Method, the annual amount of Special Tax to be levied on each Taxable Parcel in the District will be based primarily on the square footage. See APPENDIX B – "AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX" and "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Taxes." The Act provides that, if any property within the District not otherwise exempt from the Special Tax is acquired by a public entity through a negotiated transaction, or by a gift or devise, the Special Tax will continue to be levied on and enforceable against the public entity that acquired the property. In addition, the Act provides that, if property subject to the Special Tax is acquired by a public entity through eminent domain proceedings, the obligation to pay the Special

Tax with respect to that property is to be treated as if it were a special assessment and be paid from the eminent domain award. The constitutionality and operation of these provisions of the Act have not been tested in the courts. *Moreover, if a substantial portion of land within the District became exempt from the Special Tax because of public ownership, or otherwise, the maximum Special Tax which could be levied upon the remaining acreage might not be sufficient to pay principal of and interest on the 2017 Bonds when due and a default could occur with respect to the payment of such principal and interest.*

Tax Delinquencies

Under provisions of the Act, the Special Taxes, from which funds necessary for the payment of principal of, and interest on, the 2017 Bonds are derived, will be billed to the properties within the District on the regular property tax bills sent to owners of such properties. Such Special Tax installments are due and payable, and bear the same penalties and interest for non-payment, as do regular property tax installments. Special Tax installment payments cannot be made to the County Tax Collector separately from property tax payments. Therefore, the unwillingness or inability of a property owner to pay regular property tax bills as evidenced by property tax delinquencies may also indicate an unwillingness or inability to make regular property tax payments and Special Tax installment payments in the future.

See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Reserve Fund” and “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure,” for a discussion of the provisions which apply, and procedures which the District is obligated to follow under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in the event of delinquency in the payment of Special Tax installments.

Maximum Term of Levy

The 2017 Bonds are secured by Special Tax Revenues from all parcels subject to the Special Tax in the District. Upon delivery of the 2017 Bonds, Special Taxes will be levied only on three parcels. Because Special Taxes may only be levied on any individual parcel for a maximum term of 30 years, the levy on parcels 350 Mission Street and 299 Fremont Street will terminate before the final maturity of the 2017 Bonds. Unless additional parcels are annexed into the District (or a Certificate of Occupancy/Tax Commencement Authorization are issued for additional parcels already within the boundaries of the District) before the maximum term of the applicable levy is reached, payments due on the 2017 Bonds in 2047 and 2048 will be secured only by Special Taxes levied on the remaining Salesforce Tower parcel. The 2017 Bonds have been structured to maintain projected coverage of 110%, notwithstanding the termination of the levy on parcels 350 Mission Street and 299 Fremont Street.

Teeter Plan

The District is the only community facilities district in the City that is currently participating in the City’s Teeter Plan. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Teeter Plan” herein. The City has the power to unilaterally discontinue the Teeter Plan or remove the District from the Teeter Plan. The Teeter Plan may also be discontinued by petition of two-thirds (2/3) of the participant taxing agencies. The City has the power to include additional taxing agencies on the Teeter Plan.

Concentration of Property Ownership

Failure of any significant owner of taxable property in the District to pay the annual Special Taxes when due could result in the rapid, total depletion of the Reserve Fund prior to replenishment from the resale of the property upon a foreclosure or otherwise or prior to delinquency redemption after a foreclosure sale, if any. In that event, there could be a default in payments of the principal of and interest on the 2017 Bonds. Development of property in the District may not occur as currently proposed or at all. As of the date the 2017 Bonds are delivered, only three properties will be responsible for contributing 100% of the Special Tax Revenues. See “THE DISTRICT” for information regarding property ownership and the status of development in the District.

Future Indebtedness

The cost of any additional improvements may well increase the public and private debt for which the land in the District provide security, and such increased debt could reduce the ability or desire of property owners to pay the Special Taxes levied against the land in the District. In addition, in the event any additional improvements or fees are financed pursuant to the establishment of an assessment district or another district formed pursuant to the Act, any taxes or assessments levied to finance such improvements may have a lien on a parity with the lien of the Special Taxes. The City is authorized to issue on behalf of the District bonded indebtedness, including the 2017 Bonds, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion. See “THE DISTRICT – Future Financings.”

Seismic Risks

The City is located in a seismically active region. Active earthquake faults underlie both the City and the surrounding Bay Area. These faults, include the San Andreas Fault, which passes about three miles to the southeast of the City’s border, and the Hayward Fault, which runs under Oakland, Berkeley and other cities on the east side of San Francisco Bay, about 10 miles away. Historical seismic events include the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, centered about 60 miles south of the City, which registered 6.9 on the Richter scale of earthquake intensity. That earthquake caused fires, building collapses, and structural damage to buildings and highways in the City and surrounding areas. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the only east-west vehicle access into the City, was closed for a month for repairs, and several highways in the City were permanently closed and eventually removed. On August 24, 2014, the San Francisco Bay Area experienced a 6.0 earthquake centered near Napa along the West Napa Fault. The City did not suffer any material damage as a result of this earthquake.

In March 2015, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (a collaborative effort of the U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.), the California Geological Survey, and the Southern California Earthquake Center) reported that there is a 72% chance that one or more quakes of about magnitude 6.7 or larger will occur in the San Francisco Bay Area before the year 2045. Such earthquakes may be very destructive. In addition to the potential damage to City-owned buildings and facilities (on which the City does not generally carry earthquake insurance), due to the importance of San Francisco as a tourist destination and regional hub of commercial, retail and entertainment activity, a major earthquake anywhere in the Bay Area may cause significant temporary and possibly long-term harm to the City’s economy, tax receipts, and residential and business real property values, including in the District.

In early 2016, the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco commissioned an earthquake vulnerability study of the Northern Waterfront Seawall. The Seawall was constructed over 100 years ago and sits on reclaimed land, rendering it vulnerable to seismic risk. The Seawall provides flood and wave protection to downtown San Francisco, and stabilizes hundreds of acres of filled land. Preliminary findings of the study indicate that a strong earthquake may cause most of the Seawall to settle and move outward toward the Bay, which would significantly increase earthquake damage and disruption along the waterfront. The Port Commission estimates that seismic retrofitting of the Seawall could cost as much as \$3 billion, with another \$2 billion or more needed to prepare the Seawall for rising sea levels. The study estimates that approximately \$1.6 billion in Port assets and \$2.1 billion of rents, business income, and wages are at risk from major damage to the Seawall. See “- Risk of Sea Level Changes and Flooding” below.

Hazardous Substances

A serious risk in terms of the potential reduction in the value of a parcel within the District is the discovery of a hazardous substance. In general, the owners and operators of a parcel within the District may be required by law to remedy conditions of such parcel relating to release or threatened releases of hazardous substances. The federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, sometimes referred to as “CERCLA” or the “Superfund Act,” is the most well-known and widely applicable of these laws, but other California laws with regard to hazardous substances are also

similarly stringent. Under many of these laws, the owner or operator is obligated to remedy a hazardous substance condition of the property whether or not the owner or operator had anything to do with creating or handling the hazardous substance. The effect, therefore, should any of the parcels within the District be affected by a hazardous substance, would be to reduce the marketability and value of such parcel by the costs of remedying the condition. Any prospective purchaser would become obligated to remedy the condition.

Further it is possible that liabilities may arise in the future with respect to any of the parcels resulting from the current existence on the parcel of a substance currently classified as hazardous but which has not been released or the release of which is not presently threatened, or may arise in the future resulting from the current existence on the parcel of a substance not presently classified as hazardous but which may in the future be so classified. Further, such liabilities may arise not simply from the existence of a hazardous substance but from the method in which it is handled. All of these possibilities could significantly affect the value of a parcel within the District that is realizable upon a delinquency.

Risk of Sea Level Changes and Flooding

It is expected that sea levels will rise given the rising temperature of the oceans and an increase in ocean volume as land ice melts and runs off into the ocean. Over the past century, sea level has risen nearly eight inches along the California coast, and substantial increases in sea level rise are projected due to climate change over the coming century. In July 2012, the California Energy Commission released a white paper prepared by the Pacific Institute entitled “The Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the San Francisco Bay.” The paper posits that increases in sea level will be a significant consequence of climate change over the next century. The paper evaluated the population, infrastructure, and property at risk from projected sea-level rise to communities along the San Francisco Bay. The paper attempts to assess the level of property damage over ranges of sea level rise, and the corresponding cost of damage resulting from flooding from 100-year flood events. The paper estimates that 270,000 people would potentially be affected from a sea level worst case rise of 1.4 (m). The paper estimated that the assets at risk during a 100-year flood increase from about \$29 billion under then-current conditions to \$36 billion, \$49 billion, and \$62 billion (in year 2000 dollars) with a 0.5 m, 1.0 m, and 1.4 m sea level rise, respectively. Two-thirds of this at-risk property is concentrated in San Mateo County, indicating that this region is particularly vulnerable to impacts associated with sea level rise due to extensive development on the margins of the Bay. A wide range of critical infrastructure, such as roads, hospitals, schools, emergency facilities, wastewater treatment plants, power plants, and wetlands, is vulnerable. Continued development in vulnerable areas will put additional assets at risk and raise protection costs.

In March 2016, the City released a report entitled “Sea Level Rise Action Plan,” which was designed to identify geographic zones at risk of sea level rise and provide a framework for devising adaption strategies to confront these risks. It is anticipated that the citywide adaption plan will be prepared and released in the summer 2018. The goal of the adaption plan is to establish a planning framework, identify funding sources and prioritize investments.

The City is unable to predict whether sea level rise or other impacts of climate change or flooding from a major storm will occur, when they may occur, and if any such events occur, whether they will have a material adverse effect on the business operations or financial condition of the City and the local economy.

Natural Disasters and Other Events

Other natural or man-made disasters, such as flood, wildfire, tsunamis, toxic dumping or acts of terrorism, could also cause a reduction in the assessed value of taxable property within the City. Economic and market forces, such as a downturn in the Bay Area’s economy generally, can also affect assessed values, particularly as these forces might reverberate in the residential housing and commercial property markets. Such events could also damage critical City infrastructure. For example, in August 2013, a massive wildfire in Tuolumne County and the Stanislaus National Forest burned over 257,135 acres (the “Rim Fire”), which area included portions of the City’s Hetch Hetchy Project. The Hetch Hetchy Project is comprised of dams

(including O’Shaughnessy Dam), reservoirs (including Hetch Hetchy Reservoir which supplies 85% of San Francisco’s drinking water), hydroelectric generator and transmission facilities and water transmission facilities. Hetch Hetchy facilities affected by the Rim Fire included two power generating stations and the southern edge of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. There was no impact to drinking water quality. The City’s hydroelectric power generation system was interrupted by the fire, forcing the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to spend approximately \$1.6 million buying power on the open market and using existing banked energy with PG&E. The Rim Fire inflicted approximately \$40 million in damage to parts of the City’s water and power infrastructure located in the region. In September 2010, a Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) high pressure natural gas transmission pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, with catastrophic results. There are numerous gas transmission and distribution pipelines owned, operated and maintained by PG&E throughout the City.

As a result of the occurrence of events described in the preceding paragraph, a substantial portion of the property owners may be unable or unwilling to pay the Special Taxes when due, and the Reserve Fund for the 2017 Bonds may become depleted. In addition, the total assessed value can be reduced through the reclassification of taxable property to a class exempt from taxation, whether by ownership or use (such as exemptions for property owned by State and local agencies and property used for qualified educational, hospital, charitable or religious purposes).

Millennium Tower

Millennium Tower is a 58-story luxury residential building completed in 2009 located at 301 Mission Street in the City. **Millennium Tower is not located in the District, nor is it subject to the levy of the Special Tax and none of the information presented in this Official Statement assumes collection of Special Taxes from the Millennium Tower project.** On August 17, 2016, owners of condominiums in Millennium Tower filed a lawsuit (the “Lawsuit”) against the TJPA and the individual members of the TJPA, including the City, and other lawsuits have subsequently been filed against TJPA, some of which also name the City. The TJPA is a joint exercise of powers authority created by the City, the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, and Caltrans (*ex officio*). The TJPA is responsible under State law for developing the Salesforce Transit Center.

The TJPA began excavation and construction for the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities in 2010, after the Millennium Tower was completed. In brief, the Lawsuit claims that the construction of the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities harmed the Millennium Tower by causing it to settle into the soil more than planned and tilt toward the west/northwest, and the condo owners claim unspecified monetary damages for inverse condemnation and nuisance. The TJPA has said that the Millennium Tower was already sinking more than planned and tilting before the TJPA began construction of the Salesforce Transit Center and its related facilities and that the TJPA took precautionary efforts to avoid exacerbating the situation. The City cannot make any prediction as to the outcome of the Lawsuit or any other future lawsuit regarding Millennium Tower.

An adverse judgment in the Lawsuit would not affect the District or the levy or availability of Special Tax Revenues. The relevance of the Lawsuit to the 2017 Bonds is that it relates to conditions at a private development project near the District, and if those conditions were replicated at Taxable Parcels, it could adversely impact the ability of property owners of such affected buildings to pay Special Taxes. The City is not aware of any such condition affecting the Taxable Buildings (Subject Properties) within the District.

Bankruptcy and Foreclosure

The payment of property owners’ taxes and the ability of the District to foreclose the lien of a delinquent unpaid Special Tax pursuant to its covenant to pursue judicial foreclosure proceedings, may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency or other laws generally affecting creditors’ rights or by the laws of the State relating to judicial foreclosure. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court

Foreclosure.” In addition, the prosecution of a foreclosure could be delayed due to many reasons, including crowded local court calendars or lengthy procedural delays.

The various legal opinions to be delivered concurrently with the delivery of the 2017 Bonds (including Bond Counsel’s approving legal opinion) will be qualified, as to the enforceability of the various legal instruments, by moratorium, bankruptcy, reorganization, insolvency or other similar laws affecting the rights of creditors generally.

In addition, bankruptcy of a property owner (or a property owner’s partner or equity owner) would likely result in a delay in procuring Superior Court foreclosure proceedings unless the bankruptcy court consented to permit such foreclosure action to proceed. Such delay would increase the likelihood of a delay or default in payment of the principal of, and interest on, the 2017 Bonds and the possibility of delinquent tax installments not being paid in full.

Under 11 U.S.C. Section 362(b)(18), in the event of a bankruptcy petition filed on or after October 22, 1994, the lien for ad valorem taxes in subsequent fiscal years will attach even if the property is part of the bankruptcy estate. Bondowners should be aware that the potential effect of 11 U.S.C. Section 362(b)(18) on the Special Taxes depends upon whether a court were to determine that the Special Taxes should be treated like ad valorem taxes for this purpose.

The Act provides that the Special Taxes are secured by a continuing lien which is subject to the same lien priority in the case of delinquency as ad valorem taxes. *No case law exists with respect to how a bankruptcy court would treat the lien for Special Taxes levied after the filing of a petition in bankruptcy.*

Property Controlled by FDIC and Other Federal Agencies

The City’s ability to collect interest and penalties specified by State law and to foreclose the lien of delinquent Special Tax payments may be limited in certain respects with regard to properties in which the Internal Revenue Service, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the “FDIC”) or other similar federal agency has or obtains an interest.

Unless Congress has otherwise provided, if the federal government has a mortgage interest in the parcel and the City wishes to foreclose on the parcel as a result of delinquent Special Taxes, the property cannot be sold at a foreclosure sale unless it can be sold for an amount sufficient to pay delinquent taxes and assessments on a parity with the Special Taxes and preserve the federal government’s mortgage interest. In *Rust v. Johnson* (9th Circuit; 1979) 597 F.2d 174, the United States Court of Appeal, Ninth Circuit held that the Federal National Mortgage Association (“FNMA”) is a federal instrumentality for purposes of this doctrine, and not a private entity, and that, as a result, an exercise of state power over a mortgage interest held by FNMA constitutes an exercise of state power over property of the United States. The District has not undertaken to determine whether any federal governmental entity currently has, or is likely to acquire, any interest (including a mortgage interest) in any of the parcels subject to the Special Taxes within the District, and therefore expresses no view concerning the likelihood that the risks described above will materialize while the 2017 Bonds are outstanding.

On June 4, 1991 the FDIC issued a Statement of Policy Regarding the Payment of State and Local Real Property Taxes. The 1991 Policy Statement was revised and superseded by a new Policy Statement effective January 9, 1997 (the “Policy Statement”). The Policy Statement provides that real property owned by the FDIC is subject to state and local real property taxes only if those taxes are assessed according to the property’s value, and that the FDIC is immune from real property taxes assessed on any basis other than property value. According to the Policy Statement, the FDIC will pay its proper tax obligations when they become due and payable and will pay claims for delinquent property taxes as promptly as is consistent with sound business practice and the orderly administration of the institution’s affairs, unless abandonment of the FDIC’s interest in the property is appropriate. The FDIC will pay claims for interest on delinquent property taxes owed at the rate provided under state law, to the extent the interest payment obligation is secured by a valid lien. The FDIC will not pay any amounts in the nature of fines or penalties and will not

pay nor recognize liens for such amounts. If any property taxes (including interest) on FDIC owned property are secured by a valid lien (in effect before the property became owned by the FDIC), the FDIC will pay those claims. The Policy Statement further provides that no property of the FDIC is subject to levy, attachment, garnishment, foreclosure or sale without the FDIC's consent. In addition, the FDIC will not permit a lien or security interest held by the FDIC to be eliminated by foreclosure without the FDIC's consent.

The Policy Statement states that the FDIC generally will not pay non *ad valorem* taxes, including special assessments, on property in which it has a fee interest unless the amount of tax is fixed at the time that the FDIC acquires its fee interest in the property, nor will it recognize the validity of any lien to the extent it purports to secure the payment of any such amounts. Special taxes imposed under the Act and a special tax formula which determines the special tax due each year, are specifically identified in the Policy Statement as being imposed each year and therefore covered by the FDIC's federal immunity.

The FDIC has filed claims against one California county in United States Bankruptcy Court contending, among other things, that special taxes authorized under the Act are not *ad valorem* taxes and therefore not payable by the FDIC, and seeking a refund of any special taxes previously paid by the FDIC. The FDIC is also seeking a ruling that special taxes may not be imposed on properties while they are in FDIC receivership. The Bankruptcy Court ruled in favor of the FDIC's positions and, on August 28, 2001, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the decision of the Bankruptcy Court, holding that the FDIC, as an entity of the federal government, is exempt from post-receivership special taxes levied under the Act. This is consistent with provision in the Law that the federal government is exempt from special taxes.

The City is unable to predict what effect the application of the Policy Statement would have in the event of a delinquency with respect to a parcel in which the FDIC has an interest, although prohibiting the lien of the FDIC to be foreclosed on at a judicial foreclosure sale would likely reduce the number of or eliminate the persons willing to purchase such a parcel at a foreclosure sale. Owners of the 2017 Bonds should assume that the City will be unable to foreclose on any parcel owned by the FDIC. Such an outcome would cause a draw on the Reserve Fund and perhaps, ultimately, a default in payment of the 2017 Bonds. The City has not undertaken to determine whether the FDIC or any FDIC-insured lending institution currently has, or is likely to acquire, any interest in any of the parcels, and therefore expresses no view concerning the likelihood that the risks described above will materialize while the 2017 Bonds are outstanding.

Billing of Special Taxes

A special tax formula can result in a substantially heavier property tax burden being imposed upon properties within a community facilities district than elsewhere in a city or county, and this in turn, along with various other factors, can lead to problems in the collection of the special tax. In some community facilities districts, taxpayers have refused to pay the special tax and have commenced litigation challenging the special tax, the community facilities district and the bonds issued by a community facilities district.

Under provisions of the Act, the Special Taxes are levied on Taxable Buildings within the District that were entered on the Assessment Roll of the County Assessor by January 1 of the previous Fiscal Year. Such Special Tax installments are due and payable, and bear the same penalties and interest for non-payment, as do regular property tax installments. Ordinarily, these Special Tax installment payments cannot be made separately from property tax payments. Therefore, the unwillingness or inability of a property owner to pay regular property tax bills as evidenced by property tax delinquencies may also indicate an unwillingness or inability to make regular property tax payments and installment payments of Special Taxes in the future. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure," for a discussion of the provisions which apply, and procedures which the District is obligated to follow, in the event of delinquency in the payment of installments of Special Taxes.

Collection of Special Taxes

The District is currently included on the Teeter Plan and Special Taxes are expected to be paid in a timely manner. However, as described above, the District could be removed from the Teeter Plan. The City has covenanted in the Fiscal Agent Agreement to institute foreclosure proceedings under certain conditions against property with delinquent Special Taxes to obtain funds to pay debt service on the 2017 Bonds. If foreclosure proceedings were instituted, any mortgage or deed of trust holder could, but would not be required to, advance the amount of the delinquent Special Taxes to protect its security interest. If such foreclosure is necessary, there could be a delay in principal and interest payments to the owners of the 2017 Bonds pending prosecution of the foreclosure proceedings and receipt of the proceeds of the foreclosure sale, if any. No assurances can be given that the real property subject to foreclosure and sale at a judicial foreclosure sale would be sold or, if sold, that the proceeds of such sale would be sufficient to pay any delinquent Special Taxes installment. Although the Act authorizes the City to cause such an action to be commenced and diligently pursued to completion, the Act does not specify the obligations of the City with regard to purchasing or otherwise acquiring any lot or parcel of property sold at the foreclosure sale if there is no other purchaser at such sale. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Covenant for Superior Court Foreclosure.”

Maximum Special Tax Rates

Within the limits of the Rate and Method, the City may adjust the Special Taxes levied on all property within the District to provide the amount required each year to pay annual debt service on the 2017 Bonds and to replenish the Reserve Fund to an amount equal to the Reserve Requirement, but not more than a 10% increase on property used for private residential purposes above the amount that would have been levied in that Fiscal Year had there never been any delinquencies or defaults. However, the amount of Special Taxes that may be levied against particular categories of property is subject to the maximum tax rates set forth in the Rate and Method. In the event of significant Special Tax delinquencies, there is no assurance that the maximum tax rates for property in the District would be sufficient to meet debt service obligations on the 2017 Bonds. See “SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – The Special Taxes” and APPENDIX B – “AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX.”

Initial Annual Adjustment Factor

Pursuant to the Rate and Method, the initial maximum Special Tax that can be levied on a Taxable Building not currently subject to the Special Tax is adjusted on an annual basis by the Initial Annual Adjustment Factor. The Initial Annual Adjustment Factor is the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate (the “AICCIE”), as of July 1 of the applicable Fiscal Year, published by the Office of the City Administrator’s Capital Planning Group and used to calculate the annual adjustment to the City’s development impact fees that took effect as of January 1 of the prior Fiscal Year pursuant to the City’s Planning Code. Despite the actual AICCIE, the maximum Special Tax cannot be increased or decreased by more than 4.0% of the maximum Special Tax calculated for the prior Fiscal Year. Because the Salesforce Tower did not receive a Certificate of Occupancy and a Tax Commence Authorization prior to June 30, 2017, the Special Tax will not be levied on the Salesforce Tower until Fiscal Year 2018-19.

Exempt Properties

The Act provides that properties or entities of the State, federal or local government are exempt from the Special Taxes; provided, however, the property within the District acquired by a public entity through a negotiated transaction or by gift or devise, which is not otherwise exempt from the Special Taxes, will continue to be subject to the Special Taxes. The Act further provides that if property subject to the Special Taxes is acquired by a public entity through eminent domain proceedings, the obligation to pay the Special Taxes with respect to that property is to be treated as if it were a special assessment. The constitutionality and operation of these provisions of the Act have not been tested. In particular, insofar as the Act requires payment of the Special Taxes by a federal entity acquiring property within the District, it may be unconstitutional.

California Constitution Article XIIC and Article XIID

On November 5, 1996, the voters of the State approved Proposition 218, the so-called “Right to Vote on Taxes Act.” Proposition 218 added Articles XIIC and XIID to the State Constitution, which articles contain a number of provisions affecting the ability of the District to levy and collect both existing and future taxes, assessments, fees and charges. According to the “Official Title and Summary” of Proposition 218 prepared by the California State Attorney General, Proposition 218 limits the “authority of local governments to impose taxes and property-related assessments, fees and charges.” On July 1, 1997 California State Senate Bill 919 (“SB 919”) was signed into law. SB 919 enacted the “Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act,” which implements and clarifies Proposition 218 and prescribes specific procedures and parameters for local jurisdictions in complying with Articles XIIC and XIID.

Article XIID of the State Constitution reaffirms that the proceedings for the levy of any Special Taxes by the District under the Act must be conducted in conformity with the provisions of Section 4 of Article XIII A. The District has completed its proceedings for the levy of Special Taxes in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of Article XIII A. Under Section 53358 of the California Government Code, any action or proceeding to review, set aside, void, or annul the levy of a special tax or an increase in a special tax (including any constitutional challenge) must be commenced within 30 days after the special tax is approved by the voters.

Article XIIC removes certain limitations on the initiative power in matters of local taxes, assessments, fees and charges. The Act provides for a procedure, which includes notice, hearing, protest and voting requirements, to alter the rate and method of apportionment of an existing special tax. However, the Act prohibits a legislative body from adopting a resolution to reduce the rate of any special tax if the proceeds of that tax are being utilized to retire any debt incurred pursuant to the Act unless such legislative body determines that the reduction of that tax would not interfere with the timely retirement of that debt. Although the matter is not free from doubt, it is likely that exercise by the voters of the initiative power referred to in Article XIIC to reduce or terminate the Special Tax is subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to the Board of Supervisors, as the legislative body of the District, pursuant to the Act. Accordingly, although the matter is not free from doubt, it is likely that Proposition 218 has not conferred on the voters the power to repeal or reduce the Special Taxes if such repeal or reduction would interfere with the timely retirement of the 2017 Bonds.

It may be possible, however, for voters or the Board of Supervisors, acting as the legislative body of the District, to reduce the Special Taxes in a manner which does not interfere with the timely repayment of the 2017 Bonds, but which does reduce the maximum amount of Special Taxes that may be levied in any year below the existing levels. Furthermore, no assurance can be given with respect to the future levy of the Special Taxes in amounts greater than the amount necessary for the timely retirement of the 2017 Bonds.

Proposition 218 and the implementing legislation have yet to be extensively interpreted by the courts; however, the California Court of Appeal in April 1998 upheld the constitutionality of Proposition 218’s balloting procedures as a condition to the validity and collectability of local governmental assessments. A number of validation actions for and challenges to various local governmental taxes, fees and assessments have been filed in Superior Court throughout the State, which could result in additional interpretations of Proposition 218. The interpretation and application of Proposition 218 will ultimately be determined by the courts with respect to a number of the matters discussed above, and the outcome of such determination cannot be predicted at this time with any certainty.

Validity of Landowner Elections

On August 1, 2014, the California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One (the “Court”), issued its opinion in *City of San Diego v. Melvin Shapiro, et al.* (D063997). The Court considered whether Propositions 13 and 218, which amended the California Constitution to require voter approval of taxes, require registered voters to approve a tax or whether a city could limit the qualified voters to just the landowners and lessees paying the tax. The case involved a Convention Center Facilities District (the

“CCFD”) established by the City of San Diego. The CCFD is a financing district established under San Diego’s charter and was intended to function much like a community facilities district established under the provisions of the Act. The CCFD is comprised of the entire City of San Diego. However, the special tax to be levied within the CCFD was to be levied only on properties improved with a hotel located within the CCFD.

At the election to authorize such special tax, the San Diego Charter proceeding limited the electorate to owners of hotel properties and lessees of real property owned by a governmental entity on which a hotel is located, thus, the election was an election limited to landowners and lessees of properties on which the special tax would be levied, and was not a registered voter election. Such approach to determining who would constitute the qualified electors of the CCFD was based on Section 53326(c) of the Act, which generally provides that, if a special tax will not be apportioned in any tax year on residential property, the legislative body may provide that the vote shall be by the landowners of the proposed district whose property would be subject to the special tax. In addition, Section 53326(b) of the Act provides that if there are fewer than 12 registered voters in the district, the landowners shall vote.

The Court held that the CCFD special tax election did not comply with applicable requirements of Proposition 13, which added Article XIII A to the California Constitution (which states “Cities, Counties and special districts, by a two-thirds vote of the qualified electors of such district, may impose special taxes on such district”) and Proposition 218, which added Article XIII C and XIII D to the California Constitution (Section 2 of Article XIII C provides “No local government may impose, extend or increase any special tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a two-thirds vote”), or with applicable provisions of San Diego’s Charter, because the electors in such an election were not the registered voters residing within such district.

San Diego argued that the State Constitution does not expressly define the qualified voters for a tax; however, the Legislature defined qualified voters to include landowners in the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act. The Court of Appeal rejected San Diego’s argument, reasoning that the text and history of Propositions 13 and 218 clearly show California voters intended to limit the taxing powers of local government. The Court was unwilling to defer to the Act as legal authority to provide local governments more flexibility in complying with the State’s constitutional requirement to obtain voter approval for taxes. The Court held that the tax was invalid because the registered voters of San Diego did not approve it. However, the Court expressly stated that it was not addressing the validity of landowners voting to impose special taxes pursuant to the Act in situations where there are fewer than 12 registered voters. In the case of the CCFD, at the time of the election there were several hundred thousand registered voters within the CCFD (i.e., all of the registered voters in the city of San Diego). In the case of the District, there were fewer than 12 registered voters within the District at the time of the election to authorize the Special Tax within the District. In addition, each owner of property that annexed into the District after original District formation has represented to the City that there were no registered voters on such property at the time of annexation.

Moreover, Section 53341 of the Act provides that any “action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul the levy of a special tax ... shall be commenced within 30 days after the special tax is approved by the voters.” Similarly, Section 53359 of the Act provides that any action to determine the validity of bonds issued pursuant to the Act or the levy of special taxes authorized pursuant to the Act be brought within 30 days of the voters approving the issuance of such bonds or the special tax. Voters approved the special tax and the issuance of bonds for the District pursuant to the requirements of the Act on December 29, 2016, and owners of property that annexed into the District voted in favor of special taxes and the issuance of Bonds for the District at the time of annexation more than 30 days prior to the date of issuance of the 2017 Bonds. Therefore, under the provisions of Section 53341 and Section 53359 of the Mello-Roos Act, the statute of limitations period to challenge the validity of the special tax has expired.

Ballot Initiatives and Legislative Measures

Proposition 218 was adopted pursuant to a measure qualified for the ballot pursuant to California's constitutional initiative process; and the State Legislature has in the past enacted legislation which has altered the spending limitations or established minimum funding provisions for particular activities. From time to time, other initiative measures could be adopted by California voters or legislation enacted by the Legislature. The adoption of any such initiative or legislation might place limitations on the ability of the State, the District or other local districts to increase revenues or to increase appropriations or on the ability of a landowner to complete the development of property.

No Acceleration

The 2017 Bonds do not contain a provision allowing for their acceleration in the event of a payment default or other default under the terms of the 2017 Bonds or the Fiscal Agent Agreement or upon any adverse change in the tax status of interest on the 2017 Bonds. There is no provision in the Act or the Fiscal Agent Agreement for acceleration of the Special Taxes in the event of a payment default by an owner of a parcel within the District. Pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, a Bond Owner is given the right for the equal benefit and protection of all Bond Owners to pursue certain remedies described in APPENDIX C – "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT" hereto.

Limitations on Remedies

Remedies available to the Bond Owners may be limited by a variety of factors and may be inadequate to assure the timely payment of principal of and interest on the 2017 Bonds. Bond Counsel has limited its opinion as to the enforceability of the 2017 Bonds and of the Fiscal Agent Agreement to the extent that enforceability may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, fraudulent conveyance or transfer, moratorium, or other similar laws affecting generally the enforcement of creditor's rights, by equitable principles and by the exercise of judicial discretion. Additionally, the 2017 Bonds are not subject to acceleration in the event of the breach of any covenant or duty under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The lack of availability of certain remedies or the limitation of remedies may entail risks of delay, limitation or modification of the rights of the Bond Owners.

Enforceability of the rights and remedies of the Bond Owners, and the obligations incurred by the District, may become subject to the federal bankruptcy code and applicable bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium, or similar laws relating to or affecting the enforcement of creditor's rights generally, now or hereafter in effect, equity principles which may limit the specific enforcement under State law of certain remedies, the exercise by the United States of America of the powers delegated to it by the Constitution, the reasonable and necessary exercise, in certain exceptional situations, of the police powers inherent in the sovereignty of the State and its governmental bodies in the interest of serving a significant and legitimate public purpose and the limitations on remedies against joint powers authorities in the State. See "SPECIAL RISK FACTORS – Bankruptcy and Foreclosure."

Limited Secondary Market

As stated herein, investment in the 2017 Bonds poses certain economic risks which may not be appropriate for certain investors, and only persons with substantial financial resources who understand the risk of investment in the 2017 Bonds should consider such investment. There can be no guarantee that there will be a secondary market for purchase or sale of the 2017 Bonds or, if a secondary market exists, that the 2017 Bonds can or could be sold for any particular price.

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE

The City has covenanted for the benefit of owners of the 2017 Bonds to provide certain financial information and operating data relating to the District (the “Annual Report”) on an annual basis, and to provide notices of the occurrences of certain enumerated events. The Annual Report and the notices of enumerated events will be filed with the MSRB on EMMA. The specific nature of information to be contained in the Annual Report or the notice of events is summarized in APPENDIX E – “FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE.” These covenants have been made by the City in order to assist the Underwriters in complying with the Rule.

The ratings on certain obligations of the City were upgraded by Fitch Ratings on March 28, 2013. Under certain continuing disclosure undertakings of the City, the City was required to file a notice of such upgrade with EMMA by April 11, 2013. The City filed such notice on May 17, 2013. Filings through EMMA are linked to a particular issue of obligations by CUSIP number. It has come to the City’s attention that certain filings (including certain Annual Reports, comprehensive annual financial reports and notice of upgrade by S&P Global Ratings), when made, were not appropriately linked to all applicable CUSIP numbers. The City has since linked the applicable filings to the additional CUSIPs.

TAX MATTERS

The interest on the 2017 Bonds is not intended by the District to be excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes. However, in the opinion of Bond Counsel, interest on the 2017 Bonds is exempt from California personal income taxes. The proposed form of opinion of Bond Counsel with respect to the 2017 Bonds to be delivered on the date of issuance of the 2017 Bonds is set forth in Appendix D.

Owners of the 2017 Bonds should also be aware that the ownership or disposition of, or the accrual or receipt of interest on, the 2017 Bonds may have federal or state tax consequences other than as described above. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion regarding other federal or State tax consequences relating to the ownership or disposition of, or the accrual or receipt of interest on, the 2017 Bonds.

UNDERWRITING

Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated and Stinson Securities LLC (together, the “Underwriters”) purchased the 2017A Bonds at a purchase price of \$34,959,415.08 (calculated as the aggregate principal amount of the 2017A Bonds in the amount of \$36,095,000, minus an original issue discount in the amount of \$929,425.55, and less underwriters’ discount in the amount of \$206,159.37). and purchased the 2017B Bonds at a purchase price of \$167,254,821.41 (calculated as the aggregate principal amount of the 2017B Bonds in the amount of \$171,405,000, less original issue discount in the amount of \$3,171,032.10, and less underwriters’ discount in the amount of \$979,146.49). The Underwriters intend to offer the 2017 Bonds to the public initially at the prices set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement, which prices may subsequently change without any requirement of prior notice.

The Underwriters reserve the right to join with dealers and other underwriters in offering the 2017 Bonds to the public. The Underwriters may offer and sell the 2017 Bonds to certain dealers (including dealers depositing 2017 Bonds into investment trusts) at prices lower than the public offering prices, and such dealers may reallow any such discounts on sales to other dealers.

LEGAL OPINION AND OTHER LEGAL MATTERS

The legal opinion of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, as Bond Counsel, approving the validity of the 2017 Bonds, in substantially the form set forth in Appendix D hereto, will be made available to purchasers of the 2017 Bonds at the time of original delivery. Bond Counsel has not undertaken on behalf of the Owners or the Beneficial Owners of the 2017 Bonds to review the Official Statement and assumes no responsibility to such Owners and Beneficial Owners for the accuracy of the information contained herein. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by the City Attorney, and by Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, Los Angeles, California, Disclosure Counsel, with respect to the issuance of the 2017 Bonds.

Compensation paid to Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, as Bond Counsel, and Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, as Disclosure Counsel, is contingent on the issuance of the 2017 Bonds.

Norton Rose Fulbright (US) LLP, Los Angeles, California has served as Disclosure Counsel to the City, acting on behalf of the District, and in such capacity has advised City staff with respect to applicable securities laws and participated with responsible City officials and staff in conferences and meetings where information contained in this Official Statement was reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Disclosure Counsel is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the statements or information presented in this Official Statement and has not undertaken to independently verify any of such statements or information. The City is solely responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the statements and information contained in this Official Statement. Upon issuance and delivery of the 2017 Bonds, Disclosure Counsel will deliver a letter to the City, acting on behalf of the District, and the Underwriters to the effect that, subject to the assumptions, exclusions, qualifications and limitations set forth therein, no facts have come to the attention of the personnel with Norton Rose Fulbright (US) LLP directly involved in rendering legal advice and assistance to the City which caused them to believe that this Official Statement as of its date and as of the date of delivery of the 2017 Bonds contained or contains any untrue statement of a material fact or omitted or omits to state any material fact necessary to make the statements therein, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading. No purchaser or holder, other than the addressee of the letter, or other person or party, will be entitled to or may rely on such letter of Disclosure Counsel.

NO LITIGATION

A certificate of the City to the effect that no litigation is pending (for which service of process has been received) concerning the validity of the 2017 Bonds will be furnished to the Underwriters at the time of the original delivery of the 2017 Bonds. Neither the City nor the District is aware of any litigation pending or threatened which questions the existence of the District or the City or contests the authority of the City on behalf of the District to levy and collect the Special Taxes or to issue the 2017 Bonds.

RATING

Fitch Ratings has assigned the 2017 Bonds its long-term municipal bond credit rating of "AA+." Such rating should be evaluated independently of any other rating. Such rating reflects only the views of such organization and any desired explanation of the significance of such rating should be obtained from Fitch Ratings. The rating does not constitute a recommendation to buy, sell or hold the 2017 Bonds. The City has furnished to Fitch Ratings certain information respecting the 2017 Bonds and the City. Generally, rating agencies base their ratings on such information and materials and their own investigations, studies and assumptions. Ratings are subject to revision, suspension or withdrawal at any time by the applicable rating agency, and there is no assurance that any rating will continue for any period or that they will not be lowered or withdrawn. The City, on behalf of the District, undertakes no responsibility to oppose any such revision, suspension or withdrawal. Any downward revision, suspension or withdrawal of any rating may have an adverse effect on the market price of the 2017 Bonds or the ability to sell the 2017 Bonds.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX A

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

The information contained in this Appendix A is provided for informational purposes only. No representation is made that any of the information contained in this Appendix A is material to the holders from time to time of the 2017 Bonds, and the District has not undertaken in its Continuing Disclosure Certificate to update this information. The 2017 Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The 2017 Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of or interest on the 2017 Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the 2017 Bonds.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX A

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES**

This Appendix contains information that is current as of October 1, 2017

This Appendix A to the Official Statement of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City” or “San Francisco”) covers general information about the City’s governance structure, budget processes, property taxation system and other tax and revenue sources, City expenditures, labor relations, employment benefits and retirement costs, and investments, bonds and other long-term obligations.

The various reports, documents, websites and other information referred to herein are not incorporated herein by such references. The City has referred to certain specified documents in this Appendix A which are hosted on the City’s website. A wide variety of other information, including financial information, concerning the City is available from the City’s publications, websites and its departments. Any such information that is inconsistent with the information set forth in this Official Statement should be disregarded and is not a part of or incorporated into this Appendix A. The information contained in this Official Statement, including this Appendix A, speaks only as of its date, and the information herein is subject to change. Prospective investors are advised to read the entire Official Statement to obtain information essential to the making of an informed investment decision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CITY GOVERNMENT.....	A-3
City Charter	A-3
Mayor and Board of Supervisors	A-3
Other Elected and Appointed City Officers.....	A-4
CITY BUDGET	A-5
Overview	A-5
Budget Process.....	A-5
November 2009 Charter Amendment Instituting Two-Year Budgetary Cycle	A-6
Role of Controller; Budgetary Analysis and Projections	A-7
General Fund Results; Audited Financial Statements.....	A-7
Five-Year Financial Plan	A-12
City Budget Adopted for Fiscal Years 2016-17 and 2017-18	A-13
Other Budget Updates	A-14
Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances	A-14
Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances	A-14
Budgetary Reserves	A-15
Rainy Day Reserve.....	A-15
Budget Stabilization Reserve	A-16
THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY	A-16
Authority and Personnel	A-17
Effect of the Dissolution Act	A-17
Oversight Board	A-17
Department of Finance Finding of Completion	A-18
State Controller Asset Transfer Review	A-18

Continuing Activities	A-18
PROPERTY TAXATION	A-18
Property Taxation System – General	A-18
Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies	A-19
Tax Levy and Collection.....	A-21
Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property	A-23
OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES	A-24
Business Taxes	A-24
Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax)	A-25
Real Property Transfer Tax	A-26
Sales and Use Tax.....	A-27
Utility Users Tax	A-28
Emergency Response Fee; Access Line Tax.....	A-29
Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax.....	A-29
Parking Tax.....	A-29
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES.....	A-29
State - Realignment.....	A-29
Public Safety Sales Tax	A-30
Other Intergovernmental Grants and Subventions	A-30
Charges for Services.....	A-30
CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES	A-30
General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area	A-30
Baselines	A-31
EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-RETIREMENT OBLIGATIONS.....	A-33
Labor Relations	A-33
San Francisco Employees’ Retirement System (“SFERS” or “Retirement System”)	A-35
Medical Benefits	A-41
Total City Employee Benefits Costs	A-45
INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS.....	A-46
CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS	A-48
Capital Plan	A-48
Tax-Supported Debt Service	A-49
General Obligation Bonds	A-50
Refunding General Obligation Bonds.....	A-52
Lease Payments and Other Long-Term Obligations	A-53
Commercial Paper Program.....	A-55
Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Obligations.....	A-56
Overlapping Debt	A-56
MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.....	A-58
Hunters Point Shipyard (Phase 1 and 2) and Candlestick Point.....	A-59
Treasure Island.....	A-59
Mission Bay Blocks 29-32-Warrior’s Multipurpose Recreation and Entertainment Venue	A-59
Transbay.....	A-59
Mission Bay	A-60
Seawall Lot (SWL) 337 and Pier 48 (Mission Rock)	A-60
Pier 70.....	A-61
Moscone Convention Center	A-61
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES	A-62

Article XIII A of the California Constitution.....	A-62
Article XIII B of the California Constitution.....	A-62
Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution.....	A-63
Statutory Limitations	A-63
Proposition 1A	A-64
Proposition 22.....	A-64
Proposition 26.....	A-65
Future Initiatives and Changes in Law	A-65
LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT.....	A-66
Pending Litigation	A-66
Risk Retention Program	A-66

CITY GOVERNMENT

City Charter

San Francisco is governed as a city and county chartered pursuant to Article XI, Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Constitution of the State of California (the "State"), and is the only consolidated city and county in the State. In addition to its powers under its charter in respect of municipal affairs granted under the State Constitution, San Francisco generally can exercise the powers of both a city and a county under State law. On April 15, 1850, several months before California became a state, the original charter was granted by territorial government to the City. New City charters were adopted by the voters on May 26, 1898, effective January 8, 1900, and on March 26, 1931, effective January 8, 1932. In November 1995, the voters of the City approved the current charter, which went into effect in most respects on July 1, 1996 (the "Charter").

The City is governed by a Board of Supervisors consisting of eleven members elected from supervisorial districts (the "Board of Supervisors"), and a Mayor elected at large who serves as chief executive officer (the "Mayor"). Members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor each serve a four-year term. The Mayor and members of the Board of Supervisors are subject to term limits as established by the Charter. Members of the Board of Supervisors may serve no more than two successive four-year terms and may not serve another term until four years have elapsed since the end of the second successive term in office. The Mayor may serve no more than two successive four-year terms, with no limit on the number of non-successive terms of office. The City Attorney, Assessor-Recorder, District Attorney, Treasurer and Tax Collector, Sheriff, and Public Defender are also elected directly by the citizens and may serve unlimited four-year terms. The Charter provides a civil service system for most City employees. School functions are carried out by the San Francisco Unified School District (grades K-12) ("SFUSD") and the San Francisco Community College District (post-secondary) ("SFCCD"). Each is a separate legal entity with a separately elected governing board.

Under its original charter, the City committed itself to a policy of municipal ownership of utilities. The Municipal Railway, when acquired from a private operator in 1912, was the first such city-owned public transit system in the nation. In 1914, the City obtained its municipal water system, including the Hetch Hetchy watershed near Yosemite. In 1927, the City dedicated Mill's Field Municipal Airport at a site in what is now San Mateo County 14 miles south of downtown San Francisco, which would grow to become today's San Francisco International Airport (the "Airport"). In 1969, the City acquired the Port of San Francisco (the "Port") in trust from the State. Substantial expansions and improvements have been made to these enterprises since their original acquisition. The Airport, the Port, the Public Utilities Commission ("Public Utilities Commission") (which now includes the Water Enterprise, the Wastewater Enterprise and the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Project), the Municipal Transportation Agency ("MTA") (which operates the San Francisco Municipal Railway or "Muni" and the Department of Parking and Traffic ("DPT"), including the Parking Authority and its five public parking garages), and the City-owned hospitals (San Francisco General and Laguna Honda), are collectively referred to herein as the "enterprise fund departments," as they are not integrated into the City's General Fund operating budget. However, certain of the enterprise fund departments, including San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital and the MTA receive significant General Fund transfers on an annual basis.

The Charter distributes governing authority among the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the various other elected officers, the City Controller and other appointed officers, and the boards and commissions that oversee the various City departments. Compared to the governance of the City prior to 1995, the Charter

concentrates relatively more power in the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The Mayor appoints most commissioners subject to a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, unless otherwise provided in the Charter. The Mayor appoints each department head from among persons nominated to the position by the appropriate commission, and may remove department heads.

Mayor and Board of Supervisors

Edwin M. Lee is the 43rd and current Mayor of the City. The Mayor has responsibility for general administration and oversight of all departments in the executive branch of the City. Mayor Lee was elected to his current four-year term on November 3, 2015. Prior to being elected, Mayor Lee was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in January 2011 to fill the remaining year of former Mayor Gavin Newsom’s term when Mayor Newsom was sworn in as the State’s Lieutenant Governor. Mayor Lee served as the City Administrator from 2005 until his appointment to Mayor. He also previously served in each of the following positions: the City’s Director of Public Works, the City’s Director of Purchasing, the Director of the Human Rights Commission, the Deputy Director of the Employee Relations Division, and coordinator for the Mayor’s Family Policy Task Force.

Table A-1 lists the current members of the Board of Supervisors. The Supervisors are elected for staggered four-year terms and are elected by district. Vacancies are filled by appointment by the Mayor.

TABLE A-1

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
Board of Supervisors		
Name	First Elected or Appointed	Current Term Expires
Sandra Lee Fewer, <i>District 1</i>	2017	2021
Mark Farrell, <i>District 2</i>	2010	2019
Aaron Peskin, <i>District 3</i>	2017	2021
Katy Tang, <i>District 4</i>	2013	2019
London Breed, Board President, <i>District 5</i>	2017	2021
Jane Kim, <i>District 6</i>	2010	2019
Norman Yee, <i>District 7</i>	2017	2021
Jeff Sheehy, <i>District 8</i>	2017	2021
Hillary Rohen, <i>District 9</i>	2017	2021
Malia Cohen, <i>District 10</i>	2010	2019
Ahsha Safai, <i>District 11</i>	2017	2021

Other Elected and Appointed City Officers

Dennis J. Herrera was re-elected to a four-year term as City Attorney in November 2015. The City Attorney represents the City in legal proceedings in which the City has an interest. Mr. Herrera was first elected City Attorney in December 2001. Before becoming City Attorney, Mr. Herrera had been a partner in a private law firm and had served in the Clinton Administration as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Maritime Administration. He also served as president of the San Francisco Police Commission and was a member of the San Francisco Public Transportation Commission.

Carmen Chu was elected Assessor-Recorder of the City in November 2014. The Assessor-Recorder administers the property tax assessment system of the City. Before becoming Assessor-Recorder, Ms. Chu

was elected in November 2008 and November 2010 to the Board of Supervisors, representing the Sunset/Parkside District 4 after being appointed by then-Mayor Newsom in September 2007.

José Cisneros was re-elected to a four-year term as Treasurer of the City in November 2015. The Treasurer is responsible for the deposit and investment of all City moneys, and also acts as Tax Collector for the City. Mr. Cisneros has served as Treasurer since September 2004, following his appointment by then-Mayor Newsom. Prior to being appointed Treasurer, Mr. Cisneros served as Deputy General Manager, Capital Planning and External Affairs for the MTA.

Benjamin Rosenfield was appointed to a ten-year term as Controller of the City by then-Mayor Newsom in March 2008, and was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with the Charter. The City Controller is responsible for timely accounting, disbursement, and other disposition of City moneys, certifies the accuracy of budgets, estimates the cost of ballot measures, provides payroll services for the City's employees, and, as the Auditor for the City, directs performance and financial audits of City activities. Before becoming Controller, Mr. Rosenfield served as the Deputy City Administrator under former City Administrator Edwin Lee from 2005 to 2008. He was responsible for the preparation and monitoring of the City's ten-year capital plan, oversight of a number of internal service offices under the City Administrator, and implementing the City's 311 non-emergency customer service center. From 2001 to 2005, Mr. Rosenfield worked as the Budget Director for then-Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. and then-Mayor Newsom. As Budget Director, Mr. Rosenfield prepared the City's proposed budget for each fiscal year and worked on behalf of the Mayor to manage City spending during the course of each year. From 1997 to 2001, Mr. Rosenfield worked as an analyst in the Mayor's Budget Office and a project manager in the Controller's Office.

Naomi M. Kelly was appointed to a five-year term as City Administrator by Mayor Lee on February 7, 2012 and re-appointed for a second five-year term on February 8, 2017. The City Administrator has overall responsibility for the management and implementation of policies, rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the voters. In January 2012, Mrs. Kelly became Acting City Administrator. From January 2011, she served as Deputy City Administrator where she was responsible for the Office of Contract Administration, Purchasing, Fleet Management and Central Shops. Mrs. Kelly led the effort to successfully roll out the City's new Local Hire program last year by streamlining rules and regulations, eliminating duplication and creating administrative efficiencies. In 2004, Mrs. Kelly served as the City Purchaser and Director of the Office of Contract Administration. Mrs. Kelly has also served as Special Assistant in the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services, in the Mayor's Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs and served as the City's Executive Director of the Taxicab Commission.

CITY BUDGET

Overview

This section discusses the City's budget procedures, while following sections of this Appendix A describe the City's various sources of revenues and expenditure obligations.

The City manages the operations of its nearly 60 departments, commissions and authorities, including the enterprise fund departments, through its annual budget. In July 2017, the City adopted a full two-year budget. The City's fiscal year 2017-18 adopted budget appropriates annual revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves of approximately \$10.12 billion, of which the City's General Fund accounts for approximately \$5.15 billion. In fiscal year 2018-19 appropriated revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves total approximately \$10.00 billion and \$5.31 billion of General Fund budget. For a further

discussion of the fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 adopted budgets, see “City Budget Adopted for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19” herein.

Each year the Mayor prepares budget legislation for the City departments, which must be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Revenues consist largely of local property taxes, business taxes, sales taxes, other local taxes and charges for services. A significant portion of the City’s revenues come in the form of intergovernmental transfers from the State and Federal governments. Thus, the City’s fiscal situation is affected by the health of the local real estate market, the local business and tourist economy, and by budgetary decisions made by the State and federal governments which depend, in turn, on the health of the larger State and national economies. All of these factors are almost wholly outside the control of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and other City officials. In addition, the State Constitution strictly limits the City’s ability to raise taxes and property-based fees without a two-thirds popular vote. See “CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES” herein. Also, the fact that the City’s annual budget must be adopted before the State and federal budgets adds uncertainty to the budget process and necessitates flexibility so that spending decisions can be adjusted during the course of the fiscal year. See “CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES” herein.

Budget Process

The City’s fiscal year commences on July 1. The City’s budget process for each fiscal year begins in the middle of the preceding fiscal year as departments prepare their budgets and seek any required approvals from the applicable City board or commission. Departmental budgets are consolidated by the City Controller, and then transmitted to the Mayor no later than the first working day of March. By the first working day of May, the Mayor is required to submit a proposed budget to the Board of Supervisors for certain specified departments, based on criteria set forth in the Administrative Code. On or before the first working day of June, the Mayor is required to submit the complete budget, including all departments, to the Board of Supervisors.

Under the Charter, following the submission of the Mayor’s proposed budget, the City Controller must provide an opinion to the Board of Supervisors regarding the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates and the reasonableness of such estimates and revisions in the proposed budget (the City Controller’s “Revenue Letter”). The City Controller may also recommend reserves that are considered prudent given the proposed resources and expenditures contained in the Mayor’s proposed budget. The City Controller’s current Revenue Letter can be viewed online at www.sfcontroller.org. The Revenue Letter and other information from the said website are not incorporated herein by reference. The City’s Capital Planning Committee also reviews the proposed budget and provides recommendations based on the budget’s conformance with the City’s adopted ten-year capital plan. For a further discussion of the Capital Planning Committee and the City’s ten-year capital plan, see “CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS – Capital Plan” herein.

The City is required by the Charter to adopt a budget which is balanced in each fund. During its budget approval process, the Board of Supervisors has the power to reduce or augment any appropriation in the proposed budget, provided the total budgeted appropriation amount in each fund is not greater than the total budgeted appropriation amount for such fund submitted by the Mayor. The Board of Supervisors must approve the budget by adoption of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance (also referred to herein as the “Original Budget”) by no later than August 1 of each year.

The Annual Appropriation Ordinance becomes effective with or without the Mayor's signature after ten days; however, the Mayor has line-item veto authority over specific items in the budget. Additionally, in the event the Mayor were to disapprove the entire ordinance, the Charter directs the Mayor to promptly return the ordinance to the Board of Supervisors, accompanied by a statement indicating the reasons for disapproval and any recommendations which the Mayor may have. Any Annual Appropriation Ordinance so disapproved by the Mayor shall become effective only if, subsequent to its return, it is passed by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors.

Following the adoption and approval of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, the City makes various revisions throughout the fiscal year (the Original Budget plus any changes made to date are collectively referred to herein as the "Revised Budget"). A "Final Revised Budget" is prepared at the end of the fiscal year reflecting the year-end revenue and expenditure appropriations for that fiscal year.

November 2009 Charter Amendment Instituting Two-Year Budgetary Cycle

On November 3, 2009, voters approved Proposition A amending the Charter to make changes to the City's budget and financial processes which are intended to stabilize spending by requiring multi-year budgeting and financial planning.

Proposition A requires four significant changes:

1. Specifies a two-year (biennial) budget, replacing the annual budget. Fixed two-year budgets are currently approved by the Board of Supervisors for five departments: the Airport, Child Support Services, the Port, the Public Utilities Commission and MTA. All other departments prepared balanced, rolling two-year budgets.
2. Requires a five-year financial plan, which forecasts revenues and expenses and summarizes expected public service levels and funding requirements for that period. The most recent five-year financial plan, including a forecast of expenditures and revenues and proposed actions to balance them in light of strategic goals, was issued by the Mayor, Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors and Controller's Office on December 16, 2016, for fiscal year 2017-18 through fiscal year 2021-22, to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. See "Five Year Financial Plan" below. This plan was most recently updated on March 23, 2017.
3. Charges the Controller's Office with proposing to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors financial policies addressing reserves, use of volatile revenues, debt and financial measures in the case of disaster recovery and requires the City to adopt budgets consistent with these policies once approved. The Controller's Office may recommend additional financial policies or amendments to existing policies no later than October 1 of any subsequent year.
4. Standardizes the processes and deadlines for the City to submit labor agreements for all public employee unions by May 15.

On April 13, 2010, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted policies to 1) codify the City's current practice of maintaining an annual General Reserve for current year fiscal pressures not anticipated in the budget and roughly double the size of the General Reserve by fiscal year 2015-16, and 2) create a new Budget Stabilization Reserve funded by excess receipts from volatile revenue streams to augment the existing Rainy Day Reserve to help the City mitigate the impact of multi-year downturns. On November 8 and 22, 2011, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted additional financial policies limiting the

future approval of Certificates of Participation and other long-term obligations to 3.25% of discretionary revenue, and specifying that selected nonrecurring revenues may only be spent on nonrecurring expenditures. On December 16, 2014, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted financial policies to implement voter-approved changes to the City's Rainy Day Reserve, as well as changes to the General Reserve which would increase the cap from 2% to 3% of revenues and reduce deposit requirements during a recession. These policies are described in further detail below under "Budgetary Reserves." The Controller's Office may propose additional financial policies by October 1 of any year.

Role of Controller; Budgetary Analysis and Projections

As Chief Fiscal Officer and City Services Auditor, the City Controller monitors spending for all officers, departments and employees charged with receipt, collection or disbursement of City funds. Under the Charter, no obligation to expend City funds can be incurred without a prior certification by the Controller that sufficient revenues are or will be available to meet such obligation as it becomes due in the then-current fiscal year, which ends June 30. The Controller monitors revenues throughout the fiscal year, and if actual revenues are less than estimated, the City Controller may freeze department appropriations or place departments on spending "allotments" which will constrain department expenditures until estimated revenues are realized. If revenues are in excess of what was estimated, or budget surpluses are created, the Controller can certify these surplus funds as a source for supplemental appropriations that may be adopted throughout the year upon approval of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The City's annual expenditures are often different from the estimated expenditures in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance due to supplemental appropriations, continuing appropriations of prior years, and unexpended current-year funds.

In addition to the five year planning responsibilities established in Proposition A of November 2009 and discussed above, Charter Section 3.105 directs the Controller to issue periodic or special financial reports during the fiscal year. Each year, the Controller issues six-month and nine-month budget status reports to apprise the City's policymakers of the current budgetary status, including projected year-end revenues, expenditures and fund balances. The Controller issued the most recent of these reports, the fiscal year 2016-17 Nine Month Budget Status Report (the "Nine Month Report"), on May 10, 2017. The City Charter also directs the Controller to annually report on the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates in the Mayor's proposed budget. On June 9, 2017 the Controller released the Discussion of the Mayor's fiscal year 2017-18 and fiscal year 2018-19 Proposed Budget (the "Revenue Letter" as described in "Budget Process" above). All of these reports are available from the Controller's website: www.sfcontroller.org. The information from said website is not incorporated herein by reference.

General Fund Results: Audited Financial Statements

The General Fund portions of the fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 Original Budgets total \$5.15 billion and \$5.31 billion, respectively. This does not include expenditures of other governmental funds and enterprise fund departments such as the Airport, the MTA, the Public Utilities Commission, the Port and the City-owned hospitals (San Francisco General and Laguna Honda). Table A-2 shows Final Revised Budget revenues and appropriations for the City's General Fund for fiscal years 2012-13 through 2015-16 and the Original Budgets for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18. See "PROPERTY TAXATION –Tax Levy and Collection," "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" and "CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES" herein.

The City's most recently completed Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (the "CAFR," which includes the City's audited financial statements) for fiscal year 2015-16 was issued on November 18, 2016. The fiscal year 2015-16 CAFR reported that as of June 30, 2016, the General Fund available for appropriation in subsequent years was \$435 million (see Table A-4), of which \$172.1 million was assumed in the fiscal year 2016-17 Original Budget and \$191.2 million was assumed in the fiscal year 2017-18 Original Budget. This represents a \$44 million increase in available fund balance over the \$391 million available as of June 30, 2015 and resulted primarily from greater-than-budgeted additional tax revenue, particularly property and business tax revenues, partially offset by weakness in sales and parking tax revenues in fiscal year 2015-16, as well as lower required transfers to support the Department of Public Health. The fiscal year 2016-17 CAFR is scheduled to be completed in late November 2017.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Budgeted General Fund Revenues and Appropriations for
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18
(000s)

	2013-14 Final Revised Budget	2014-15 Final Revised Budget	2015-16 Final Revised Budget	2016-17 Final Revised Budget ²	2017-18 Original Budget ³
Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves	\$674,637	\$941,702	\$1,236,090	\$178,109	\$195,221
<u>Budgeted Revenues</u>					
Property Taxes	\$1,153,417	\$1,232,927	\$1,291,000	\$1,412,000	\$1,468,000
Business Taxes	532,988	572,385	634,460	669,450	697,887
Other Local Taxes	846,924	910,430	1,062,535	1,117,245	1,262,875
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	25,533	27,129	27,163	28,876	29,187
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	4,994	4,242	4,550	4,580	4,578
Interest and Investment Earnings	10,946	6,853	10,680	13,970	14,353
Rents and Concessions	23,060	22,692	15,432	16,140	15,828
Grants and Subventions	799,188	856,336	900,997	959,099	978,866
Charges for Services	177,081	210,020	219,628	236,102	236,786
Other	14,321	21,532	31,084	61,334	27,821
Total Budgeted Revenues	\$3,588,452	\$3,864,545	\$4,197,529	\$4,518,796	\$4,736,181
Bond Proceeds & Repayment of Loans	1,105	1,026	918	881	881
<u>Expenditure Appropriations</u>					
Public Protection	\$1,102,667	\$1,158,771	\$1,211,007	\$1,298,185	\$1,323,268
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	79,635	89,270	138,288	176,768	165,498
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	745,277	828,555	892,069	970,679	1,009,995
Community Health	703,092	703,569	751,416	786,218	824,100
Culture and Recreation	112,624	119,051	125,253	158,954	158,979
General Administration & Finance	199,709	214,958	235,647	349,308	333,291
General City Responsibilities ¹	86,516	116,322	113,672	154,344	164,895
Total Expenditure Appropriations	\$3,029,520	\$3,230,496	\$3,467,352	\$3,894,456	\$3,980,026
Budgetary reserves and designations, net	\$0	\$39,966	\$9,907	\$58,469	\$61,014
Transfers In	\$242,958	\$199,175	\$235,416	\$161,995	\$159,211
Transfers Out	(720,806)	(873,592)	(962,511)	(906,856)	(1,050,454)
Net Transfers In/Out	(\$477,848)	(\$674,417)	(\$727,095)	(\$744,861)	(\$891,243)
Budgeted Excess (Deficiency) of Sources					
Over (Under) Uses	\$756,825	\$862,394	\$1,230,182	\$0	\$1
Variance of Actual vs. Budget	184,184	373,696	296,673		
Total Actual Budgetary Fund Balance³	\$941,009	\$1,236,090	\$1,526,855	\$0	\$1

¹ Over the past five years, the City has consolidated various departments to achieve operational efficiencies. This has resulted in changes in how departments were summarized in the service area groupings above for the time periods shown.

² Fiscal year 2016-17 Final Revised Budget will be available upon release of the fiscal year 2016-17 CAFR.

³ Fiscal year 2017-18 Original Budget Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves will be reconciled with the previous year's Final Revised Budget.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

The City prepares its budget on a modified accrual basis. Accruals for incurred liabilities, such as claims and judgments, workers' compensation, accrued vacation and sick leave pay are funded only as payments are required to be made. The audited General Fund balance as of June 30, 2016 was \$1.4 billion (as shown in Table A-3 and Table A-4) using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), derived from audited revenues of \$4.4 billion. Audited General Fund balances are shown in Table A-3 on both a budget basis and a GAAP basis with comparative financial information for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2012 through June 30, 2016.

TABLE A-3

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Summary of Audited General Fund Balances
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16
(000s)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Restricted for rainy day (Economic Stabilization account)	\$31,099	\$23,329	\$60,289	\$71,904	\$74,986
Restricted for rainy day (One-time Spending account)	3,010	3,010	22,905	43,065	45,120
Committed for budget stabilization (citywide)	74,330	121,580	132,264	132,264	178,434
Committed for Recreation & Parks expenditure savings reserve	4,946	15,907	12,862	10,551	8,736
<u>Assigned, not available for appropriation</u>					
Assigned for encumbrances	\$62,699	\$74,815	\$92,269	\$137,641	\$190,965
Assigned for appropriation carryforward	85,283	112,327	159,345	201,192	293,921
Assigned for budget savings incentive program (citywide)	22,410	24,819	32,088	33,939	58,907
Assigned for salaries and benefits (MOU)	7,100	6,338	10,040	20,155	18,203
Total Fund Balance Not Available for Appropriation	\$290,877	\$382,125	\$522,062	\$650,711	\$869,272
<u>Assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation</u>					
Assigned for litigation & contingencies	\$23,637	\$30,254	79,223	131,970	\$145,443
Assigned for General reserve	22,306	21,818	-	-	-
Assigned for subsequent year's budget	104,284	122,689	135,938	180,179	172,128
Unassigned for General Reserve	-	-	45,748	62,579	76,913
Unassigned - Budgeted for use second budget year	103,575	111,604	137,075	194,082	191,202
Unassigned - Contingency for second budget year	-	-	-	-	60,000
Unassigned - Available for future appropriation	12,418	6,147	21,656	16,569	11,872
Total Fund Balance Available for Appropriation	\$266,220	\$292,512	\$419,640	\$585,379	\$657,558
Total Fund Balance, Budget Basis	\$557,097	\$674,637	\$941,702	\$1,236,090	\$1,526,830
<u>Budget Basis to GAAP Basis Reconciliation</u>					
Total Fund Balance - Budget Basis	\$557,097	\$674,637	\$941,702	\$1,236,090	\$1,526,830
Unrealized gain or loss on investments	6,838	(1,140)	935	1,141	343
Nonspendable fund balance	19,598	23,854	24,022	24,786	522
Cumulative Excess Property Tax Revenues Recognized	(46,140)	(38,210)	(37,303)	(37,303)	(36,008)
Cumulative Excess Health, Human Service, Franchise Tax and other Revenues on Budget Basis	(62,241)	(93,910)	(66,415)	(50,406)	(56,709)
Deferred Amounts on Loan Receivables	(16,551)	(20,067)	(21,670)	(23,212)	-
Pre-paid lease revenue	(2,876)	(4,293)	(5,709)	(5,900)	(5,816)
Total Fund Balance, GAAP Basis	\$455,725	\$540,871	\$835,562	\$1,145,196	\$1,429,162

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Table A-4, entitled “Audited Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances,” is extracted from information in the City’s CAFR for the five most recent fiscal years. Audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016 are included herein as Appendix B – “COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016.” Prior years’ audited financial statements can be obtained from the City Controller’s website. Information from the City Controller’s website is not incorporated herein by reference. Excluded from this Statement of General Fund Revenues and Expenditures in Table A-4 are fiduciary funds, internal service funds, special revenue funds (which relate to proceeds of specific revenue sources which are legally restricted to expenditures for specific purposes) and all of the enterprise fund departments of the City, each of which prepares separate audited financial statements.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-4

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Audited Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16¹
(000s)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Revenues:					
Property Taxes	\$1,056,143	\$1,122,008	\$1,178,277	\$1,272,623	\$1,393,574
Business Taxes ²	435,316	479,627	562,896	609,614	659,086
Other Local Taxes	751,301	756,346	922,205	1,085,381	1,054,109
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	25,022	26,273	26,975	27,789	27,909
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	8,444	6,226	5,281	6,369	8,985
Interest and Investment Income	10,262	2,125	7,866	7,867	9,613
Rents and Concessions	24,932	35,273	25,501	24,339	46,553
Intergovernmental	678,808	720,625	827,750	854,464	900,820
Charges for Services	145,797	164,391	180,850	215,036	233,976
Other	17,090	14,142	9,760	9,162	22,291
Total Revenues	\$3,153,115	\$3,327,036	\$3,747,361	\$4,112,644	\$4,356,916
Expenditures:					
Public Protection	\$991,275	\$1,057,451	\$1,096,839	\$1,148,405	\$1,204,666
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	52,815	68,014	78,249	87,452	136,762
Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development	626,194	660,657	720,787	786,362	853,924
Community Health	545,962	634,701	668,701	650,741	666,138
Culture and Recreation	100,246	105,870	113,019	119,278	124,515
General Administration & Finance	182,898	186,342	190,335	208,695	223,844
General City Responsibilities	96,132	81,657	86,968	98,620	114,663
Total Expenditures	\$2,595,522	\$2,794,692	\$2,954,898	\$3,099,553	\$3,324,512
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures	\$557,593	\$532,344	\$792,463	\$1,013,091	\$1,032,404
Other Financing Sources (Uses):					
Transfers In	\$120,449	\$195,272	\$216,449	\$164,712	\$209,494
Transfers Out	(553,190)	(646,912)	(720,806)	(873,741)	(962,343)
Other Financing Sources	3,682	4,442	6,585	5,572	4,411
Other Financing Uses	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	(\$429,059)	(\$447,198)	(\$497,772)	(\$703,457)	(\$748,438)
Extraordinary gain/(loss) from dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency	(815)	-	-	-	-
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues and Other Sources Over Expenditures and Other Uses	\$127,719	\$85,146	\$294,691	\$309,634	\$283,966
Total Fund Balance at Beginning of Year	\$328,006	\$455,725	\$540,871	\$835,562	\$1,145,196
Total Fund Balance at End of Year -- GAAP Basis³	\$455,725	\$540,871	\$835,562	\$1,145,196	\$1,429,162
Assigned for Subsequent Year's Appropriations and Unassigned Fund Balance, Year End					
-- GAAP Basis	\$133,794	\$135,795	\$178,066	\$234,273	\$249,238
-- Budget Basis	\$220,277	\$240,410	\$294,669	\$390,830	\$435,202

¹ Summary of financial information derived from City CAFRs. Fund balances include amounts reserved for rainy day (Economic Stabilization and One-time Spending accounts), encumbrances, appropriation carryforwards and other purposes (as required by the Charter or appropriate accounting practices) as well as unreserved designated and undesignated available fund balances (which amounts constitute unrestricted General Fund balances).

² Does not include business taxes allocated to special revenue fund for the Community Challenge Grant program.

³ Total fiscal year 2012-13 amount is comprised of \$122.7 million in assigned balance subsequently appropriated for use in fiscal year 2013-14 plus \$117.8 million unassigned balance available for future appropriations.

Sources: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report; Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Five-Year Financial Plan

The Five-Year Financial Plan (“Plan”) is required under Proposition A, a Charter amendment approved by voters in November 2009. The Charter requires the Plan to forecast expenditures and revenues for the next five fiscal years, propose actions to balance revenues and expenditures during each year of the Plan, and discuss strategic goals and corresponding resources for City departments. Proposition A required that a Plan be adopted every two years. The City updates the Plan annually. The most recently adopted Plan, for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2021-22, was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor on May 5, 2017.

On December 16, 2016, the Mayor, Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors and the Controller’s Office issued a proposed Plan for fiscal year 2017-18 through fiscal year 2021-22, to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed Plan projects shortfalls of \$119 million, \$283 million, \$585 million, \$713 million, and \$848 million cumulatively for fiscal years 2017-18 through fiscal year 2021-22, respectively. On March 23, 2017, the proposed Plan was updated with the most recent information on the City’s fiscal condition. For General Fund Supported operations, the updated Plan projects budgetary shortfalls of \$87 million, \$201 million, \$612 million, \$774 million, and \$907 million cumulatively over the next five fiscal years. This represents a cumulative increase in shortfall of \$59 million from the prior projection.

The updated Plan projects growth over a five-year period in General Fund revenues of 11%, primarily composed of growth in local tax sources, offset by projected expenditure increases of 30% over the same period, primarily composed of growth in employee salaries and benefits, citywide operating expenses, and Charter mandated baselines and reserves. The Plan presents an array of fiscal strategies to constrain this increase in expenditures and bring revenues and expenditures into balance. To the extent budgets are balanced with ongoing savings or revenues, future shortfalls are would decrease.

The City currently projects growth in General Fund sources of \$541 million over the Plan period, and expenditure growth of \$1.4 billion. Growth in salaries and benefits account for 51% or \$732 million of the cumulative five year shortfall. Growth in citywide operating costs account for 31% or \$451 million of the cumulative five year shortfall. Growth in Charter mandated baselines and reserves account for 15% or \$214 million of the cumulative five year shortfall. Growth in individual department costs account for 4% or \$52.4 million of the cumulative five year shortfall. These figures incorporate the key assumptions from the December 2016 plan, including:

- **Continued Increases in Employer Contribution Rates to City Retirement System:** Consistent with the December 2016 proposed Plan, the March 2017 update anticipates increased retirement costs. This is in contrast to the pension relief anticipated at the time of the proposed Plan from December 2014, when decreased pension contributions were expected after the amortization of investment losses during the financial crisis. The increase in employer contribution rates is due to three main factors: lower than expected actual fiscal year 2015-16 investment earnings; updated demographic assumptions, which show that retirees are living longer and collecting pensions longer than previously expected, and an appellate court ruling against the City which found that voter-adopted changes to the conditions under which retirees could receive a supplemental COLA violated retirees’ vested rights. Current projections are marginally improved since the December 2016 Plan, as they incorporate the SFERS Retirement Board approved results of their July 1, 2016 actuarial funding valuation, resulting in slightly lower than previously assumed SFERS contribution rates paid by the City for miscellaneous employees. In addition, on December 21, 2016, the CalPERS Board of Administration approved lowering their discount rate assumption, the long-term rate of return , from 7.5% to 7% over three years. The March 2017 Plan update incorporates

increased contribution rates by the City for CalPERS employees, as a result of the discount rate changes beginning in FY 2018-19.

Voter Adopted Revenue and Spending Requirements: Consistent with the December 2016 proposed Plan, the March 2017 update continues to assume several new revenue and expenditure requirements that have been adopted by voters in 2016: a Recreation and Parks baseline (June 2016 Proposition B), a Dignity Fund baseline (November 2016 Proposition I), and a Street Tree Maintenance Fund baseline (November 2016 Proposition E). In addition to these spending requirements, the voters adopted an increase to the Real Property Transfer Tax rate (November 2016 Proposition W) and a tax on the distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages (November 2016 Proposition

The March 2017 update also incorporates the following key changes from the December 2016 Plan:

- **Two-Year Contract Extensions for Most Miscellaneous Employees:** In February 2017, the City negotiated two-year contract extensions (for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19) with most of its labor unions. The parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2017 and 3% on July 1, 2018, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2018-19 adjustment by six months if the City's deficit, as projected in the March 2017 update to the Five Year Financial Plan, exceeds \$200 million.
- **Updates to the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan:** On February 28, 2017, the City's Proposed Ten-Year Capital Plan for fiscal years 2018-2027 was introduced to the Board of Supervisors. The assumptions in the Capital Plan are reflected in the March update to the Five Year Financial Plan.

Importantly, the updated Plan does not assume any losses of federal or state revenues, except for formula-driven reductions. Although proposals that would have significant negative impact on the City budget are pending at the state and federal level, it is unclear which will ultimately be adopted and what the specific impacts will be.

While the projected shortfalls in the updated Plan reflect the difference in projected revenues and expenditures over the next five years if current service levels and policies continue, San Francisco's Charter requires that each year's budget be balanced. Balancing the budgets will require some combination of expenditure reductions and/or additional revenues. These projections assume no ongoing solutions are implemented. To the extent budgets are balanced with ongoing solutions, future shortfalls will decrease.

The December 2016 proposed Plan and the March 2017 update do not assume an economic downturn due to the difficulty of predicting recessions; however, the City has historically not experienced more than six consecutive years of expansion and the current economic expansion began over seven years ago. For this reason, the December 2016 proposed Plan includes a recession scenario, which reflects a revenue shortfall of \$960 million during the forecast period, based on the average rates of revenue declines experienced in major tax revenue sources during the previous two recessions.

City Budget Adopted for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

On July 26, 2017, Mayor Lee signed the Consolidated Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (the "Original Budget") for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2018 and June 30, 2019. This is the sixth two-year budget for the entire City. The adopted budget closed the \$119 million and \$283 million General Fund

shortfalls for fiscal year 2017-18 and fiscal year 2018-19 identified in the City's December 2016 Plan update through a combination of increased revenues and expenditures savings.

The Original Budget for fiscal year 2017-18 and fiscal year 2018-19 totals \$10.12 billion and \$10.00 billion respectively, representing a year over year increase of \$532 million in fiscal year 2017-18 and year over year decrease of \$117 million in fiscal year 2018-19. The General Fund portion of each year's budget is \$5.15 billion in fiscal year 2017-18 and \$5.31 billion in fiscal year 2018-19 representing year over year increases of \$83 million and \$138 million. There are 30,835 funded full time positions in the fiscal year 2017-18 Original Budget and 30,938 in the fiscal year 2018-19 Original Budget representing year-over-year increases of 208 and 103 positions, respectively.

Other Budget Updates

On June 9 2017, the Controller's Office issued the Controller's Discussion of the Mayor's FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 Proposed Budget ("Revenue Letter"). The report found that the revenue assumptions in the proposed and now-adopted budget are reasonable, voter-required baseline and set-aside requirements are met or exceeded, and that code-mandated reserves and funded and maintained at required levels.

The letter also certified that the Original Budget for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 adheres to the City's policy limiting the use of certain nonrecurring revenues to nonrecurring expenses proposed by the Controller's Office and approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors on November 22, 2011. The policy was approved by the Mayor on December 1, 2011 and can only be suspended for a given fiscal year by a two-thirds vote of the Board. Specifically, this policy limited the Mayor and Board's ability to use for operating expenses the following nonrecurring revenues: extraordinary year-end General Fund balance (defined as General Fund prior year unassigned fund balance before deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve or Budget Stabilization Reserve in excess of the average of the previous five years), the General Fund share of revenues from prepayments provided under long-term leases, concessions, or contracts, otherwise unrestricted revenues from legal judgments and settlements, and other unrestricted revenues from the sale of land or other fixed assets. Under the policy, these nonrecurring revenues may only be used for nonrecurring expenditures that do not create liability for or expectation of substantial ongoing costs, including but not limited to: discretionary funding of reserves, acquisition of capital equipment, capital projects included in the City's capital plans, development of affordable housing, and discretionary payment of pension, debt or other long term obligations.

Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances

Revenues from the State represent approximately 15% of the General Fund revenues appropriated in the budget for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19, and thus changes in State revenues could have a significant impact on the City's finances. In a typical year, the Governor releases two primary proposed budget documents: 1) the Governor's Proposed Budget required to be submitted in January; and 2) the "May Revise" to the Governor's Proposed Budget. The Governor's Proposed Budget is then considered and typically revised by the State Legislature. Following that process, the State Legislature adopts, and the Governor signs, the State budget. City policy makers review and estimate the impact of both the Governor's Proposed and May Revise Budgets prior to the City adopting its own budget.

On June 27, 2017, the Governor signed the 2017-18 State Budget, appropriating \$183.3 billion from the General Fund and other State funds. General Fund appropriations total \$125.1 billion, \$3.7 billion or 3% more than the 2016-17 budget. The budget agreement focuses on maintaining fiscal prudence by adding mostly one-time expenditures, paying down past budgetary borrowing and state employee pension liabilities, and contributing to stabilization reserves. The budget increases funding to K-14 schools and

community colleges by adding \$3.1 billion above fiscal year 2016-17 funding levels, including \$1.4 billion through the Local Control Funding Formula. The Budget expands the state's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to include a wider income range, as well as self-employed individuals. It also implements the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1) providing \$54 billion of new transportation infrastructure funding over the next 10 years.

The final fiscal year 2017-18 budget re-bases the In-Home Supportive Services Maintenance-of-Effort (IHSS MOE) agreement negotiated in 2012, as proposed in the Governor's January budget, but provides \$400 million of General Fund support to partially mitigate the increase to counties' costs in fiscal year 2017-18, \$330 million in 2018-19, \$200 million in 2019-20, and \$150 million annually thereafter. The City's fiscal year 2017-18 budget assumes a cost of \$11.1 million to support the IHSS program, partially offset by health and welfare realignment subventions. However, the exact impact of the new IHSS funding structure on San Francisco is still uncertain, as the funding structure and formulas are still being developed. San Francisco's fiscal year 2017-18 budget assumes \$8.6 million of new street-related capital funding through the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1). This amount is expected to annualize to approximately \$23 million in fiscal year 2018-19.

Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances

The City is continuing to assess the potential material adverse changes in current and anticipated federal funding under the new presidential administration and Congress. These changes include, for example, potential increased costs associated with changes to or termination or replacement of the Affordable Care Act, potential withholding of federal grants or other federal funds flowing to "sanctuary jurisdictions" and suspension or termination of other federal grants for capital projects. The scope and timing of such changes will not be known until the administration concretely proposes specific changes or Congress acts on such proposals, as applicable. As to potential withholding of funds for "sanctuary cities" the City has challenged in federal court the Presidential Executive Order that would cut funding from "sanctuary jurisdictions," and the federal court has entered a preliminary injunction enjoining the executive order. Litigation is proceeding and final disposition of the case may come by end of 2018. The fiscal year 2016-17 Original Budget includes about \$1.2 billion in federal payments, of which about \$1 billion is for entitlement programs mostly administered by the City's Human Services Agency and Department of Public Health. The City also receives about \$800 million in multi-year federal grants. The City will continue to monitor federal budget and policy changes, but cannot at this time determine the financial impacts of any proposed federal budget changes, or whether the budget will include a reserve against anticipated loss of federal funding.

Budgetary Reserves

Under the Charter, the Treasurer, upon recommendation of the City Controller, is authorized to transfer legally available moneys to the City's operating cash reserve from any unencumbered funds then held in the City's pooled investment fund. The operating cash reserve is available to cover cash flow deficits in various City funds, including the City's General Fund. From time to time, the Treasurer has transferred unencumbered moneys in the pooled investment fund to the operating cash reserve to cover temporary cash flow deficits in the General Fund and other City funds. Any such transfers must be repaid within the same fiscal year in which the transfer was made, together with interest at the rate earned on the pooled funds at the time the funds were used. The City has not issued tax and revenue anticipation notes to finance short-term cash flow needs since fiscal year 1996-97. See "INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS – Investment Policy" herein.

The financial policies passed on April 13, 2010 codified the current practice of maintaining an annual General Reserve to be used for current-year fiscal pressures not anticipated during the budget process. The policy set the reserve equal to 1% of budgeted regular General Fund revenues in fiscal year 2012-13 and increasing by 0.25% each year thereafter until reaching 2% of General Fund revenues in fiscal year 2016-17. The Original Budget for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18 includes starting balances of \$90.4 million and \$106.5 million for the General Reserve for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18, respectively. On December 16, 2014, the Board of Supervisors adopted financial policies to further increase the City's General Reserve from 2% to 3% of General Fund revenues between fiscal year 2017-18 and fiscal year 2020-21 while reducing the required deposit to 1.5% of General Fund revenues during economic downturns. The intent of this policy change is to increase reserves available during a multi-year downturn.

In addition to the operating cash and general reserves the City maintains two types of reserves to offset unanticipated expenses and which are available for appropriation to City departments by action of the Board of Supervisors. These include the Salaries and Benefit Reserve (Original Budget for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 includes \$14.5 million in fiscal year 2017-18 and \$31.0 million in fiscal year 2018-19), and the Litigation Reserve (Original Budget for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 includes \$11 million in each year). Balances in both reflect new appropriations to the reserves and do not include carry-forward of prior year balances. The Charter also requires set asides of a portion of departmental expenditure savings in the form of a citywide Budget Savings Incentive Reserve and a Recreation and Parks Budget Savings Incentive Reserve.

The City also maintains Rainy Day and Budget Stabilization reserves whose balances carry-forward annually and whose use is allowed under select circumstances described below.

Rainy Day Reserve

In November 2003, City voters approved the creation of the City's Rainy Day Reserve into which the previous Charter-mandated cash reserve was incorporated. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires that if the Controller projects total General Fund revenues for the upcoming budget year will exceed total General Fund revenues for the current year by more than five percent, then the City's budget shall allocate the anticipated General Fund revenues in excess of that five percent growth into two accounts within the Rainy Day Reserve and for other lawful governmental purposes. Effective January 1, 2015, Proposition C passed by the voters in November 2014 divided the existing Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Account into a City Rainy Day Reserve ("City Reserve") and a School Rainy Day Reserve ("School Reserve") with each reserve account receiving 50% of the existing balance. Additionally, any deposits to the reserve subsequent to January 1, 2015 will be allocated as follows:

- 37.5 percent of the excess revenues to the City Reserve;
- 12.5 percent of the excess revenues to the School Reserve;
- 25 percent of the excess revenues to the Rainy Day One-Time or Capital Expenditures account;
- and
- 25 percent of the excess revenues to any lawful governmental purpose.

Fiscal year 2015-16 revenue exceeded the deposit threshold by \$8.2 million generating a deposit of \$3.1 million to the City Reserve, \$1.0 million to the School Reserve, and \$2.1 million to the One-Time or Capital Expenditures account. Deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve's Economic Stabilization account are subject to a cap of 10% of actual total General Fund revenues as stated in the City's most recent independent annual audit. Amounts in excess of that cap in any year will be allocated to capital and other one-time expenditures.

Monies in the City Reserve are available to provide a budgetary cushion in years when General Fund revenues are projected to decrease from prior-year levels (or, in the case of a multi-year downturn, the highest of any previous year's total General Fund revenues). Monies in the Rainy Day Reserve's One-Time or Capital Expenditures account are available for capital and other one-time spending initiatives. The fiscal year 2015-16 combined ending balance of the One-Time and Economic Stabilization portions of the Reserve was \$120.1 million. There are no projected deposits or withdrawals assumed in the fiscal year 2017-18 and 2018-19 budgets.

Budget Stabilization Reserve

On April 13, 2010, the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the Controller's proposed financial policies on reserves and the use of certain volatile revenues. The policies were approved by the Mayor on April 30, 2010, and can only be suspended for a given fiscal year by a two-thirds vote of the Board. With these policies the City created two additional types of reserves: the General Reserve, described above, and the Budget Stabilization Reserve.

The Budget Stabilization Reserve augments the existing Rainy Day Reserve and is funded through the dedication of 75% of certain volatile revenues, including Real Property Transfer Tax ("RPTT") receipts in excess of the five-year annual average (controlling for the effect of any rate increases approved by voters), funds from the sale of assets, and year-end unassigned General Fund balances beyond the amount assumed as a source in the subsequent year's budget.

Fiscal year 2015-16 RPTT receipts exceeded the five-year annual average by \$22.3 million and ending general fund unassigned fund balance was \$47.5 million, triggering a \$52.3 million deposit. However, \$6.2 million of this deposit requirement was offset by the Rainy Day Reserve deposit, resulting in a \$46.2 million deposit to the Budget Stabilization Reserve and leaving an ending balance to \$178.4 million. The fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 budgets assume no reserve deposits given projected RPTT receipts. The Controller's Office determines deposits in October of each year based on actual receipts during the prior fiscal year.

The maximum combined value of the Rainy Day Reserve and the Budget Stabilization Reserve is 10% of General Fund revenues, which would be approximately \$437 million for fiscal year 2015-16. No further deposits will be made once this cap is reached, and no deposits are required in years when the City is eligible to withdraw. The Budget Stabilization Reserve has the same withdrawal requirements as the Rainy Day Reserve, however, there is no provision for allocations to the SFUSD. Withdrawals are structured to occur over a period of three years: in the first year of a downturn, a maximum of 30% of the combined value of the Rainy Day Reserve and Budget Stabilization Reserve could be drawn; in the second year, the maximum withdrawal is 50%; and, in the third year, the entire remaining balance may be drawn.

THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY

As described below, the Successor Agency was established by the Board of Supervisors of the City following dissolution of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (the "Former Agency") pursuant to the Dissolution Act. Within City government, the Successor Agency is titled "The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as the Successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency." Set forth below is a discussion of the history of the Former Agency and the Successor Agency, the governance and operations of the Successor Agency and its powers under the Redevelopment Law and the Dissolution Act, and the limitations thereon.

The Successor Agency maintains a website as part of the City's website. The information on such websites is not incorporated herein by reference.

Authority and Personnel

The powers of the Successor Agency are vested in its governing board (the "Successor Agency Commission"), referred to within the City as the "Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure," which has five members who are appointed by the Mayor of the City with the approval of the Board of Supervisors. Members are appointed to staggered four-year terms (provided that two members have initial two-year terms). Once appointed, members serve until replaced or reappointed.

The Successor Agency currently employs approximately 47 full-time equivalent positions. The Interim Executive Director, Nadia Sesay, was appointed in January 2017. The other principal full-time staff positions are the Deputy Director, Projects and Programs; the Deputy Director, Finance and Administration; and the Successor Agency General Counsel and Deputy Director. Each project area in which the Successor Agency continues to implement redevelopment plans, is managed by a Project Manager. There are separate staff support divisions with real estate and housing development specialists, architects, engineers and planners, and the Successor Agency has its own fiscal, legal, administrative and property management staffs.

Effect of the Dissolution Act

AB 26 and AB 27. The Former Agency was established under the Community Redevelopment Law in 1948. As a result of AB 1X 26 and the decision of the California Supreme Court in the *California Redevelopment Association* case, as of February 1, 2012, all redevelopment agencies in the State were dissolved, including the Former Agency, and successor agencies were designated as successor entities to the former redevelopment agencies to expeditiously wind down the affairs of the former redevelopment agencies and also to satisfy "enforceable obligations" of the former redevelopment agency all under the supervision of a new oversight board, the State Department of Finance and the State Controller.

Pursuant to Resolution No. 11-12 (the "Establishing Resolution") adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City on January 24, 2012 and signed by the Mayor on January 26, 2012, and Sections 34171(j) and 34173 of the Dissolution Act, the Board of Supervisors of the City confirmed the City's role as successor to the Former Agency. On June 27, 2012, the Redevelopment Law was amended by AB 1484, which clarified that successor agencies are separate political entities and that the successor agency succeeds to the organizational status of the former redevelopment agency but without any legal authority to participate in redevelopment activities except to complete the work related to an approved enforceable obligation.

Pursuant to Ordinance No. 215-12 passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City on October 2, 2012 and signed by the Mayor on October 4, 2012, the Board of Supervisors (i) officially gave the following name to the Successor Agency: the "Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco," (ii) created the Successor Agency Commission as the policy body of the Successor Agency, (iii) delegated to the Successor Agency Commission the authority to act in place of the Former Agency Commission to implement the surviving redevelopment projects, the replacement housing obligations and other enforceable obligations of the Former Agency and the authority to take actions that AB 26 and AB 1484 require or allow on behalf of the Successor Agency and (iv) established the composition and terms of the members of the Successor Agency Commission.

As discussed below, many actions of the Successor Agency are subject to approval by an “oversight board” and the review or approval by the California Department of Finance, including the issuance of bonds such as the Bonds but excludes the CFD Bonds.

Oversight Board

The Oversight Board was formed pursuant to Establishing Resolution adopted by the City’s Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor on January 26, 2012. The Oversight Board is governed by a seven-member governing board, with four members appointed by the Mayor, and one member appointed by each of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (“BART”), the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, and the County Superintendent of Education.

Department of Finance Finding of Completion

The Dissolution Act established a process for determining the liquid assets that redevelopment agencies should have shifted to their successor agencies when they were dissolved, and the amount that should be available for remittance by the successor agencies to their respective county auditor-controllers for distribution to affected taxing entities within the project areas of the former redevelopment agencies. This determination process was required to be completed through the final step (review by the State Department of Finance) by November 9, 2012 with respect to affordable housing funds and by April 1, 2013 with respect to non-housing funds. Within five business days of receiving notification from the State Department of Finance, a successor agency must remit to the county auditor-controller the amount of unobligated balances determined by the State Department of Finance, or it may request a meet and confer with the State Department of Finance to resolve any disputes.

On May 23, 2013, the Successor Agency promptly remitted to the City Controller the amounts of unobligated balances relating to affording housing funds, determined by the State Department of Finance in the amount of \$10,577,932, plus \$1,916 in interest. On May 23, 2013, the Successor Agency promptly remitted to the City Controller the amount of unobligated balances relating to all other funds determined by the State Department of Finance in the amount of \$959,147. The Successor Agency has made all payments required under AB 1484 and has received its finding of completion from the State Department of Finance on May 29, 2013.

State Controller Asset Transfer Review

The Dissolution Act requires that any assets of a former redevelopment agency transferred to a city, county or other local agency after January 1, 2011, be sent back to the successor agency. The Dissolution Act further requires that the State Controller review any such transfer. The State Controller’s Office issued their Asset Transfer Review in October 2014. The review found \$746,060,330 in assets transferred to the City after January 1, 2011, including unallowable transfers to the City totaling \$666,830, or less than 1% of transferred assets. The City returned \$666,830 to OCII to comply with the State Controller’s Office review.

Continuing Activities

The Former Agency was organized in 1948 by the Board of Supervisors of the City pursuant to the Redevelopment Law. The Former Agency’s mission was to eliminate physical and economic blight within specific geographic areas of the City designated by the Board of Supervisors. The Former Agency had redevelopment plans for nine redevelopment project areas.

Because of the existence of enforceable obligations, the Successor Agency is authorized to continue to implement, through the issuance of tax allocation bonds, four major redevelopment projects that were previously administered by the Former Agency: (i) the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Project Areas, (ii) the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and Zone 1 of the Bayview Redevelopment Project Area, and (iii) the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (collectively, the “Major Approved Development Projects”). In addition, the Successor Agency continues to manage Yerba Buena Gardens and other assets within the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area (“YBC”). The Successor Agency exercises land use, development and design approval authority for the Major Approved Development Projects and manages the former Redevelopment Agency assets in YBC in place of the Former Agency.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Property Taxation System – General

The City receives approximately one-third of its total General Fund operating revenues from local property taxes. Property tax revenues result from the application of the appropriate tax rate to the total assessed value of taxable property in the City. The City levies property taxes for general operating purposes as well as for the payment of voter-approved bonds. As a county under State law, the City also levies property taxes on behalf of all local agencies with overlapping jurisdiction within the boundaries of the City.

Local property taxation is the responsibility of various City officers. The Assessor computes the value of locally assessed taxable property. After the assessed roll is closed on June 30th, the City Controller issues a Certificate of Assessed Valuation in August which certifies the taxable assessed value for that fiscal year. The Controller also compiles a schedule of tax rates including the 1.0% tax authorized by Article XIII A of the State Constitution (and mandated by statute), tax surcharges needed to repay voter-approved general obligation bonds, and tax surcharges imposed by overlapping jurisdictions that have been authorized to levy taxes on property located in the City. The Board of Supervisors approves the schedule of tax rates each year by ordinance adopted no later than the last working day of September. The Treasurer and Tax Collector prepare and mail tax bills to taxpayers and collect the taxes on behalf of the City and other overlapping taxing agencies that levy taxes on taxable property located in the City. The Treasurer holds and invests City tax funds, including taxes collected for payment of general obligation bonds, and is charged with payment of principal and interest on such bonds when due. The State Board of Equalization assesses certain special classes of property, as described below. See “Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property” below.

Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies

Table A-5 provides a recent history of assessed valuations of taxable property within the City. The property tax rate is composed of two components: 1) the 1.0% countywide portion, and 2) all voter-approved overrides which fund debt service for general obligation bond indebtedness. The total tax rate shown in Table A-5 includes taxes assessed on behalf of the City as well as SFUSD, SFCCD, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”), and BART, all of which are legal entities separate from the City. See also, Table A-26: “Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations” below. In addition to *ad valorem* taxes, voter-approved special assessment taxes or direct charges may also appear on a property tax bill.

Additionally, although no additional rate is levied, a portion of property taxes collected within the City is allocated to the Successor Agency (also known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure or OCII). Property tax revenues attributable to the growth in assessed value of taxable property (known

as “tax increment”) within the adopted redevelopment project areas may be utilized by OCII to pay for outstanding and enforceable obligations, causing a loss of tax revenues from those parcels located within project areas to the City and other local taxing agencies, including SFUSD and SFCCD. Taxes collected for payment of debt service on general obligation bonds are not affected or diverted. The Successor Agency received \$122 million of property tax increment in fiscal year 2015-16, diverting about \$69 million that would have otherwise been apportioned to the City’s discretionary general fund.

The percent collected of property tax (current year levies excluding supplemental) was 99.07% for fiscal year 2015-16. This table has been modified from the corresponding table in previous disclosures in order to make the levy and collection figures consistent with statistical reports provided to the State. Foreclosures, defined as the number of trustee deeds recorded by the Assessor-Recorder’s Office, numbered 212 for fiscal year 2015-16 compared to 102 for fiscal year 2014-15. The trustee deeds recorded in fiscal year 2011-12, fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 were 804, 363 and 187, respectively. In the first half of fiscal year 2016-17 there were 126 Notices of Trustee’s Sales deeds recorded.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-5

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Assessed Valuation of Taxable Property
Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2017-18
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Net Assessed Valuation (NAV)	% Change from Prior Year	Total Tax Rate per \$100 ²	Total Tax Levy ³	Total Tax Collected ³	% Collected June 30
2012-13	\$165,043,120	4.0%	1.169	\$1,997,645	\$1,970,662	98.6%
2013-14	172,489,208	4.5%	1.188	2,138,245	2,113,284	98.8%
2014-15	181,809,981	5.4%	1.174	2,139,050	2,113,968	98.8%
2015-16	194,392,572	6.9%	1.183	2,290,280	2,268,876	99.1%
2016-17	211,532,524	8.8%	1.179	2,494,392	N/A	N/A
2017-18	234,074,597 ¹	10.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ Unsecured Rolls, less Non-reimbursable Exemptions and Homeowner Exemptions.

² Annual tax rate for unsecured property is the same rate as the previous year's secured tax rate.

³ The Total Tax Levy and Total Tax Collected through fiscal year 2015-16 is based on year-end current year secured and unsecured levies as adjusted through roll corrections, excluding supplemental assessments, as reported to the State of California (available on the website of the California State Controller's Office). Total Tax Levy for fiscal year 2016-17 is based on NAV times the 1.1792% tax rate.

Note: This table has been modified from the corresponding table in previous bond disclosures to make levy and collection figures consistent with statistical reports provided to the State of California.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

At the start of fiscal year 2017-18, the total net assessed valuation of taxable property within the City was \$234.1 billion. Of this total, \$220.1 billion (93.5%) represents secured valuations and \$14.0 billion (6.5%) represents unsecured valuations. See "Tax Levy and Collection" below, for a further discussion of secured and unsecured property valuations.

Proposition 13 limits to 2% per year any increase in the assessed value of property, unless it is sold or the structure is improved. The total net assessed valuation of taxable property therefore does not generally reflect the current market value of taxable property within the City and is in the aggregate substantially less than current market value. For this same reason, the total net assessed valuation of taxable property lags behind changes in market value and may continue to increase even without an increase in aggregate market values of property.

Under Article XIII A of the State Constitution added by Proposition 13 in 1978, property sold after March 1, 1975 must be reassessed to full cash value at the time of sale. Every year, some taxpayers appeal the Assessor's determination of their property's assessed value, and some of the appeals may be retroactive and for multiple years. The State prescribes the assessment valuation methodologies and the adjudication process that counties must employ in connection with counties' property assessments.

The City typically experiences increases in assessment appeals activity during economic downturns and decreases in appeals as the economy rebounds. Historically, during severe economic downturns, partial reductions of up to approximately 30% of the assessed valuations appealed have been granted. Assessment appeals granted typically result in revenue refunds, and the level of refund activity depends

on the unique economic circumstances of each fiscal year. Other taxing agencies such as SFUSD, SFCCD, BAAQMD, and BART share proportionately in the rest of any refunds paid as a result of successful appeals. To mitigate the financial risk of potential assessment appeal refunds, the City funds appeal reserves for its share of estimated property tax revenues for each fiscal year. In addition, appeals activity is reviewed each year and incorporated into the current and subsequent years' budget projections of property tax revenues. Refunds of prior years' property taxes from the discretionary General Fund appeals reserve fund for fiscal years 2011-12 through 2015-16 are listed in Table A-6 below.

TABLE A-6

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Refunds of Prior Years' Property Taxes
General Fund Assessment Appeals Reserve
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2016-17
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Amount Refunded
2011-12	\$53,288
2012-13	36,744
2013-14	25,756
2014-15	16,304
2015-16	16,199
2016-17	33,397

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

As of July 1, 2016, the Assessor granted 7,055 temporary reductions in property assessed values worth a total of \$128.7 million (equating to a reduction of approximately \$1.52 million in general fund taxes), compared to 8,598 temporary reductions worth \$425.1 million (equating to a reduction of approximately \$5.03 million in general fund taxes) as of July 1, 2015, and 10,726 temporary reductions worth \$640.3 million (equating to a reduction of approximately \$7.52 million in general fund taxes) as of July 1, 2014. The July 2016 temporary reductions of \$128.7 million represent .06% of the fiscal year 2016-17 Net Assessed Valuation of \$211.5 billion shown in Table A-5. All of the temporary reductions granted are subject to review in the following year. Property owners who are not satisfied with the valuation shown on a Notice of Assessed Value may have a right to file an appeal with the Assessment Appeals Board ("AAB") within a certain period of time. For regular, annual secured property tax assessments, the time period for property owners to file an appeal typically falls between July 2nd and September 15th.

As of December 31, 2016, the total number of open appeals before the AAB was 1,754, compared to 2,931 open AAB appeals as of December 31, 2015. In the first half of fiscal year 2016-17 there were 1,242 appeals filed. The difference between the current assessed value and the taxpayers' opinion of values for the open AAB appeals is \$13.3 billion. Assuming the City did not contest any taxpayer appeals and the Board upheld all of the taxpayers' requests, this represents a negative potential property tax impact of about \$157.29 million (based upon the fiscal year 2015-16 tax rate) with an impact on the General Fund of about \$67.9 million. The volume of appeals is not necessarily an indication of how many appeals will be granted, nor of the magnitude of the reduction in assessed valuation that the Assessor may ultimately grant. City revenue estimates take into account projected losses from pending and future assessment appeals.

Tax Levy and Collection

As the local tax-levying agency under State law, the City levies property taxes on all taxable property within the City's boundaries for the benefit of all overlapping local agencies, including SFUSD, SFCCD, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and BART. The total tax levy for all taxing entities in fiscal year 2016-17 is estimated to produce about \$2.6 billion, not including supplemental, escape and special assessments that may be assessed during the year. Of this amount, the City has budgeted to receive \$1.4 billion into the General Fund and \$176.2 million into special revenue funds designated for children's programs, libraries and open space. SFUSD and SFCCD are estimated to receive about \$163.1 million and \$30.6 million, respectively, and the local ERAF is estimated to receive \$536.6 million (before adjusting for the vehicle license fees ("VLF") backfill shift). The Successor Agency will receive about \$118 million. The remaining portion is allocated to various other governmental bodies, various special funds, and general obligation bond debt service funds, and other taxing entities. Taxes levied to pay debt service for general obligation bonds issued by the City, SFUSD, SFCCD and BART may only be applied for that purpose.

General Fund property tax revenues in fiscal year 2015-16 were \$1.39 billion, representing an increase of \$102.6 million (7.9%) over fiscal year 2015-16 Original Budget and \$121.0 million (9.5%) over fiscal year 2014-15 actual revenue. Property tax revenue is budgeted at \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 2016-17 representing an increase of \$18.4 million (1.3%) over fiscal year 2015-16 actual receipts and \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 2017-18 representing an annual increase of \$56.0 million (4.0%) over fiscal year 2016-17 budget. Tables A-2 and A-3 set forth a history of budgeted and actual property tax revenues for fiscal years 2011-12 through 2015-16, and budgeted receipts for fiscal years 2016-17 and fiscal year 2017-18.

The City's General Fund is allocated about 48% of total property tax revenue before adjusting for the VLF backfill shift. The State's Triple Flip ended in fiscal year 2015-16, eliminating the sales tax in-lieu revenue from property taxes from succeeding fiscal years and shifting it to the local sales tax revenue line.

Generally, property taxes levied by the City on real property become a lien on that property by operation of law. A tax levied on personal property does not automatically become a lien against real property without an affirmative act of the City taxing authority. Real property tax liens have priority over all other liens against the same property regardless of the time of their creation by virtue of express provision of law.

Property subject to ad valorem taxes is entered as secured or unsecured on the assessment roll maintained by the Assessor-Recorder. The secured roll is that part of the assessment roll containing State-assessed property and property (real or personal) on which liens are sufficient, in the opinion of the Assessor-Recorder, to secure payment of the taxes owed. Other property is placed on the "unsecured roll."

The method of collecting delinquent taxes is substantially different for the two classifications of property. The City has four ways of collecting unsecured personal property taxes: 1) pursuing civil action against the taxpayer; 2) filing a certificate in the Office of the Clerk of the Court specifying certain facts, including the date of mailing a copy thereof to the affected taxpayer, in order to obtain a judgment against the taxpayer; 3) filing a certificate of delinquency for recording in the Assessor-Recorder's Office in order to obtain a lien on certain property of the taxpayer; and 4) seizing and selling personal property, improvements or possessory interests belonging or assessed to the taxpayer. The exclusive means of enforcing the payment of delinquent taxes with respect to property on the secured roll is the sale of the property securing the taxes. Proceeds of the sale are used to pay the costs of sale and the amount of delinquent taxes.

A 10% penalty is added to delinquent taxes that have been levied on property on the secured roll. In addition, property on the secured roll with respect to which taxes are delinquent is declared “tax defaulted” and subject to eventual sale by the Treasurer and Tax Collector of the City. Such property may thereafter be redeemed by payment of the delinquent taxes and the delinquency penalty, plus a redemption penalty of 1.5% per month, which begins to accrue on such taxes beginning July 1 following the date on which the property becomes tax-defaulted.

In October 1993, the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that adopted the Alternative Method of Tax Apportionment (the “Teeter Plan”). This resolution changed the method by which the City apportions property taxes among itself and other taxing agencies. In June 2017, the Teeter Plan was extended to include the allocation and distribution of special taxes levied for City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center). This apportionment method authorizes the City Controller to allocate to the City’s taxing agencies 100% of the secured property taxes billed but not yet collected. In return, as the delinquent property taxes and associated penalties and interest are collected, the City’s General Fund retains such amounts. Prior to adoption of the Teeter Plan, the City could only allocate secured property taxes actually collected (property taxes billed minus delinquent taxes). Delinquent taxes, penalties and interest were allocated to the City and other taxing agencies only when they were collected. The City has funded payment of accrued and current delinquencies through authorized internal borrowing. The City also maintains a Tax Loss Reserve for the Teeter Plan as shown on Table A-7.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Teeter Plan
Tax Loss Reserve Fund Balance
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16
(000s)

Year Ended	Amount Funded
2011-12	\$17,980
2012-13	18,341
2013-14	19,654
2014-15	20,569
2015-16	22,882

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Assessed valuations of the aggregate ten largest assessment parcels in the City for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016 are shown in Table A-8. The City cannot determine from its assessment records whether individual persons, corporations or other organizations are liable for tax payments with respect to multiple properties held in various names that in aggregate may be larger than is suggested by the Office of the Assessor-Recorder.

TABLE A-8

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Top 10 Parcels Total Assessed Value
July 1, 2017
(000s)

Assessee	Location	Parcel Number	Type	Total Assessed Value ¹	% of Basis of Levy ²
HWA 555 Owners LLC	555 California St	0259 026	Commercial Office	\$998,450	0.43%
Elm Property Venture LLC	101 California St	0263 011	Commercial Office	965,547	0.41%
PPF Paramount One Market Plaza Owner LP	1 Market St	3713 007	Commercial Office	817,948	0.35%
SFDC 50 Fremont LLC	50 Fremont St	3709 019	Commercial Office	675,803	0.29%
SHR St. Francis LLC	301 - 345 Powell St	0307 001	Commercial Hotel	656,823	0.28%
Sutter Bay Hospitals	1101 Van Ness Ave	0695 006	Commercial Hospit	653,432	0.28%
Transbay Tower LLC	415 Mission St	3720 009	Commercial Office	560,825	0.24%
P55 Hotel Owner LLC	55 Cyril Magnin St	0330 026	Commercial Hotel	527,815	0.22%
Union Investment Real Estate GMBH	555 Mission St	3721 120	Commercial Office	483,303	0.21%
Emporium Mall LLC	845 Market St	3705 056	Commercial Retail	456,949	0.19%
					2.90%

¹ Represents the Total Assessed Valuation (TAV) as of the Basis of Levy, which excludes assessments processed during the fiscal year. TAV includes land & improvements, personal property, and fixtures.

² The Basis of Levy is total assessed value less exemptions for which the state does not reimburse counties (e.g. those that apply to nonprofit organizations).

Source: Office of the Assessor-Recorder, City and County of San Francisco.

Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property

A portion of the City's total net assessed valuation consists of utility property subject to assessment by the State Board of Equalization. State-assessed property, or "unitary property," is property of a utility system with components located in many taxing jurisdictions assessed as part of a "going concern" rather than as individual parcels of real or personal property. Unitary and certain other State-assessed property values are allocated to the counties by the State Board of Equalization, taxed at special county-wide rates, and the tax revenues distributed to taxing jurisdictions (including the City itself) according to statutory

formulae generally based on the distribution of taxes in the prior year. The fiscal year 2016-17 valuation of property assessed by the State Board of Equalization is \$3.1 billion.

OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES

In addition to the property tax, the City has several other major tax revenue sources, as described below. For a discussion of State constitutional and statutory limitations on taxes that may be imposed by the City, including a discussion of Proposition 62 and Proposition 218, see “CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES” herein.

The following section contains a brief description of other major City-imposed taxes as well as taxes that are collected by the State and shared with the City.

Business Taxes

Through tax year 2014 businesses in the City were subject to payroll expense and business registration taxes. Proposition E approved by the voters in the November 6, 2012 election changed business registration tax rates and introduced a gross receipts tax which phases in over a five-year period beginning January 1, 2014, replacing the current 1.5% tax on business payrolls over the same period. Overall, the ordinance increases the number and types of businesses in the City that pay business tax and registration fees from approximately 7,500 currently to 15,000. Current payroll tax exclusions will be converted into a gross receipts tax exclusion of the same size, terms and expiration dates.

The payroll expense tax is authorized by Article 12-A of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code. The 1.5% payroll tax rate in 2013 was adjusted to 1.35% in tax year 2014, 1.16% in tax year 2015 and annually thereafter according to gross receipts tax collections to ensure that the phase-in of the gross receipts tax neither results in a windfall nor a loss for the City. The new gross receipts tax ordinance, like the current payroll expense tax, is imposed for the privilege of “engaging in business” in San Francisco. The gross receipts tax will apply to businesses with \$1 million or more in gross receipts, adjusted by the Consumer Price Index going forward. Proposition E also imposes a 1.4% tax on administrative office business activities measured by a company’s total payroll expense within San Francisco in lieu of the Gross Receipts Tax, and increases annual business registration fees to as much as \$35,000 for businesses with over \$200 million in gross receipts. Prior to Proposition E, business registration taxes varied from \$25 to \$500 per year per subject business based on the prior year computed payroll tax liability. Proposition E increased the business registration tax rates to between \$75 and \$35,000 annually.

Business tax revenue in fiscal year 2015-16 was \$660.9 million (all funds), representing an increase of \$49.0 million (8.0%) from fiscal year 2014-15. Business tax revenue is budgeted at \$671.4 million in fiscal year 2016-17 representing an increase of \$10.5 million (1.6%) over fiscal year 2015-16 revenue.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-9

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Business Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18
All Funds
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Revenue	Change	
2011-12	\$437,677	\$45,898	11.7%
2012-13	480,131	42,454	9.7%
2013-14	563,406	83,276	17.3%
2014-15	611,932	48,525	8.6%
2015-16	660,926	48,994	8.0%
2016-17	671,450	10,524	1.6%
2017-18 budgeted	699,987	28,537	4.3%

Includes Payroll Tax, portion of Payroll Tax allocated to special revenue funds for the Community Challenge Grant program, Business Registration Tax, and beginning in fiscal year 2013-14, Gross Receipts Tax revenues. Figures for fiscal years 2013-14 through 2015-16 are audited actuals. Figures for fiscal year 2016-17 and 2017-18 are Original Budget amounts.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax)

Pursuant to the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code, a 14.0% transient occupancy tax is imposed on occupants of hotel rooms and is remitted by hotel operators monthly. A quarterly tax-filing requirement is also imposed. Hotel tax revenue growth is a function of changes in occupancy, average daily room rates (“ADR”) and room supply. Revenue per available room (RevPAR), the combined effect of occupancy and ADR, increased by more than 7% annually for each of the last six years, driving an 87% increase in hotel tax revenue between fiscal years 2010-11 and 2015-16. Increases in RevPAR are budgeted to continue at a slower pace through fiscal year 2017-18. Fiscal year 2015-16 transient occupancy tax was \$392 million, representing a \$6.6 million decrease from fiscal year 2014-15 revenue. Fiscal year 2016-17 is budgeted to be \$414 million, an increase of \$21.5 million (5.5%) from fiscal year 2015-16. Fiscal year 2017-18 is budgeted to be \$440 million, an increase of \$26 million (6%) from fiscal year 2015-16 budget.

San Francisco and a number of other jurisdictions in California and the United States are currently involved in litigation with online travel companies regarding the companies’ duty to remit hotel taxes on the difference between the wholesale and retail prices paid for hotel rooms. On February 6, 2013, the Los Angeles Superior Court issued a summary judgment concluding that the online travel companies had no obligation to remit hotel tax to San Francisco. The City has received approximately \$88 million in disputed hotel taxes paid by the companies. Under State law, the City is required to accrue interest on such amounts. The portion of these remittances that will be retained or returned (including legal fees and interest) will depend on the ultimate outcome of these lawsuits. San Francisco has appealed the judgment against it. That appeal has been stayed pending the California Supreme Court’s decision in a similar case between the online travel companies and the City of San Diego. That ruling was issued on December 12, 2016 but did not resolve the matters that are the subject to the City’s appeal. The City’s appeal is proceeding, but the schedule for that appeal is not yet known.

TABLE A -10

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Transient Occupancy Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18
(000s)

Fiscal Year ¹	Tax Rate	Revenue	Change	
2011-12	14.0%	\$239,568	\$24,056	11.2%
2012-13	14.0%	241,961	2,393	1.0%
2013-14	14.0%	313,138	71,177	29.4%
2014-15 ²	14.0%	399,364	86,226	27.5%
2015-16	14.0%	392,686	(6,678)	-1.7%
2016-17 budgeted	14.0%	414,200	21,514	5.5%
2017-18 budgeted	14.0%	440,205	26,004	6.3%

¹Figures for fiscal year 2013-14 through fiscal year 2015-16 are audited actuals and include the portion of hotel tax revenue used to pay debt service on hotel tax revenue bonds. Figures for fiscal year 2016-17 and 2017-18 are Original Budget amounts.

²Amounts in fiscal year 2012-13 and FY 2014-15 are substantially adjusted due to multi-year audit and litigation resolutions.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Real Property Transfer Tax

A tax is imposed on all real estate transfers recorded in the City. Transfer tax revenue is more susceptible to economic and real estate cycles than most other City revenue sources. Prior to November 8, 2016, the rates were \$5.00 per \$1,000 of the sale price of the property being transferred for properties valued at \$250,000 or less; \$6.80 per \$1,000 for properties valued more than \$250,000 and less than \$999,999; \$7.50 per \$1,000 for properties valued at \$1.0 million to \$5.0 million; \$20.00 per \$1,000 for properties valued more than \$5.0 million and less than \$10.0 million; and \$25 per \$1,000 for properties valued at more than \$10.0 million. After the passage of Proposition V on November 8, 2016, transfer tax rates were amended, raising the rate to \$22.50 per \$1,000 for properties valued more than \$5.0 million and less than \$10.0 million; \$27.50 per \$1,000 for properties valued at more than \$10.0 million and less than \$25.0 million; and \$30.00 per \$1,000 for properties valued at more than \$25.0 million. This change is projected to result in an additional \$18.2 million in transfer tax revenue in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$34.8 million in fiscal year 2017-18, and is reflected in the December 2016 projected Five Year Plan projections.

Real property transfer tax ("RPTT") revenue in fiscal year 2015-16 was \$269 million, a \$46 million (-14.5%) decrease from fiscal year 2014-15 revenue. Fiscal year 2016-17 RPTT revenue is budgeted to be \$235 million, approximately \$34 million (-13%) less than the revenue received in fiscal year 2015-16 primarily due to the assumption that fiscal year 2014-15 represents the peak in high value property transactions during the current economic cycle. This slowing is budgeted to continue into fiscal year 2017-18 with RPTT revenue budgeted at \$225 million, a reduction of \$10 million (-4%).

TABLE A-11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Real Property Transfer Tax Receipts
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18
(000s)

Fiscal Year ¹	Revenue	Change	
2011-12	\$233,591	\$98,407	72.8%
2012-13	232,730	(861)	-0.4%
2013-14	261,925	29,195	12.5%
2014-15	314,603	52,678	20.1%
2015-16	269,090	(45,513)	-14.5%
2016-17 budgeted	235,000	(34,090)	-12.7%
2017-18 budgeted	225,000	(10,000)	-4.3%

¹ Figures for fiscal year 2013-14 through 2015-16 are audited actuals.

Figures for fiscal year 2016-17 and 2017-18 are Original Budget amounts.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Sales and Use Tax

The State collects the City's local sales tax on retail transactions along with State and special district sales taxes, and then remits the local sales tax collections to the City. The rate of tax is one percent; however, between fiscal year 2004-05 and the first half of fiscal year 2015-16, the State diverted one-quarter of this, and replaced the lost revenue with a shift of local property taxes to the City from local school district funding. This "Triple Flip" concluded on December 31, 2015, after which point the full 1% local tax is recorded in the General Fund.

Local sales tax collections in fiscal year 2015-16 were \$168 million, an increase of \$28 million (20%) from fiscal year 2014-15 sales tax revenue. Moderate revenue growth is expected to continue during fiscal year 2016-17 with \$200.1 million budgeted, an increase of \$8 million (5%) from fiscal year 2015-16. Fiscal year 2017-18 revenue is budgeted to be \$208 million, an increase of \$7 million (3.5%) from fiscal year 2016-17 budget.

Historically, sales tax revenues have been highly correlated to growth in tourism, business activity and population. This revenue is significantly affected by changes in the economy. In recent years online retailers have contributed significantly to sales tax receipts. The budget assumes no changes from State laws affecting sales tax reporting for these online retailers. Sustained growth in sales tax revenue will depend on changes to state and federal law and order fulfillment strategies for online retailers.

Table A-12 reflects the City's actual sales and use tax receipts for fiscal years 2011-12 through 2015-16, and budgeted receipt for fiscal year 2016-17 and 2017-18, as well as the imputed impact of the property tax shift made in compensation for the one-quarter of the sales tax revenue taken by the State through the fiscal year 2015-16.

TABLE A-12

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Sales and Use Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18
(000s)

Fiscal Year*	Tax Rate	City Share	Revenue	Change	
2011-12	8.50%	0.75%	\$117,071	\$10,769	10.1%
2011-12 adj. ¹	8.50%	1.00%	155,466	14,541	10.3%
2012-13	8.50%	0.75%	122,271	5,200	4.4%
2012-13 adj. ¹	8.50%	1.00%	162,825	7,359	4.7%
2013-14	8.75%	0.75%	133,705	11,434	9.4%
2013-14 adj. ¹	8.75%	1.00%	177,299	14,474	8.9%
2014-15	8.75%	0.75%	140,146	6,441	4.8%
2014-15 adj. ¹	8.75%	1.00%	186,891	9,592	5.4%
2015-16	8.75%	0.75%	167,915	27,769	19.8%
2015-16 adj. ²	8.75%	1.00%	204,118	17,227	9.2%
2016-17 <i>budgeted</i> ³	8.75%	1.00%	200,060	(4,058)	-2.4%
2017-18 <i>budgeted</i> ³	8.50%	1.00%	207,060	7,000	3.5%

*Figures for fiscal year 2013-14 through fiscal year 2015-16 are audited actuals. Figures for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18 are Original Budget amounts.

¹Adjusted figures represent the value of the entire 1.00% local sales tax, which was reduced by 0.25% beginning in fiscal year 2004-05 through December 31, 2015 in order to repay the State's Economic Recovery Bonds as authorized under Proposition 57 in March 2004. This 0.25% reduction is backfilled by the State.

²The 2015-16 adjusted figure includes the State's final payment to the Counties for the lost 0.25% of sales tax, from July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015. It also includes a true-up payment for April through June 2015.

³In November 2012 voters approved Proposition 30, which temporarily increases the state sales tax rate by 0.25% effective January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016. The City share did not change.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Utility Users Tax

The City imposes a 7.5% tax on non-residential users of gas, electricity, water, steam and telephone services. The Telephone Users Tax ("TUT") applies to charges for all telephone communications services in the City to the extent permitted by Federal and State law, including intrastate, interstate, and international telephone services, cellular telephone services, and voice over internet protocol ("VOIP"). Telephone communications services do not include Internet access, which is exempt from taxation under the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

Fiscal year 2015-16 Utility User Tax revenues were \$99 million, representing no change from fiscal year 2014-15 revenue. Fiscal year 2016-17 revenue is budgeted to be \$94.3 million, representing expected decline of \$4.4 million (4.4%) from fiscal year 2015-16. Fiscal year 2017-18 Utility User Tax revenues are budgeted at \$95.5 million, a \$1.2 million increase from fiscal year 2016-17 budget.

Emergency Response Fee; Access Line Tax

The City imposes an Access Line Tax (“ALT”) on every person who subscribes to telephone communications services in the City. The ALT replaced the Emergency Response Fee (“ERF”) in 2009. It applies to each telephone line in the City and is collected from telephone communications service subscribers by the telephone service supplier. Access Line Tax revenue for fiscal year 2015-16 was \$44 million, a \$5 million (-11%) decrease over the previous fiscal year due to a large one-time payment in fiscal year 2014-15 related to a prior year audit finding. In fiscal year 2016-17, the Access Line Tax revenue is budgeted at \$47 million, a \$3 million (-8%) decrease from fiscal year 2015-16 revenue. Fiscal year 2017-18 revenue is budgeted at \$48 million a \$1 million (3%) increase from fiscal year 2016-17 budget. Budgeted amounts in fiscal year 2016-17 and fiscal year 2017-18 assume annual inflationary increases to the access line tax rate as required under Business and Tax Regulation Code Section 784.

Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax

On November 9, 2016 voters adopted Proposition V, a one cent per ounce tax on the distribution of sugary beverages. This measure takes effect on January 1, 2018 and is expected to raise \$15 million in annual revenue.

Parking Tax

A 25% tax is imposed on the charge for off-street parking spaces. The tax is authorized by the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code. The tax is paid by the occupants of the spaces, and then remitted monthly to the City by the operators of the parking facilities. Parking Tax revenue is positively correlated with business activity and employment, both of which are projected to increase over the next two years as reflected in increases in business and sales tax revenue projections.

Fiscal year 2015-16 Parking Tax revenue was \$86.0 million, \$1.2 million (-1%) below fiscal year 2014-15 revenue. Parking tax revenue is budgeted at \$92.8 million in fiscal year 2016-17, an increase of \$6.8 million (7%) over the fiscal year 2015-16. In fiscal year 2017-18, Parking Tax revenue is budgeted at \$95.2 million, \$2.4 million (3%) over the fiscal year 2016-17 budgeted amount. Parking tax growth estimates are commensurate with expected changes to the CPI over the same period.

Parking tax revenues are deposited into the General Fund, from which an amount equivalent to 80% is transferred to the MTA for public transit as mandated by Charter Section 16.110.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES

State – Realignment

San Francisco receives allocations of State sales tax and Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenue for 1991 Health and Welfare Realignment and 2011 Public Safety Realignment.

1991 Health & Welfare Realignment. In fiscal year 2015-16, the General Fund share of 1991 realignment revenue was \$176 million. In fiscal year 2016-17, it is budgeted at \$180 million, or \$3 million (2%) more than the fiscal year 2015-16 actual. This growth is attributed to a \$6 million (5%) increase in sales tax distribution and a \$3 million (8%) decrease in the VLF distribution due to the base allocation changes and projected fiscal year 2015-16 growth payments. The fiscal year 2017-18 General Fund share of revenue is budgeted at \$176 million, a net annual decrease of \$3 million (-2%) in sales tax and VLF distributions based on the projected growth payments.

Increases in both years are net of State allocation reductions due to implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) equal to assumed savings for counties as a result of treating fewer uninsured patients. The State's fiscal year 2015-16 Budget included assumed Statewide county savings of \$742 million and the fiscal year 2016-17 Budget included assumed savings of \$565 million as a result of ACA implementation, and redirects these savings from realignment allocations to cover CalWORKs expenditures previously paid for by the State's General Fund. Reductions to the City's allocation are assumed equal to \$11.9 million in both years. Future budget adjustments could be necessary depending on final State determinations of ACA savings amounts, which are expected in January 2017 and January 2018 for fiscal year 2014-15 and fiscal year 2015-16, respectively.

Public Safety Realignment. Public Safety Realignment (AB 109), enacted in early 2011, transfers responsibility for supervising certain kinds of felony offenders and state prison parolees from state prisons and parole agents to county jails and probation officers. In fiscal year 2015-16, this revenue source totaled \$40 million. Based on the State's budget, this revenue is budgeted at \$41 million in fiscal year 2016-17, a \$1 million (2%) increase over the fiscal year 2015-16 actual. This increase reflects increased State funding to support implementation of AB109. The fiscal year 2017-18 budget assumes a \$2 million (6%) increase from fiscal year 2016-17 budget.

Public Safety Sales Tax

State Proposition 172, passed by California voters in November 1993, provided for the continuation of a one-half percent sales tax for public safety expenditures. This revenue is a function of the City's proportionate share of Statewide sales activity. Revenue from this source for fiscal year 2015-16 was \$97 million, an increase of \$3 million (3%) from fiscal year 2014-15 revenues. This revenue is budgeted at \$102 million in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$106 million in fiscal year 2017-18, representing annual growth of \$5 million (5%) and \$4 million (4%) respectively. These revenues are allocated to counties by the State separately from the local one-percent sales tax discussed above, and are used to fund police and fire services. Disbursements are made to counties based on the county ratio, which is the county's percent share of total statewide sales taxes in the most recent calendar year. The county ratio for San Francisco in fiscal year 2015-16 is 3% and is expected to remain at that level in fiscal year 2016-17 and fiscal year 2017-18.

Other Intergovernmental Grants and Subventions

In addition to those categories listed above, the City received \$588 million of funds in fiscal year 2015-16 from grants and subventions from State and federal governments to fund public health, social services and other programs in the General Fund. This represents a \$17 million (3%) increase from fiscal year 2014-15. The fiscal year 2016-17 budget is \$637 million, an increase of \$49 million (8%).

Charges for Services

Revenue from charges for services in the General Fund in fiscal year 2015-16 was \$234 million and is projected to be largely unchanged in the fiscal year 2016-17 and 2017-18 budget.

CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

Unique among California cities, San Francisco as a charter city and county must provide the services of both a city and a county. Public services include police, fire and public safety; public health, mental health and other social services; courts, jails, and juvenile justice; public works, streets, and transportation, including port and airport; construction and maintenance of all public buildings and facilities; water,

sewer, and power services; parks and recreation; libraries and cultural facilities and events; zoning and planning, and many others. Employment costs are relatively fixed by labor and retirement agreements, and account for approximately 50% of all City expenditures. In addition, the Charter imposes certain baselines, mandates, and property tax set-asides, which dictate expenditure or service levels for certain programs, and allocate specific revenues or specific proportions thereof to other programs, including MTA, children’s services and public education, and libraries. Budgeted baseline and mandated funding is \$968 million in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$1 billion in fiscal year 2017-18. As noted above, voters approved additional spending requirements on the November 2016 ballot, which are incorporated into five-year projections and will be included in the fiscal year 2017-18 budget.

General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area

San Francisco is a consolidated city and county, and budgets General Fund expenditures for both city and county functions in seven major service areas described in table A-13:

TABLE A-13

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO Expenditures by Major Service Area Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2017-18 (000s)					
Major Service Areas	2013-14 Final Budget	2014-15 Final Budget	2015-16 Final Budget	2016-17 Final Budget	2017-18 Original Budget
Public Protection	\$1,130,932	\$1,173,977	\$1,223,981	\$1,298,185	\$1,323,268
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	700,254	799,355	857,055	176,768	165,498
Community Health	701,978	736,916	787,554	970,679	1,009,995
General Administration & Finance	244,591	293,107	286,871	786,218	824,100
Culture & Recreation	119,579	126,932	137,062	158,954	158,979
General City Responsibilities	137,025	158,180	186,068	349,308	333,291
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	80,797	127,973	161,545	154,344	164,895
Total*	\$3,115,155	\$3,416,440	\$3,640,137	\$3,894,456	\$3,980,026

*Total may not add due to rounding

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

Public Protection primarily includes the Police Department, the Fire Department and the Sheriff’s Office. These departments are budgeted to receive \$450 million, \$241 million and \$170 million of General Fund support respectively in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$460 million, \$245 million, and \$178 million respectively in fiscal year 2017-18. Within Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development, the Department of Human Services, which includes aid assistance and aid payments and City grant programs, is budgeted to receive \$219 million of General Fund support in the fiscal year 2016-17 and \$233 million in fiscal year 2017-18.

The Public Health Department is budgeted to receive \$608 million in General Fund support for public health programs and the operation of San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$712 million in fiscal year 2017-18.

For budgetary purposes, enterprise funds are characterized as either self-supported funds or General Fund-supported funds. General Fund-supported funds include the Convention Facility Fund, the Cultural and Recreation Film Fund the Gas Tax Fund, the Golf Fund, the Grants Fund, the General Hospital Fund, and the Laguna Honda Hospital Fund. The MTA is classified as a self-supported fund, although it receives an annual general fund transfer equal to 80% of general fund parking tax receipts pursuant to the Charter. This transfer is budgeted to be \$74.3 million in fiscal year 2016-17 and \$76.2 million in the fiscal year 2017-18.

Baselines

The Charter requires funding for baselines and other mandated funding requirements. The chart below identifies the required and budgeted levels of appropriation funding for key baselines and mandated funding requirements. Revenue-driven baselines are based on the projected aggregate City discretionary revenues, whereas expenditure-driven baselines are typically a function of total spending. This table reflects spending requirements at the time the fiscal year 2016-17 and fiscal year 2017-18 budget was finally adopted. It does not include spending requirements subsequently adopted by voters in November 2016, which require the City to maintain street trees (Proposition E), estimated at \$19 million annually, and fund services for seniors and adults with disabilities (Proposition I), estimated at \$38 million in fiscal year 2016-17.

TABLE A-14

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
Baselines & Set-Asides		
Fiscal Year 2016-17		
(millions)		
Baselines & Set-Asides	2016-17 Required Baseline	2016-17 Original Budget
Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)	\$212.0	\$212.0
MTA Baseline - Population Adjustment	\$38.0	\$38.0
Parking and Traffic Commission	\$79.5	\$79.5
Children's Services	\$153.1	\$157.5
Transitional Aged Youth	\$18.4	\$23.2
Library Preservation	\$72.5	\$72.5
Public Education Baseline Services	\$9.2	\$9.2
Recreation and Park Maintenance of Effort	\$67.4	\$67.4
<u>Public Education Enrichment Funding</u>		
Unified School District	\$64.6	\$64.6
Office of Early Care and Education	\$32.3	\$32.3
City Services Auditor	\$16.3	\$16.3
Human Services Homeless Care Fund	\$16.7	\$16.7
<u>Property Tax Related Set-Asides</u>		
Municipal Symphony	\$2.6	\$2.6
Children's Fund Set-Aside	\$72.6	\$72.6
Library Preservation Set-Aside	\$51.8	\$51.8
Open Space Set-Aside	\$51.8	\$51.8
<u>Staffing and Service-Driven</u>		
Police Minimum Staffing	Requirement likely met	
Fire Neighborhood Firehouse Funding	Requirement met	
Treatment on Demand	Requirement met	
Total Baseline Spending	\$959	\$968

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

With respect to Police Department staffing, the Charter mandates a police staffing baseline of not less than 1,971 full-duty officers. The Charter-mandated baseline staffing level may be reduced in cases where civilian hires result in the return of a full-duty officer to active police work. The Charter also provides that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors may convert a position from a sworn officer to a civilian through the

budget process. With respect to the Fire Department, the Charter mandates baseline 24-hour staffing of 42 firehouses, the Arson and Fire Investigation Unit, no fewer than four ambulances and four Rescue Captains (medical supervisors).

EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-RETIREMENT OBLIGATIONS

The cost of salaries and benefits for City employees represents nearly half of the City's expenditures, totaling \$5.0 billion in the fiscal year 2017-18 Original Budget (all-funds), and \$5.1 billion in the fiscal year 2018-19 Original Budget. Looking only at the General Fund, the combined salary and benefits budget was \$2.3 billion in the fiscal year 2017-18 Original Budget and \$2.4 billion in the fiscal year 2018-19 Original Budget. This section discusses the organization of City workers into bargaining units, the status of employment contracts, and City expenditures on employee-related costs including salaries, wages, medical benefits, retirement benefits and the City's retirement system, and post-retirement health and medical benefits. Employees of SFUSD, SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court are not City employees.

Labor Relations

The City's budget for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 includes 30,835 and 30,938 budgeted City positions, respectively. City workers are represented by 37 different labor unions. The largest unions in the City are the Service Employees International Union, Local 1021 ("SEIU"); the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21 ("IFPTE"); and the unions representing police, fire, deputy sheriffs and transit workers.

The wages, hours and working conditions of City employees are determined by collective bargaining pursuant to State law (the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, California Government Code Sections 3500-3511) and the City Charter. San Francisco is unusual among California's cities and counties in that nearly all of its employees, even managers, are represented by labor organizations. Further, the City Charter provides a unique impasse resolution procedure. In most cities and counties, when labor organizations cannot reach agreement on a new contract, there is no mandatory procedure to settle the impasse. However, in San Francisco, nearly all of the City's contracts advance to interest arbitration in the event the parties cannot reach agreement. This process provides a mandatory ruling by an impartial third party arbitrator, who will set the terms of the new agreement. Except for nurses and less than one-hundred unrepresented employees, the Charter requires that bargaining impasses be resolved through final and binding interest arbitration conducted by a panel of three arbitrators. The award of the arbitration panel is final and binding unless legally challenged. Wages, hours and working conditions of nurses are not subject to interest arbitration, but are subject to Charter-mandated economic limits. Strikes by City employees are prohibited by the Charter. Since 1976, no City employees have participated in a union-authorized strike.

The City's employee selection procedures are established and maintained through a civil service system. In general, selection procedures and other merit system issues, with the exception of discipline, are not subject to arbitration. Disciplinary actions are generally subject to grievance arbitration, with the exception of police, fire and sheriff's employees.

In June 2013, the City negotiated a contract extension with the Police Officers' Association ("POA"), through June 30, 2018, that includes wage increases of 1% on July 1, 2015; 2% on July 1, 2016; and 2% on July 1, 2017. In addition, the union agreed to lower entry rates of pay for new hires in entry Police Officer classifications. In May 2014, the City negotiated a contract extension with the Firefighters Association through June 30, 2018, which mirrored the terms of POA agreement.

In May 2014, the City negotiated three-year agreements (for fiscal years 2014-15 through 2016-17) with most of its labor unions. In general, the parties agreed to: (1) annual wage increase schedules of 3% (October 11, 2014), 3.25% (October 10, 2015), and 3.25% (July 1, 2016); and (2) some structural reforms of the City's healthcare benefit and cost-sharing structures to rebalance required premiums between the two main health plans offered by the City. These changes to health contributions build reforms agreed to by most unions during earlier negotiations.

Pursuant to Charter Section 8A.104, the MTA is responsible for negotiating contracts for the transit operators and employees in service-critical bargaining units. These contracts are subject to approval by the MTA Board. In May 2014, the MTA and the union representing the transit operators (TWU, Local 250-A) agreed to a three-year contract that runs through June 30, 2017. Provisions in the contract include 14.25% in wage increases in exchange for elimination of the 7.5% employer retirement pick-up.

In February 2017, the City negotiated two-year contract extensions (for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19) with most of its labor unions. The parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2017 and 3% on July 1, 2018, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2018-19 adjustment by six months if the City's deficit for fiscal year 2018-2019, as projected in the March, 2018 update to the Five Year Financial Plan, exceeds \$200 million. MTA and TWU, Local 250-A, along with unions representing MTA service critical employees, agreed to two-year contract extensions with the same wage provisions and term as those contracts covering City employees. Existing agreements with police officers, firefighters, and physicians expire in June 2018; the agreement with supervising nurses expires in June, 2019. Successor labor agreements will be completed prior to the adoption of the 2018-2019 budget.

Table A-15 shows the membership of each operating employee bargaining unit and the date the current labor contract expires.

TABLE A-15

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (All Funds)
Employee Organizations as of July 1, 2016**

Organization	Budgeted Positions	Expiration Date of MOU
Auto Machinist, Lodge 1414	466	30-Jun-19
BrickLayers, Local 3 / Hod Carriers, Local 36	10	30-Jun-19
Building Inspectors Association	92	30-Jun-19
CAIR/CIR (Interns & Residents)	0	30-Jun-19
Carpenters, Local 22	116	30-Jun-19
Carpet, Linoleum & Soft Tile	3	30-Jun-19
Cement Masons, Local 300	43	30-Jun-19
Electrical Workers, Local 6	915	30-Jun-19
Firefighters, Local 798	1,875	30-Jun-18
Glaziers, Local 718	9	30-Jun-19
Hod Carriers, Local 36	8	30-Jun-19
Iron Workers, Local 377	15	30-Jun-19
Laborers, Local 261	1,158	30-Jun-19
Municipal Attorneys Association	465	30-Jun-19
Municipal Exec Assoc - Fire	9	30-Jun-18
Municipal Exec Assoc - Misc	1,330	30-Jun-19
Municipal Exec Assoc - Police	16	30-Jun-18
Operating Engineers, Local 3	65	30-Jun-19
Physician/Dentists, UAPD	203	30-Jun-18
Pile Drivers, Local 34	37	30-Jun-19
Plasterers & Shphnds, Local 66	0	30-Jun-19
Plumbers, Local 38	349	30-Jun-19
Police Officers Association	2,495	30-Jun-18
Prof & Tech Eng, Local 21	6,212	30-Jun-19
Roofers, Local 40	13	30-Jun-19
SEIU 1021, H-1 Paramedics	4	30-Jun-19
SEIU 1021, Misc.	12,509	30-Jun-19
SEIU 1021, Staff & Per Diem RNs	1,720	30-Jun-19
SF City Workers United	131	30-Jun-19
SF Deputy Sheriffs Assn	825	30-Jun-19
SF Probation Off Assoc	152	30-Jun-19
SF Sheriff's Managers and Supv	100	30-Jun-19
SFDA Investigators Assn	45	30-Jun-19
SFIPOA, Op Eng, Local 3	2	30-Jun-19
Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104	43	30-Jun-19
Stationary Engineers, Local 39	690	30-Jun-19
Sup Probation Ofcr, Op Eng 3	31	30-Jun-19
Teamsters, Local 853	173	30-Jun-19
Teamsters, Local 856 Multi-Unit	112	30-Jun-19
Teamsters, Local 856 Spv Nurses	127	30-Jun-19
Theatrical Stage Emp, Local 16	27	30-Jun-19
TWU Local 200	364	30-Jun-19
TWU Local 250-A, AutoServWrkr	126	30-Jun-19
TWU Local 250-A, Misc	111	30-Jun-19
TWU Local 250-A, TranFareInsp	54	30-Jun-19
TWU Local 250-A, TransitOpr	2,659	30-Jun-19
¹ Unrepresented Employees	<u>83</u> ¹	30-Jun-18
	35,990	

Source: Department of Human Resources - Employee Relations Division, City and County of San Francisco.

San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System ("SFERS" or "Retirement System")

History and Administration

SFERS is charged with administering a defined-benefit pension plan that covers substantially all City employees and certain other employees. The Retirement System was initially established by approval of City voters on November 2, 1920 and the State Legislature on January 12, 1921 and is currently codified in the City Charter. The Charter provisions governing the Retirement System may be revised only by a Charter amendment, which requires an affirmative public vote at a duly called election.

The Retirement System is administered by the Retirement Board consisting of seven members, three appointed by the Mayor, three elected from among the members of the Retirement System, at least two of whom must be actively employed, and a member of the Board of Supervisors appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors.

The Retirement Board appoints an Executive Director and an Actuary to aid in the administration of the Retirement System. The Executive Director serves as chief executive officer, with responsibility extending to all divisions of the Retirement System. The Actuary's responsibilities include advising the Retirement Board on actuarial matters and monitoring of actuarial service providers. The Retirement Board retains an independent consulting actuarial firm to prepare the annual valuation reports and other analyses. The independent consulting actuarial firm is currently Cheiron, Inc., a nationally recognized firm selected by the Retirement Board pursuant to a competitive process.

In 2014, the Retirement System filed an application with the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") for a Determination Letter. In July 2014, the IRS issued a favorable Determination Letter for SFERS. Issuance of a Determination Letter constitutes a finding by the IRS that operation of the defined benefit plan in accordance with the plan provisions and documents disclosed in the application qualifies the plan for federal tax exempt status. A tax qualified plan also provides tax advantages to the City and to members of the Retirement System. The favorable Determination Letter included IRS review of all SFERS provisions, including the provisions of Proposition C approved by the City voters in November 2011.

Membership

Retirement System members include eligible employees of the City and County of San Francisco, the SFUSD, the SFCCD, and the San Francisco Trial Courts.

The Retirement System estimates that the total active membership as of July 1, 2016 is 40,051, compared to 37,821 at July 1, 2015. Active membership at July 1, 2016 includes 6,617 terminated vested members and 1,028 reciprocal members. Terminated vested members are former employees who have vested rights in future benefits from SFERS. Reciprocal members are individuals who have established membership in a reciprocal pension plan such as CalPERS and may be eligible to receive a reciprocal pension from the Retirement System in the future. Monthly retirement allowances are paid to approximately 28,286 retired members and beneficiaries. Benefit recipients include retired members, vested members receiving a vesting allowance, and qualified survivors.

Table A-16 displays total Retirement System participation (City and County of San Francisco, SFUSD, SFCCD, and San Francisco Trial Courts) as of the five most recent actuarial valuation dates, July 1, 2012 through July 1, 2016.

TABLE A-16

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY
Employees' Retirement System
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16

As of 7/1	Active Members	Vested Members	Reciprocal Members	Total Non-retired	Retirees/ Continuants	Active to Retiree Ratio
2011-12	28,097	4,543	1,015	33,655	25,190	1.115
2012-13	28,717	4,933	1,040	34,690	26,034	1.103
2013-14	29,516	5,409	1,032	35,957	26,852	1.099
2014-15	30,837	5,960	1,024	37,821	27,485	1.122
2015-16	32,406	6,617	1,028	40,051	28,286	1.146

Sources: SFERS' annual July 1 actuarial valuation reports

See <http://mysfers.org/resources/publications/sfers-actuarial-valuations/>

Notes: Member counts exclude DROP participants.

Member counts are for the entire Retirement System and include non-City employees.

Funding Practices

Employer and employee (member) contributions are mandated by the Charter. Sponsoring employers are required to contribute 100% of the actuarially determined contribution approved by the Retirement Board. The Charter specifies that employer contributions consist of the normal cost (the present value of the benefits that SFERS expects to become payable in the future attributable to a current year's employment) plus an amortization of the unfunded liability over a period not to exceed 20 years. The Retirement Board sets the funding policy subject to the Charter requirements.

The Retirement Board adopts the economic and demographic assumptions used in the annual valuations. Demographic assumptions such as retirement, termination and disability rates are based upon periodic demographic studies performed by the consulting actuarial firm approximately every five years. Economic assumptions are reviewed each year by the Retirement Board after receiving an economic experience analysis from the consulting actuarial firm.

At the November 2016 Retirement Board meeting, the Board voted to make no changes in economic assumptions for the July 1, 2016 actuarial valuation following the recommendation of the consulting actuarial firm. Key economic assumptions are the long-term investment earnings assumption of 7.50%, the long-term wage inflation assumption of 3.75%, and the long-term consumer price index assumption of 3.25%. In November 2015 the Board voted to update demographic assumptions, including mortality, after review of a new demographic assumptions study by the consulting actuarial firm.

While employee contribution rates are mandated by the Charter, sources of payment of employee contributions (i.e. City or employee) may be the subject of collective bargaining agreements with each union or bargaining unit. Since July 1, 2011, substantially all employee groups have agreed through collective bargaining for employees to contribute all employee contributions through pre-tax payroll deductions.

Prospective purchasers of the City's bonds should carefully review and assess the assumptions regarding the performance of the Retirement System. Audited financials and actuarial reports may be found on the Retirement System's website, mysfers.org, under Publications. The information on such website is not incorporated herein by reference. There is a risk that actual results will differ significantly from assumptions. In addition, prospective purchasers of the City's bonds are cautioned that the information

and assumptions speak only as of the respective dates contained in the underlying source documents, and are therefore subject to change.

Employer Contribution History and Annual Valuations

Fiscal year 2014-15 total City employer contributions were \$556.5 million which included \$243.6 million from the General Fund. Fiscal year 2015-16 total City employer contributions were \$496.3 million which included \$215.2 million from the General Fund. For fiscal year 2016-17, total City employer contributions to the Retirement System are budgeted at \$515.0 million which includes \$240.4 million from the General Fund. These budgeted amounts are based upon the fiscal year 2016-17 employer contribution rate of 21.40% (estimated to be 18.8% after taking into account the 2011 Proposition C cost-sharing provisions). The fiscal year 2017-18 employer contribution rate is 23.46% per the July 1, 2016 actuarial valuation report (estimated to be 20.1% after taking into account cost-sharing provisions). The increase in employer contribution rate from 21.40% to 23.46% results primarily from two reasons: 1) the retroactive grant of 2013 and 2014 Supplemental COLAs after the October 2015 California Court of Appeal determination in *Protect Our Benefits v. City and County of San Francisco* that the “full funding” requirement for Supplemental COLAs adopted under Proposition C does not apply to members who retired on or after November 6, 1996 and were hired prior to January 7, 2012, and 2) the continued phase in of the 2015 assumption changes approved by the Retirement Board. As discussed under “City Budget – Five Year Financial Plan” increases in retirement costs are projected in the City’s December 2016 Five Year Financial Plan.

Table A-17 shows total Retirement System liabilities, assets, and percent funded for the last five actuarial valuations as well as contributions for the fiscal years 2011-12 through 2015-16. Information is shown for all employers in the Retirement System (City and County of San Francisco, SFUSD, SFCCD, and San Francisco Trial Courts). “Actuarial Liability” reflects the actuarial accrued liability of the Retirement System measured for purposes of determining the funding contribution. “Market Value of Assets” reflects the fair market value of assets held in trust for payment of pension benefits. “Actuarial Value of Assets” are the plan assets with investment returns different than expected smoothed over five years to provide a more stable contribution rate. The “Market Percent Funded” column is determined by dividing the market value of assets by the actuarial accrued liability. The “Actuarial Percent Funded” column is determined by dividing the actuarial value of assets by the actuarial accrued liability. “Employee and Employer Contributions” reflects the total of mandated employee contributions and employer contributions received by the Retirement System in the fiscal year ended June 30th prior to the July 1st valuation date.

TABLE A-17

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY
Employees' Retirement System
Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16
(000s)

As of 7/1	Actuarial Liability	Market Value of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Market Percent Funded	Actuarial Percent Funded	Employee & Employer Contributions in prior FY	Employer Contribution Rates ¹ in prior FY
2011-12	\$19,393,854	\$15,293,724	\$16,027,683	78.9%	82.6%	\$608,957	18.09%
2012-13	20,224,777	17,011,545	16,303,397	84.1%	80.6	701,596	20.71
2013-14	21,122,567	19,920,607	18,012,088	94.3%	85.3	821,902	24.82
2014-15	22,970,892	20,428,069	19,653,339	88.9%	85.6	894,325	26.76
2015-16	24,403,882	20,154,503	20,654,703	82.6%	84.6	849,569	22.80

¹ Employer contribution rates for fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18 are 21.40% and 23.46%, respectively.

Sources: SFERS' audited year-end financial statements and required supplemental information
SFERS' annual July 1 actuarial valuation reports

Note: Information above reflects entire Retirement System, not just the City and County of San Francisco.

Please note in the table above, that the Market Percent Funded ratio is lower than the Actuarial Percent Funded ratio for the first time in four years. The Actuarial Percent Funded ratio does not yet fully reflect all asset losses from the last five fiscal years.

The actuarial accrued liability is measured by the independent consulting actuary in accordance with Actuarial Standards of Practice. In addition, an actuarial audit is conducted every five years in accordance with Retirement Board policy.

GASB Disclosures

The Retirement System discloses accounting and financial reporting information under GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*. This statement was first implemented by the Retirement System in fiscal year 2013-14. The City discloses accounting and financial information about the Retirement System under GASB Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*. This accounting statement was first effective in fiscal year 2014-15. These accounting statements separated financial reporting from funding and required additional disclosures in the notes to the financial statements and required supplemental information. In general, the City's funding of its pension obligations are not affected by the GASB 68 changes to the reporting of the City's pension liability. Funding requirements are specified in the City Charter and are described in "Funding Practices" above.

Total Pension Liability reported under GASB Statements No. 67 and 68 differs from the Actuarial Liability calculated for funding purposes in several ways, including the following differences. First, Total Pension Liability measured at fiscal year-end is a roll-forward of liabilities calculated at the beginning of the year and is based upon a beginning of year census adjusted for significant events that occurred during the year. Second, Total Pension Liability is based upon a discount rate determined by a blend of the assumed investment return to the extent the fiduciary net position is available to make payments and at a municipal bond rate to the extent that the fiduciary net position is unavailable to make payments. Differences between the discount rate and assumed investment return have ranged from zero to six basis points at the last four fiscal year-ends. The third distinct difference is that Total Pension Liability includes a provision for Supplemental COLAS that may be granted in the future, while Actuarial Liability for funding purposes includes only Supplemental COLAS that have been already been granted.

See Note 2(s) of the City’s CAFR attached to this Official Statement as Appendix B for more information about the effects of GASB 68 and certain other new accounting standards on the City’s financial statements.

Table A-17A below shows the collective Total Pension Liability, Plan Fiduciary Net Position (market value of assets), and Net Pension Liability for all employers who sponsor the Retirement System. The City’s audited financial statements disclose only its own proportionate share of the Net Pension Liability and other required GASB 68 disclosures.

TABLE A-17A

**SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY
Employees' Retirement System (000s)
GASB 67/68 Disclosures**

As of 6/30	Collective Total Pension Liability (TPL)	Discount Rate	Plan Fiduciary Net Position	Plan Net Position as % of TPL	Collective Net Pension Liability (NPL)	City and County's Proportionate Share of NPL
2012-13	\$20,785,417	7.52 %	\$17,011,545	81.8 %	\$3,773,872	\$3,552,075
2013-14	21,691,042	7.58	19,920,607	91.8	1,770,435	1,660,365
2014-15	22,724,102	7.46	20,428,069	89.9	2,296,033	2,156,049
2015-16	25,967,281	7.50	20,154,503	77.6	5,812,778	5,476,653

Sources: SFERS fiscal year-end GASB 67/68 Reports as of June 30, 2014, 2015, and 2016.

Notes: Collective amounts include all employees (City and County, SFUSD, SFCCD, Superior Courts)

The fiscal year 2016 increase in the City’s net pension liability is due to investment return shortfalls, the Appeals Court’s elimination of the full funding requirement for payment of Supplemental COLAs for certain members, and the impact of the Retirement Board’s 2015 adoption of revised demographic assumptions.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Asset Management

The assets of the Retirement System, (the “Fund”) are invested in a broadly diversified manner across the institutional global capital markets. In addition to U.S. equities and fixed income securities, the Fund holds international equities, global sovereign and corporate debt, global public and private real estate and an array of alternative investments including private equity and venture capital limited partnerships. For a breakdown of the asset allocation as of June 30, 2016, see Appendix B: “COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016,” Page 72. Although the Fund did not hold hedge funds as of June 30, 2016, the Board approved a 5% allocation to absolute return/hedge funds at its February 2015 meeting. Implementation of this new allocation began during fiscal year 2016-17.

Annualized investment returns (net of fees and expenses) for the Retirement System for the five years ending June 30, 2016 were 7.53%. For the ten-year and twenty-year periods ending June 30, 2016, annualized investment returns were 5.85% and 7.66% respectively.

The investments, their allocation, transactions and proxy votes are regularly reviewed by the Retirement Board and monitored by an internal staff of investment professionals who in turn are advised by external consultants who are specialists in the areas of investments detailed above. A description of the Retirement System’s investment policy, a description of asset allocation targets and current investments, and the Annual Report of the Retirement System are available upon request from the Retirement System by writing to the San Francisco Retirement System, 1145 Market Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, or by calling (415) 487-7020. Certain documents are available at the Retirement System website at www.mysfers.org. These documents are not incorporated herein by reference.

Recent Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan

The levels of SFERS plan benefits are established under the Charter and approved directly by the voters, rather than through the collective bargaining process. Changes to retirement benefits require a voter-approved Charter amendment. As detailed below, the most recent changes to SFERS plan benefits have been intended to reduce pension costs associated with future City employees.

Voters of San Francisco approved Proposition C in November 2011 which provided the following:

1. New SFERS benefit plans for Miscellaneous and Safety employees commencing employment on or after January 7, 2012, which raise the minimum service retirement age for Miscellaneous members from 50 to 53; limit covered compensation to 85% of the IRC §401(a)(17) limits for Miscellaneous members and 75% of the IRC §401(a)(17) limits for Safety members; calculate final compensation using highest three-year average compensation; and decrease vesting allowances for Miscellaneous members by lowering the City’s funding for a portion of the vesting allowance from 100% to 50%;
2. Employees commencing employment on or after January 7, 2012 otherwise eligible for membership in CalPERS may become members of SFERS;
3. Cost-sharing provisions which increase or decrease employee contributions to SFERS on and after July 1, 2012 for certain SFERS members based on the employer contribution rate set by the Retirement Board for that year. For example, Miscellaneous employees who earn between \$50,000 and \$100,000 per year pay a fluctuating contribution rate in the range of +4% to -4% of the Charter-mandated employee contribution rate, while Miscellaneous employees who earn

\$100,000 or more per year pay a fluctuating contribution rate in the range of +5% to -5% of the Charter-mandated employee contribution rate. Similar fluctuating employee contributions are also required from Safety employees; and

4. Effective July 1, 2012, no Supplemental COLA will be paid unless SFERS is fully funded on a market value of assets basis and, for employees hired on or after January 7, 2012, Supplemental COLA benefits will not be permanent adjustments to retirement benefits - in any year when a Supplemental COLA is not paid, all previously paid Supplemental COLAs will expire.

A retiree organization has brought a legal action against the requirement in Proposition C that SFERS be fully funded in order to pay the Supplemental COLA. In that case, *Protect our Benefits (POB) v. City of San Francisco* (1st DCA Case No. A140095), the Court of Appeals held that changes to the Supplemental COLA adopted by the voters in November 2011 under Proposition C could not be applied to current City and County employees and those who retired after November 1996 when the Supplemental COLA provisions were originally adopted, but could be applied to SFERS members who retired before November 1996. This decision is now final and its implementation increased the July 1, 2016 unfunded actuarial liability by \$429.3 million for Supplemental COLAs granted retroactive to July 1, 2013 and July 1, 2014.

On July 13, 2016, the SFERS Board adopted a Resolution to exempt members who retired before November 6, 1996, from the “fully funded” provision related to payment of Supplemental COLAs under Proposition C. The Resolution directed that retroactive payments for Supplemental COLAs be made to these retirees. After the Board adopted the Resolution, the Retirement System published an actuarial study on the cost to the Fund of payments to the pre-1996 retirees. The study reports that the two retroactive supplemental payments will trigger immediate payments of \$34 million, create additional liability for continuing payments of \$114 million, and cause a new unfunded liability of \$148 million. This liability does not include the Supplemental COLA payments that may be triggered in the future. Under the cost sharing formulas in Proposition C, the City and its employees will pay for these costs in the form of higher yearly contribution rates. The Controller has projected the future cost to the City and its employees to be \$260 million, with over \$200 million to be paid in the next five fiscal years. The City obtained a permanent injunction to prevent SFERS from making Supplemental COLA payments to these members who retired before November 6, 1996. The Retirement Board has appealed the Superior Court’s injunction, and the schedule for that appeal is not yet known.

In August 2012, Governor Brown signed the Public Employee Pension Reform Act of 2012 (“PEPRA”). Current plan provisions of SFERS are not subject to PEPRA although future amendments may be subject to these reforms.

Recent Changes in the Economic Environment and the Impact on the Retirement System

As of June 30, 2016, the audited market value of Retirement System assets was \$20.2 billion. As of June 30, 2017, the unaudited market value of SFERS’ portfolio was \$21.5 billion. These values represent, as of the date specified, the estimated value of the Retirement System’s portfolio if it were liquidated on that date. The Retirement System cannot be certain of the value of certain of its portfolio assets and, accordingly, the market value of the portfolio could be more or less. Moreover, appraisals for classes of assets that are not publicly traded are based on estimates which typically lag changes in actual market value by three to six months. Representations of market valuations are audited at each fiscal year end as part of the annual audit of the Retirement System’s financial statements.

The Retirement System investment portfolio is structured for long-term performance. The Retirement System continually reviews investment and asset allocation policies as part of its regular operations and

continues to rely on an investment policy which is consistent with the principles of diversification and the search for long-term value. Market fluctuations are an expected investment risk for any long-term strategy. Significant market fluctuations are expected to have significant impact on the value of the Retirement System investment portfolio.

A decline in the value of SFERS Trust assets over time, without a commensurate decline in the pension liabilities, will result in an increase in the contribution rate for the City. No assurance can be provided by the City that contribution rates will not increase in the future, and that the impact of such increases will not have a material impact on City finances.

Other Employee Retirement Benefits

As noted above, various City employees are members of CalPERS, an agent multiple-employer public employee defined benefit plan for safety members and a cost-sharing multiple-employer plan for miscellaneous members. The City makes certain payments to CalPERS in respect of such members, at rates determined by the CalPERS board. Such payment from the General Fund equaled \$19.2 million in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$20.0 million in fiscal year 2013-14. For fiscal year 2014-15, the City prepaid its annual CalPERS obligation at a level of \$25.2 million. Further discussion of the City's CalPERS plan obligations are summarized in Note 9 to the City's CAFR, as of June 30, 2016, attached to this Official Statement as Appendix B. A discussion of other post-employment benefits, including retiree medical benefits, is provided below under "Medical Benefits – *Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45.*"

Medical Benefits

Administration through San Francisco Health Service System; Audited System Financial Statements

Medical benefits for eligible active City employees and eligible dependents, for retired City employees and eligible dependents, and for surviving spouses and domestic partners of covered City employees (the "City Beneficiaries") are administered by the San Francisco Health Service System (the "San Francisco Health Service System" or "SFHSS") pursuant to City Charter Sections 12.200 *et seq.* and A8.420 *et seq.* Pursuant to such Charter Sections, the San Francisco Health Service System also administers medical benefits to active and retired employees of SFUSD, SFCCD, and the San Francisco Superior Court (collectively the "System's Other Beneficiaries"). However, the City is not required to fund medical benefits for the System's Other Beneficiaries and therefore this section focuses on the funding by the City of medical and dental benefits for City Beneficiaries. The San Francisco Health Service System is overseen by the City's Health Service Board (the "Health Service Board"). The seven member Health Service Board is composed of members including a seated member of the City's Board of Supervisors, appointed by the Board President; an individual who regularly consults in the health care field, appointed by the Mayor; a doctor of medicine, appointed by the Mayor; a member nominated by the Controller and approved by the Health Service Board, and three members of the San Francisco Health Service System, active or retired, elected from among their members. The plans (the "SFHSS Medical Plans") for providing medical care to the City Beneficiaries and the System's Other Beneficiaries (collectively, the "SFHSS Beneficiaries") are determined annually by the Health Service Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Charter Section A8.422.

The San Francisco Health Service System oversees a trust fund (the "Health Service Trust Fund") established pursuant to Charter Sections 12.203 and A8.428 through which medical benefits for the SFHSS Beneficiaries are funded. The San Francisco Health Service System issues annually a publicly available, independently audited financial report that includes financial statements for the Health Service Trust

Fund. This report may be obtained on the SFHSS website or by writing to the San Francisco Health Service System, 1145 Market Street, Third Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, or by calling (415) 554-1727. Audited annual financial statements for several years are also posted on the SFHSS website. The information available on such website is not incorporated in this Official Statement by reference.

As presently structured under the City Charter, the Health Service Trust Fund is not a fund through which assets are accumulated to finance post-employment healthcare benefits (an "OPEB trust fund"). Thus, the Health Service Trust Fund is not currently affected by Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") Statement Number 45, *Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefit Plans Other Than Pensions* ("GASB 45"), which applies to OPEB trust funds.

Determination of Employer and Employee Contributions for Medical Benefits

According to the City Charter Section A8.428, the City's contribution towards SFHSS Medical Plans for active employees and retirees is determined by the results of a survey annually of the amount of premium contributions provided by the 10 most populous counties in California (other than the City). The survey is commonly called the 10-County Average Survey and used to determine "the average contribution made by each such County toward the providing of health care plans, exclusive of dental or optical care, for each employee of such County." Under City Charter Section A8.428, the City is required to contribute to the Health Service Trust Fund an amount equal to such "average contribution" for each City Beneficiary.

In the Memoranda of Understandings negotiated through collective bargaining in June 2014, the 10-County Average was eliminated in the calculation of premiums for active employees represented by most unions, and exchanged for a percentage based employee premium contribution. The long term impact of the premium contribution model is anticipated to be a reduction in the relative proportion of the projected increases in the City's contributions for healthcare, stabilization of the medical plan membership and maintenance of competition among plans. The contribution amounts are paid by the City into the Health Service Trust Fund. The 10-County Average is still used as a basis for calculating all retiree premiums. To the extent annual medical premiums exceed the contributions made by the City as required by the Charter and union agreements, such excess must be paid by SFHSS Beneficiaries or, if elected by the Health Service Board, from net assets also held in the Health Service Trust Fund. Medical benefits for City Beneficiaries who are retired or otherwise not employed by the City (e.g., surviving spouses and surviving domestic partners of City retirees) ("Nonemployee City Beneficiaries") are funded through contributions from such Nonemployee City Beneficiaries and the City as determined pursuant to Charter Section A8.428. The San Francisco Health Service System medical benefit eligibility requirements for Nonemployee City Beneficiaries are described below under "*Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45.*"

Contributions relating to Nonemployee City Beneficiaries are also based on the negotiated methodologies found in most of the union agreements and, when applicable, the City contribution of the "10-County average contribution" corresponding to such Nonemployee City Beneficiaries as described in Charter Section A8.423 along with the following:

Monthly contributions from Nonemployee City Beneficiaries in amounts equal to the monthly contributions required from active employees excluding health coverage or subsidies for health coverage paid for active employees as a result of collective bargaining. However, such monthly contributions from Nonemployee City Beneficiaries covered under Medicare are reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare.

In addition to the average contribution the City contributes additional amounts in respect of the Nonemployee City Beneficiaries sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the San Francisco Health Service System in providing the same health coverage to Nonemployee City Beneficiaries as is provided for active employee City Beneficiaries, excluding health coverage or subsidies for health coverage paid for active employees as a result of collective bargaining.

After application of the calculations described above, the City contributes 50% of monthly contributions required for the first dependent.

Health Care Reform

The description that follows of the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is current. The election of a Republican President in November 2016 who promised to repeal “Obamacare” (or the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”) combined with both Houses of Congress with Republican majorities who are equally set on repealing the ACA puts many of the fees and taxes in limbo until legislation is passed to “repeal and replace Obamacare” by the current Congress and signed by President Trump (“HealthReform 2.0”).

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-114), and on March 30, 2010 signed the Health Care and Education Reconciliation of 2010 (collectively, the “Health Care Reform Law” or the ACA or “Obamacare”). The ACA was intended to extend health insurance to over 32 million uninsured Americans by 2019, and includes other significant changes with respect to the obligation to carry health insurance by individuals and the provision of health care by private and public employers, such as the City.

The Health Care Reform Law was designed to be implemented in phases from 2010 to 2018. The provisions of the Health Care Reform Law include the expansion of Medicaid, subsidies for health insurance for certain individuals, mandates that require most Americans obtain health insurance, and incentives for employers with over 50 employees to provide health insurance for their employees or pay a fine. On June 28, 2012 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled to uphold the employer mandate, the individual mandate and the state Medicaid expansion requirements.

Provisions of Health Care Reform already implemented by SFHSS include discontinued eligibility for non-prescription drugs reimbursement through flexible spending accounts (“FSAs”) in 2011, eliminated copayments for wellness visits, eliminated life-time caps on coverage, expanded eligibility to cover member dependent children up to age 26 in 2011, eliminated copayments for women’s preventative health including contraception in 2012, W-2 reporting on total healthcare premium costs, implementation of a medical loss ratio rebate on self-insured plans, issuance of a separate summary of benefits to every member and provided to every new member and providing information on State Exchanges to both employees currently on COBRA and future COBRA recipients and as of 2015 and 2016, and beyond, healthcare FSAs are limited to \$2,550 annually.

The change to the definition of a full time employee was implemented in 2015. The City modified health benefit eligibility to employees who are employed, on average, at least 20 hours of service per week. The Automatic Enrollment requirement in the Health Care Reform was deferred indefinitely. This requires that employers automatically enroll new full-time employees in one of the employer’s health benefit plans (subject to any waiting period authorized by law). Further it is required employees be given adequate notice and the opportunity to opt out of any coverage in which they were automatically enrolled. It is uncertain when or if final guidance will be issued by the Department of Labor.

The federal Health Care Reform Law created two direct fees: Transitional Reinsurance Fee and Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute (“PCORI”) fee and one tax, the Federal Health Insurer Tax (“HIT”). The Transitional Reinsurance Fee was eliminated beginning in 2017 and the HIT tax was waived in 2017. PCORI was factored into the calculation of medical premium rates and premium equivalents for the 2017 plan year and the impact on the City is \$0.22 million.

Beginning in 2013, the PCORI Fee was assessed at the rate of \$2.00 per enrollee per year to all participants in the Self-Insured medical-only plan (approximately 8,600). The fee is charged directly to SFHSS. In 2015 the rate was \$2.17, \$2.25 in 2016 and \$2.25 in 2017. SFHSS pays this fee directly to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the fee will increase with health care inflation until it sunsets in 2019.

The Federal HIT tax is a fixed-dollar amount applied to “full funded” HMOs and was charged in the 2016 plan year. The 2016 plan year premiums for Kaiser Permanente, Blue Shield of California, and the dental and vision plans included the impact of the HIT tax. Late in 2016, Blue Shield and the California Department of Managed Health Care agreed that the HIT tax was not applicable to Blue Shield because SFHSS “flex funds” Blue Shield meaning that SFHSS is at risk directly for non-physician costs and thus it is not fully-insured. This resulted in a refund for 2016 of \$9.93 million which is being applied to the 2018 rate stabilization reserve. The estimated impact of the HIT tax on the City was \$12.73 million. When the refund from Blue Shield of California is taken into account, the total impact on the City was \$2.8 million for Kaiser Permanente, and the dental and vision plans.

Beginning in 2016, employers are required to report coverage for employees to the IRS each January on complex electronic interface systems using 1095 forms. The San Francisco Health Service System spent over 2,080 hours on system configuration and is compliant with this requirement for 2016 and 2017.

Local Elections:

Proposition B (2008) Changing Qualification for Retiree Health and Pension Benefits and Establishing a Retiree Health Care Trust Fund

On June 3, 2008, the San Francisco voters approved Proposition B, a charter amendment that changed the way the City and current and future employees share in funding SFERS pension and health benefits. With regard to health benefits, elected officials and employees hired on or before January 9, 2009, contribute up to 2% of pre-tax compensation toward their retiree health care and the City contributes up to 1%. The impact of Proposition B on standard retirements occurred in 2014.

Proposition C (2011) City Pension and Health Care Benefit

On November 8, 2011, the San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, a charter amendment that made additional changes to the way the City and current and future employees share in funding SFERS pension and health benefits. The Proposition limits the 50% coverage for dependents to employees who left the workforces (without retiring) prior to 2001. The San Francisco Health Service System is in compliance with Proposition C.

Employer Contributions for San Francisco Health Service System Benefits

For fiscal year 2015-16, based on the most recent audited financial statements, the San Francisco Health Service System received approximately \$674.6 million from participating employers for San Francisco Health Service System benefit costs. Of this total, the City contributed approximately \$569.0 million; approximately \$158.4 million of this \$569.0 million amount was for health care benefits for approximately 23,453 retired City employees and their eligible dependents and approximately \$410.6 million was for benefits for approximately 31,085 active City employees and their eligible dependents.

The 2018 aggregate plan costs for the City increased by 3.28%. This is due to a number of factors including aggressive contracting by SFHSS that maintains competition among the City's vendors, implementing Accountable Care Organizations that reduced utilization and increased use of generic prescription rates and changing the City's Blue Shield plan from a fully-funded to a flex-funded product and implementing a narrow network. Flex-funding allows lower premiums to be set by the City's actuarial consultant, AON-Hewitt, without the typical margins added by Blue Shield; however, more risk is assumed by the City and reserves are required to protect against this risk. The flatten trend is anticipated to continue.

Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45

Eligibility of former City employees for retiree health care benefits is governed by the Charter. In general, employees hired before January 10, 2009 and a spouse or dependent are potentially eligible for health benefits following retirement at age 50 and completion of five years of City service. Proposition B, passed by San Francisco voters on June 3, 2008, tightened post-retirement health benefit eligibility rules for employees hired on or after January 10, 2009, and generally requires payments by the City and these employees equal to 3% of salary into a new retiree health trust fund.

Proposition A, passed by San Francisco voters on November 5, 2013 restricted the City's ability to withdraw funds from the retiree health trust fund. The restrictions allow payments from the fund only when two of the three following conditions are met:

1. The City's account balance in any fiscal year is fully funded. The account is fully funded when it is large enough to pay then-projected retiree health care costs as they come due; and,
2. The City's retiree health care costs exceed 10% of the City's total payroll costs in a fiscal year. The Controller, Mayor, Trust Board, and a majority of the Board of Supervisors must agree to allow payments from the Fund for that year. These payments can only cover retiree health care costs that exceed 10% of the City's total payroll cost. The payments are limited to no more than 10% of the City's account; or,
3. The Controller, Mayor, Trust Board, and two-thirds of the Board of Supervisors approve changes to these limits.

GASB 45 Reporting Requirements

The City was required to begin reporting the liability and related information for unfunded OPEBs in the City's financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008. This reporting requirement is defined under GASB 45. GASB 45 does not require that the affected government agencies, including the City, actually fund any portion of this post-retirement health benefit liability – rather, GASB 45 requires government agencies to determine on an actuarial basis the amount of its total OPEB liability and the

annual contributions estimated to fund such liability over 30 years. Any underfunding in a year is recognized as a liability on the government agency’s balance sheet.

City’s Estimated Liability

The City is required by GASB 45 to prepare a new actuarial study of its post-retirement benefits obligation every two years. As of July 1, 2014, the most recent actuarial valuation date, the funded status of retiree health care benefits was 1.1%. The actuarial accrued liability for benefits was \$4.26 billion, and the actuarial value of assets was \$49.0 million, resulting in an unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) of \$4.21 billion. As of July 1, 2014, the estimated covered payroll (annual payroll of active employees covered by the plan) was \$2.62 billion and the ratio of the UAAL to the covered payroll was 160.8%. The City’s actuary is currently updating this valuation for release in January, 2017.

The difference between the estimated ARC and the amount expended on post-retirement medical benefits in any year is the amount by which the City’s overall liability for such benefits increases in that year. The City’s most recent CAFR estimated that the 2015-16 annual OPEB cost was \$326.1 million, of which the City funded \$168.9 million which caused, among other factors, the City’s long-term liability to increase by \$157.3 million (as shown on the City’s balance sheet and below). The annual OPEB cost consists of the ARC, one year of interest on the net OPEB obligation, and recognition of one year of amortization of the net OPEB obligation. While GASB 45 does not require funding of the annual OPEB cost, any differences between the amount funded in a year and the annual OPEB cost are recorded as increases or decreases in the net OPEB obligation. See Note 9(b) to the City’s CAFR, as of June 30, 2016, included as Appendix B to this Official Statement. Five-year trend information is displayed in Table A-18 (dollars in thousands):

TABLE A-18

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Five-year Trend
Fiscal Years 2011-12 to 2015-16
(000s)

Fiscal Year Ended	Annual OPEB	Percentage of Annual OPEB Cost Funded	Net OPEB Obligation
2011-12	\$405,850	38.5%	\$1,348,883
2012-13	418,539	38.3%	1,607,130
2013-14	353,251	47.2%	1,793,753
2014-15	363,643	46.0%	1,990,155
2015-16	326,133	51.8%	2,147,434

Actuarial projections of the City’s OPEB liability will be affected by Proposition B as well as by changes in the other factors affecting that calculation. For example, the City’s actuarial analysis shows that by 2031, Proposition B’s three-percent of salary funding requirement will be sufficient to cover the cost of retiree health benefits for employees hired after January 10, 2009. See “Retirement System – *Recent Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan*” above. As of June 30, 2016, the fund balance in the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund established by Proposition B was \$114.8 million, an increase of 57% versus the prior year. Future projections of the City’s GASB 45 liability will be lowered by the SFHSS implementation of the Employer Group Waiver Plan prescription benefit program for City Plan retirees. See “– Local Elections: Proposition C (2011).”

Total City Employee Benefits Costs

The City budgets to pay its ARC for pension and has established a Retiree Health Care Trust Fund into which both the City and employees are required to contribute funds as retiree health care benefits are earned. Currently, these Trust deposits are only required on behalf of employees hired after 2009, and are therefore limited, but is expected to grow as the workforce retires and this requirement is extended to all employees in 2016. Proposition A, passed by San Francisco voters on November 5, 2013 restricted the City's ability to make withdrawals from the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund.

The balance in the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund as of June 30, 2016 is approximately \$114.8 million. The City will continue to monitor and update its actuarial valuations of liability as required under GASB 45. Table A-19 provides a five-year history for all health benefits costs paid including pension, health, dental and other miscellaneous benefits. For all fiscal years shown, a "pay-as-you-go" approach was used by the City for health care benefits.

Table A-19 below provides a summary of the City's employee benefit actual and budgeted costs from fiscal years 2012-13 to fiscal year 2016-17.

TABLE A-19

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO					
Employee Benefit Costs, All Funds					
Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2016-17¹					
(000s)					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Budget
SFERS and PERS Retirement Contributions	\$452,325	\$535,309	\$593,619	\$531,821	\$550,302
Social Security & Medicare	156,322	160,288	171,877	184,530	196,741
Health - Medical + Dental, active employees ²	370,346	369,428	383,218	421,864	451,905
Health - Retiree Medical ²	155,885	161,859	146,164	158,939	169,612
Other Benefits ³	16,665	16,106	18,439	20,827	26,719
Total Benefit Costs	\$1,151,543	\$1,242,990	\$1,313,318	\$1,317,981	\$1,395,279

¹Fiscal year 2012-13 through fiscal year 2015-16 figures are audited actuals. Fiscal year 2016-17 figures are original budget.

² Does not include Health Service System administrative costs. Does include flexible benefits that may be used for health insurance.

³ "Other Benefits" includes unemployment insurance premiums, life insurance, and other miscellaneous employee benefits.

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS

Investment Pool

The Treasurer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Treasurer") is authorized by Charter Section 6.106 to invest funds available under California Government Code Title 5, Division 2, Part 1, Chapter 4. In addition to the funds of the City, the funds of various City departments and local agencies located within the boundaries of the City, including the school and community college districts, airport and public hospitals, are deposited into the City and County's Pooled Investment Fund (the "Pool"). The funds are commingled for investment purposes.

Investment Policy

The management of the Pool is governed by the Investment Policy administered by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector in accordance with California Government Code Sections 27000, 53601, 53635, et. al. In order of priority, the objectives of this Investment Policy are safety, liquidity, and return on investments. Safety of principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. The investment portfolio maintains sufficient liquidity to meet all expected expenditures for at least the next six months. The Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector also attempts to generate a market rate of return, without undue compromise of the first two objectives.

The Investment Policy is reviewed and monitored annually by a Treasury Oversight Committee established by the Board of Supervisors. The Treasury Oversight Committee meets quarterly and is comprised of members drawn from (a) the Treasurer; (b) the Controller; (c) a representative appointed by the Board of Supervisors; (d) the County Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee; (e) the Chancellor of the Community College District or his/her designee; and (f) Members of the general public. A complete copy of the Treasurer's Investment Policy, dated May 2016, is included as an appendix to this Official Statement. The Investment Policy is also posted at the Treasurer's website. The information available on such website is not incorporated herein by reference.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Investment Portfolio

As of August 31, 2017, the City's surplus investment fund consisted of the investments classified in Table A-20, and had the investment maturity distribution presented in Table A-21.

TABLE A-20

**City and County of San Francisco
Investment Portfolio
Pooled Funds
As of August 31, 2017**

<u>Type of Investment</u>	<u>Par Value</u>	<u>Book Value</u>	<u>Market Value</u>
U.S. Treasuries	\$625,000,000	\$622,117,103	\$623,924,250
Federal Agencies	4,242,655,000	4,242,459,002	4,241,648,011
State and Local Obligations	287,133,823	289,206,729	287,573,278
Public Time Deposits	960,000	960,000	960,000
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	1,477,838,000	1,477,838,000	1,478,725,745
Banker's Acceptances			
Commercial Paper	985,000,000	980,671,350	982,262,736
Medium Term Notes	64,775,000	64,938,774	64,900,653
Money Market Funds	152,060,496	152,060,496	152,060,496
Supranationals	369,300,000	368,829,713	369,280,699
Total	<u>\$8,204,722,319</u>	<u>\$8,199,081,167</u>	<u>\$8,201,335,867</u>

August 2017 Earned Income Yield: 1.41%

Sources: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City and County of San Francisco
From Citibank-Custodial Safekeeping, SunGard Systems-Inventory Control Program.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-21

**City and County of San Francisco
Investment Maturity Distribution
Pooled Funds
As of August 31, 2017**

Maturity in Months			Par Value	Percentage
0	to	1	\$841,855,496	10.3%
1	to	2	607,000,000	7.4%
2	to	3	271,500,000	3.3%
3	to	4	650,000,000	7.9%
4	to	5	100,000,000	1.2%
5	to	6	205,690,000	2.5%
6	to	12	2,004,170,000	24.4%
12	to	24	1,252,093,000	15.3%
24	to	36	1,400,010,000	17.1%
36	to	48	359,778,823	4.4%
48	to	60	512,625,000	6.2%
			\$8,204,722,319	100.0%

Weighted Average Maturity: 487 Days

Sources: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City and County of San Francisco
From Citibank-Custodial Safekeeping, SunGard Systems-Inventory Control Program.

Further Information

A report detailing the investment portfolio and investment activity, including the market value of the portfolio, is submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors monthly. The monthly reports and annual reports are available on the Treasurer’s web page: www.sftreasurer.org. The monthly reports and annual reports are not incorporated by reference herein.

Additional information on the City’s investments, investment policies, and risk exposure as of June 30, 2017 are described in Appendix B: “COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016,” Notes 2(d) and 5.

CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS

Capital Plan

In October 2005, the Board of Supervisors adopted, and the Mayor approved, Ordinance No. 216-05, which established a new capital planning process for the City. The legislation requires that the City develop and adopt a ten-year capital expenditure plan for City-owned facilities and infrastructure. It also created the Capital Planning Committee (“CPC”) and the Capital Planning Program (“CPP”). The CPC, composed of other City finance and capital project officials, makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on all of the City’s capital expenditures. To help inform CPC recommendations, the CPP staff, under the direction of the City Administrator, review and prioritize funding needs; project and coordinate funding sources and uses; and provide policy analysis and reports on interagency capital planning.

The City Administrator, in conjunction with the CPC, is directed to develop and submit a ten-year capital plan every other fiscal year for approval by the Board of Supervisors. The Capital Plan is a fiscally constrained long-term finance strategy that prioritizes projects based on a set of funding principles. It provides an assessment of the City's infrastructure needs over ten years, highlights investments required to meet these needs and recommends a plan of finance to fund these investments. Although the Capital Plan provides cost estimates and proposes methods to finance such costs, the document does not reflect any commitment by the Board of Supervisors to expend such amounts or to adopt any specific financing method. The Capital Plan is required to be updated and adopted biennially, along with the City's Five Year Financial Plan and the Five-Year Information & Communication Technology Plan. The CPC is also charged with reviewing the annual capital budget submission and all long-term financing proposals, and providing recommendations to the Board of Supervisors relating to the compliance of any such proposal or submission with the adopted Capital Plan.

The Capital Plan is required to be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors by each March 1 in odd-numbered years and adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on or before May 1 of the same year. The fiscal year 2018-2027 Capital Plan was approved by the CPC on February 27, 2017 and was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in April 2017. The Capital Plan contains \$35.2 billion in capital investments over the coming decade for all City departments, including \$5.25 billion in projects for General Fund-supported departments. The Capital Plan proposes \$1.9 billion for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects over the next ten years. The amount for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects is assumed to grow to over \$200 million per year by fiscal year 2023-24. Major capital projects for General Fund-supported departments included in the Capital Plan consist of upgrades to public health, police, and fire facilities; improvements to homeless service sites; street and right-of-way improvements; the removal of barriers to accessibility; park improvements; the relocation of public health staff and services to improved spaces, among other capital projects. \$2.1 billion of the capital projects of General Fund supported departments are expected to be financed with general obligation bonds and other long-term obligations. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, the General Fund, and other sources.

In addition to the City General Fund-supported capital spending, the Capital Plan recommends \$18.9 billion in enterprise fund department projects to continue major transit, economic development and public utility projects such as the Central Subway project, runway and terminal upgrades at San Francisco International Airport, Pier 70 infrastructure investments, and the Sewer System Improvement Program, among others. Approximately \$12.3 billion of enterprise fund department capital projects is financed with revenue bonds. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, user/operator fees, General Fund and other sources.

While significant investments are proposed in the City's adopted Capital Plan, identified resources remain below those necessary to maintain and enhance the City's physical infrastructure. As a result, over \$4.6 billion in capital needs including enhancements are deferred from the plan's horizon. Over two-thirds of these unfunded needs are for the City's transportation and waterfront infrastructure, where core maintenance investments have lagged for decades. Mayor Edwin Lee has convened a taskforce to recommend funding mechanisms to bridge a portion of the gaps in the City's transportation needs, but it is likely that significant funding gaps will remain even assuming the identification of significant new funding sources for these needs.

Failure to make the capital improvements and repairs recommended in the Capital Plan may have the following impacts: (i) failing to meet federal, State or local legal mandates; (ii) failing to provide for the imminent life, health, safety and security of occupants and the public; (iii) failing to prevent the loss of use

of the asset; (iv) impairing the value of the City's assets; (v) increasing future repair and replacement costs; and (vi) harming the local economy.

Tax-Supported Debt Service

Under the State Constitution and the Charter, City bonds secured by *ad valorem* property taxes ("general obligation bonds") can only be authorized with a two-thirds approval of the voters. As of October 1, 2017, the City had approximately \$2.07 billion aggregate principal amount of general obligation bonds outstanding.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Table A-22 shows the annual amount of debt service payable on the City’s outstanding general obligation bonds.

TABLE A-22

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds Debt Service
As of October 1, 2017^{1 2}

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Debt Service
2017-18	\$123,873,225	\$88,868,612	\$212,741,837
2018-19	124,230,545	84,676,748	208,907,293
2019-20	123,541,232	78,649,111	202,190,343
2020-21	122,085,457	72,700,986	194,786,443
2021-22	128,083,401	67,121,223	195,204,624
2022-23	131,760,251	61,192,905	192,953,156
2023-24	134,366,206	54,907,030	189,273,236
2024-25	135,221,476	48,463,484	183,684,960
2025-26	130,491,279	42,140,369	172,631,648
2026-27	135,690,840	36,402,040	172,092,880
2027-28	140,604,035	30,447,874	171,051,909
2028-29	141,041,751	24,668,943	165,710,694
2029-30	137,285,095	18,856,513	156,141,608
2030-31	99,261,950	13,238,784	112,500,734
2031-32	102,620,000	9,573,281	112,193,281
2032-33	68,105,000	5,848,349	73,953,349
2033-34	43,770,000	3,291,929	47,061,929
2034-35	35,160,000	1,711,971	36,871,971
2035-36	12,680,000	475,476	13,155,476
TOTAL ³	\$2,069,871,743	\$743,235,628	\$2,813,107,371

¹ This table does not reflect any debt other than City direct tax-supported debt, such as any assessment district indebtedness or any redevelopment agency indebtedness.

² Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

³ Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of the assessed value of all real and personal assessment district indebtedness or any redevelopment agency indebtedness.

Source: Office of Public Finance, City and County of San Francisco.

General Obligation Bonds

Certain general obligation bonds authorized by the City’s voters as discussed below have not yet been issued. Such bonds may be issued at any time by action of the Board of Supervisors, without further approval by the voters.

In November 1992, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$350.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide moneys to fund the City’s Seismic Safety Loan Program (the “Loan Program”). The purpose of the Loan Program is to provide loans for the seismic strengthening of privately-owned unreinforced masonry buildings in San Francisco for affordable housing and market-rate residential, commercial and institutional purposes. In April 1994, the City issued \$35.0 million in taxable

general obligation bonds to fund the Loan Program and in October 2002, the City redeemed all outstanding bonds remaining from such issuance. In February 2007, the Board of Supervisors approved the issuance of additional indebtedness under this authorization in an amount not to exceed \$35.0 million. Such issuance would be achieved pursuant to the terms of a Credit Agreement with Bank of America, N.A. (the "Credit Bank"), under which the Credit Bank agreed to fund one or more loans to the City from time to time as evidenced by the City's issuance to the Credit Bank of the Taxable General Obligation Bond (Seismic Safety Loan Program), Series 2007A. The funding by the Credit Bank of the loans at the City's request and the terms of repayment of such loans are governed by the terms of the Credit Agreement. Loan funds received by the City from the Credit Bank are in turn used to finance loans to Seismic Safety Loan Program borrowers. In March 2007, the City initiated an initial borrowing of \$2.0 million, and in October 2007, the City borrowed approximately \$3.8 million from the Credit Bank. In January 2008, the City borrowed approximately \$3.9 million and in November 2008, the City borrowed \$1.3 million from the Credit Bank. Further borrowings under the Credit Agreement with the Credit Bank (up to the \$35.0 million not-to-exceed amount) are expected as additional loans to Seismic Safety Loan Program borrowers are approved. On November 8, 2016, voters approved Proposition C, authorizing the use of Seismic Safety Bond Program to fund the purchase and improvement of buildings in need of safety upgrades in order to convert them into affordable housing.

In February 2008, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$185.0 million in general obligation bonds for the construction, reconstruction, purchase, and/or improvement of park and recreation facilities located in the City and under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission or under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition A in the amount of approximately \$42.5 million in August 2008. The City issued the second series in the amount of approximately \$60.4 million in March 2010 and the third series in the amount of approximately \$73.4 million in March 2012. The City issued the fourth series in the amount of approximately \$8.7 million in January 2016.

In June 2010, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$412.3 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement and retrofitting of neighborhood fire and police stations, the auxiliary water supply system, a public safety building, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related costs. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition B in the amount of \$79.5 million in December 2010 and the second series of bonds in the amount of \$183.3 million in March 2012. The City issued the third series in the amount of approximately \$38.3 million in August 2012 and the fourth series of bonds in the amount of \$31.0 million in June 2013, and the fifth series in the amount of \$54.9 million was issued in October 2014. The final series was issued in June 2016 in the amount of approximately \$25 million. In November 2011, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$248.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to repair and repave City streets and remove potholes; strengthen and seismically upgrade street structures; redesign street corridors by adding or improving pedestrian signals, lighting, sidewalk extensions, bicycle lanes, trees and landscaping; construct and renovate curb ramps and sidewalks to increase accessibility and safety for everyone, including persons with disabilities; and add and upgrade traffic signals to improve MUNI service and traffic flow. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition B in the amount of approximately \$74.3 million in March 2012 and the second series of bonds in the amount of \$129.6 million in June 2013. The City issued the final series in June 2016 in the amount of approximately \$109 million.

In November 2012, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$195.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds for the construction, reconstruction, renovation, demolition, environmental remediation and/or improvement of park, open space, and recreation facilities located in the City and under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission or under the jurisdiction of

the Port Commission. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition B in the amount of approximately \$71.9 million in June 2013. The City issued the second series of bonds in the amount of \$43 million in January 2016.

In June 2014, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$400.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement and retrofitting of neighborhood fire and police stations, emergency firefighting water system, medical examiner facility, traffic company & forensic services division and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related costs. The City issued the first series of bonds in the amount of \$100.6 million in October 2014 and the second series of bonds in the amount of \$44 million in June 2016.

In November 2014, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$500 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the construction, acquisition and improvement of certain transportation and transit related improvements and other related costs. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition A in the amount of approximately \$67 million in June 2015.

In November 2015, voters approved Proposition A which authorized the issuance of up to \$310 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of housing affordable to low- and middle-income households and to assist in the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable rental apartment buildings to prevent the eviction of long-term residents; to repair and reconstruct dilapidated public housing; to fund a middle-income rental program; and to provide for homeownership down payment assistance opportunities for educators and middle-income households. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition A in the amount of approximately \$75 million in October 2016.

In June 2016, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$350 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to protect public health and safety, improve community medical and mental health care services, earthquake safety, and emergency medical response; to seismically improve, and modernize neighborhood fire stations and vital public health and homeless service sites; to construct a seismically safe and improved San Francisco Fire Department ambulance deployment facility; and to pay related costs. The City issued the first series of the bonds under Proposition A in the amount of approximately \$173.1 million in January 2017.

Refunding General Obligation Bonds

The Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 272-04 on May 11, 2004 (the "2004 Resolution"). The Mayor approved the 2004 Resolution on May 13, 2004. The 2004 Resolution authorized the issuance of not to exceed \$800.0 million aggregate principal amount of its General Obligation Refunding Bonds from time to time in one or more series for the purpose of refunding all or a portion of the City's then outstanding General Obligation Bonds. On November 1, 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted, and the Mayor approved, Resolution No. 448-11 (the "2011 Resolution," and together with the 2004 Resolution, the "Refunding Resolutions"). The 2011 Resolution authorized the issuance of not to exceed \$1.356 billion aggregate principal amount of the City's General Obligation Refunding Bonds from time to time in one or more series for the purpose of refunding certain outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City. The City has issued four series of refunding bonds currently outstanding under the Refunding Resolutions, as shown on Table A-23.

TABLE A-23

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Refunding Bonds
As of October 1, 2017

<u>Series Name</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Principal Amount Issued</u>	<u>Amount Outstanding</u>
2008-R1	May 2008	\$232,075,000	\$8,170,000
2008-R2	May 2008	39,320,000	11,105,000
2008-R3	July 2008	118,130,000	-
2011-R1	November 2011	339,475,000	226,920,000 ¹
2015-R1	February 2015	293,910,000	277,165,000 ²

¹ Series 2004-R1 Bonds were refunded by the 2011-R1 Bonds in November 2011

² Series 2006-R1, 2006-R2, and 2008-R3 Bonds were refunded by the 2015-R1 Bonds in February 2015.
 Series 2008-R3 Bonds were partially refunded and are no longer outstanding.

Table A-24 below lists for each of the City’s voter-authorized general obligation bond programs the amount issued and outstanding, and the amount of remaining authorization for which bonds have not yet been issued. Series are grouped by program authorization in chronological order. The authorized and unissued column refers to total program authorization that can still be issued, and does not refer to any particular series. As of October 1, 2017, the City had authorized and unissued general obligation bond authority of approximately \$1.37 billion.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-24

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO				
General Obligation Bonds				
As of October 1, 2017				
Description of Issue (Date of Authorization)	Series	Issued	Outstanding ¹	Authorized & Unissued
Seismic Safety Loan Program (11/3/92)	2007A	\$30,315,450	\$21,461,743	
	2015A	24,000,000	24,000,000	260,684,550
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks (2/5/08)	2010B	24,785,000	5,120,000	
	2010D	35,645,000	35,645,000	
	2012B	73,355,000	50,675,000	
	2016A	8,695,000	7,825,000	
San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (11/4/08)	2009A	131,650,000	10,790,000	
	2010A	120,890,000	24,980,000	
	2010C	173,805,000	173,805,000	
	2012D	251,100,000	163,495,000	
	2014A	209,955,000	169,055,000	
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (6/8/10)	2010E	79,520,000	43,175,000	
	2012A	183,330,000	127,945,000	
	2012E	38,265,000	31,400,000	
	2013B	31,020,000	18,320,000	
	2014C	54,950,000	43,665,000	
	2016C	25,215,000	23,260,000	
Road Repaving & Street Safety (11/8/11)	2012C	74,295,000	51,880,000	
	2013C	129,560,000	76,465,000	
	2016E	44,145,000	40,715,000	
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks (11/6/12)	2013A	71,970,000	42,490,000	
	2016B	43,220,000	25,395,000	79,810,000
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (6/3/14)	2014D	100,670,000	79,970,000	
	2016D	109,595,000	78,475,000	189,735,000
Transportation and Road Improvement (11/4/15)	2015B	67,005,000	45,375,000	432,995,000
Affordable Housing Bond (11/4/15)	2016F	75,130,000	53,060,000	234,870,000
Public Health and Safety Bond (6/7/16)	2017A	173,120,000	125,760,000	176,880,000
SUB TOTALS		\$2,385,205,450	\$1,594,201,743	\$1,374,974,550
General Obligation Refunding Bonds:				
	Series 2008-R1 issued 5/29/08	232,075,000	6,675,000	
	Series 2008-R2 issued 5/29/08	39,320,000	5,680,000	
	Series 2011-R1 issued 11/9/12	339,475,000	202,220,000	
	Series 2015-R1 issued 2/25/15	293,910,000	261,095,000	
SUB TOTALS		904,780,000	475,670,000	
TOTALS		\$3,289,985,450	\$2,069,871,743	\$1,374,974,550

¹ Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of the assessed value of all taxable real and personal property, located within the City and County.

Source: Office of Public Finance, City and County of San Francisco.

Lease Payments and Other Long-Term Obligations

The Charter requires that any lease-financing agreements with a nonprofit corporation or another public agency must be approved by a majority vote of the City's electorate, except (i) leases approved prior to April 1, 1977, (ii) refunding lease financing expected to result in net savings, and (iii) certain lease financing

for capital equipment. The Charter does not require voter approval of lease financing agreements with for-profit corporations or entities.

Table A-25 sets forth the aggregate annual lease payment obligations supported by the City's General Fund with respect to outstanding lease revenue bonds and certificates of participation as of October 1, 2017. Note that the annual payment obligations reflected in Table A-25 reflect the fully accreted value of any capital appreciation obligations as of the payment dates.

TABLE A-25

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO			
Lease Revenue Bonds and Certificates of Participation			
As of October 1, 2017			
Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Payment Obligation
2017-18	\$40,995,000	\$46,158,845	\$87,153,845
2018-19	63,790,000	62,426,217	126,216,217
2019-20	49,630,000	59,788,198	109,418,198
2020-21	58,345,000	57,310,890	115,655,890
2021-22	58,775,000	54,742,504	113,517,504
2022-23	61,390,000	52,119,175	113,509,175
2023-24	63,620,000	49,374,771	112,994,771
2024-25	63,985,000	46,505,114	110,490,114
2025-26	64,500,000	43,645,624	108,145,624
2026-27	67,545,000	40,628,011	108,173,011
2027-28	68,940,000	37,474,005	106,414,005
2028-29	72,160,000	34,218,461	106,378,461
2029-30	72,540,000	30,826,226	103,366,226
2030-31	64,540,000	27,588,665	92,128,665
2031-32	54,320,000	24,737,593	79,057,593
2032-33	55,495,000	22,446,642	77,941,642
2033-34	57,735,000	19,918,261	77,653,261
2034-35	46,410,000	17,650,673	64,060,673
2035-36	45,695,000	15,599,242	61,294,242
2036-37	44,775,000	13,589,230	58,364,230
2037-38	46,595,000	11,612,665	58,207,665
2038-39	48,485,000	9,553,956	58,038,956
2039-40	50,470,000	7,407,472	57,877,472
2040-41	52,520,000	5,172,668	57,692,668
2041-42	19,400,000	3,007,611	22,407,611
2042-43	10,125,000	1,242,000	11,367,000
2043-44	8,555,000	818,000	9,373,000
2044-45	8,895,000	475,800	9,370,800
2045-46	1,470,000	120,000	1,590,000
2046-47	1,530,000	61,200	1,591,200
TOTAL ¹	\$1,423,230,000	\$796,219,719 ²	\$2,219,449,719

¹ Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

² For purposes of this table, the interest rate on the Lease Revenue Bonds Series 2008-1, and 2008-2 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) is assumed to be 3.25%. These bonds are in variable rate mode.

Source: Office of Public Finance, City and County of San Francisco.

The City electorate has approved several lease revenue bond propositions, some of which have authorized but unissued bonds. The following lease programs have remaining authorization:

In 1987, voters approved Proposition B, which authorizes the City to lease finance (without limitation as to maximum aggregate par amount) the construction of new parking facilities, including garages and surface lots, in eight of the City's neighborhoods. In July 2000, the City issued \$8.2 million in lease revenue bonds to finance the construction of the North Beach Parking Garage, which was opened in February 2002. There is no current plan to issue any more bonds under Proposition B.

In 1990, voters approved Proposition C, which amended the Charter to authorize the City to lease-purchase equipment through a nonprofit corporation without additional voter approval but with certain restrictions. The City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation (the "Corporation") was incorporated for that purpose. Proposition C provides that the outstanding aggregate principal amount of obligations with respect to lease financings may not exceed \$20.0 million, with such amount increasing by five percent each fiscal year. As of October 1, 2017 the total authorized amount for such financings was \$71.1 million. The total principal amount outstanding as of October 1, 2017 was \$1.4 million.

In 1994, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$60.0 million in lease revenue bonds for the acquisition and construction of a combined dispatch center for the City's emergency 911 communication system and for the emergency information and communications equipment for the center. In 1997 and 1998, the Corporation issued \$22.6 million and \$23.3 million of Proposition B lease revenue bonds, respectively, leaving \$14.0 million in remaining authorization. There is no current plan to issue additional series of bonds under Proposition B.

In June 1997, voters approved Proposition D, which authorized the issuance of up to \$100.0 million in lease revenue bonds for the construction of a new football stadium at Candlestick Park, the previous home of the San Francisco 49ers football team. If issued, the \$100.0 million of lease revenue bonds would be the City's contribution toward the total cost of the stadium project and the 49ers would be responsible for paying the remaining cost of the stadium construction project. There is no current plan to issue the Proposition D bonds.

On March 7, 2000, voters approved Proposition C, which extended a two and one half cent per \$100.0 in assessed valuation property tax set-aside for the benefit of the Recreation and Park Department (the "Open Space Fund"). Proposition C also authorizes the issuance of lease revenue bonds or other forms of indebtedness payable from the Open Space Fund. The City issued approximately \$27.0 million and \$42.4 million of such Open Space Fund lease revenue bonds in October 2006 and October 2007, respectively.

In November 2007, voters approved Proposition D, which amended the Charter and renewed the Library Preservation Fund. Proposition D continues the two and one half cent per \$100.0 in assessed valuation property tax set-aside and establishes a minimum level of City appropriations, moneys that are maintained in the Library Preservation Fund. Proposition D also authorizes the issuance of revenue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness. The City issued the first series of lease revenue bonds in the amount of approximately \$34.3 million in March 2009.

Commercial Paper Program

The Board authorized on March 17, 2009 and the Mayor approved on March 24, 2009 the establishment of a not-to-exceed \$150.0 million Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation Program, Series 1 and 1-T and Series 2 and 2-T (the "CP Program"). Commercial Paper Notes (the "CP Notes") are

issued from time to time to pay approved project costs in connection with the acquisition, improvement, renovation and construction of real property and the acquisition of capital equipment and vehicles in anticipation of long-term or other take-out financing to be issued when market conditions are favorable. Projects are eligible to access the CP Program once the Board and the Mayor have approved the project and the long-term, permanent financing for the project. The former Series 1 and 1-T and Series 2 and 2-T letters of credit issued in 2010 by J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association expired in June 2016. In May 2016, the City obtained renewal credit facilities securing the CP Notes issued by State Street Bank and Trust Company with a maximum principal amount of \$75 million and by U.S. Bank National Association with a maximum principal amount of \$75 million. The renewal credit facilities will expire in May 2021.

The Board authorized on July 16, 2013 and the Mayor approved on July 25, 2013 an additional \$100.0 million Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation Program, Series 3 and 3-T and Series 4 and 4-T that increases the total authorization of the CP Program to \$250.0 million. The Series 3 and 3-T and 4 and 4-T are secured by a letter of credit issued by State Street Bank and Trust Company expiring February 2019.

As of September 30, 2017, the outstanding principal amount of CP Notes is \$22.3 million. The weighted average interest rate for CP Notes is approximately 0.88%.

Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Obligations

The Board of Supervisors authorized on October 26, 2010 and the Mayor approved on November 5, 2010 the issuance of not to exceed \$38 million in City and County of San Francisco certificates of participation to partially finance the rebuilding of severely distressed public housing sites, while increasing affordable housing and ownership opportunities and improving the quality of life for existing residents and the surrounding communities (the HOPE SF Project). The City anticipates issuing the certificates in the June of 2017.

The Board of Supervisors authorized on February 12, 2013 and the Mayor approved on February 15, 2013 the issuance of not to exceed \$507.9 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Moscone Expansion Project) payable from Moscone Expansion District assessments to finance the costs of additions and improvements to the George R. Moscone Convention Center. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in the summer of 2017.

The Board of Supervisors authorized October 8, 2013 and the Mayor approved October 11, 2013 the issuance of not to exceed \$13.5 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Treasure Island Improvement Project) to finance the cost of additions and improvements to the utility infrastructure at Treasure island.

Overlapping Debt

Table A-26 shows bonded debt and long-term obligations as of October 1, 2017 sold in the public capital markets by the City and those public agencies whose boundaries overlap the boundaries of the City in whole or in part. Long-term obligations of non-City agencies generally are not payable from revenues of the City. In many cases, long-term obligations issued by a public agency are payable only from the General Fund or other revenues of such public agency. In the table, lease obligations of the City which support indebtedness incurred by others are included. As noted below, the Charter limits the City's outstanding general obligation bond debt to 3% of the total assessed valuation of all taxable real and personal property within the City.

TABLE A-26

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations
As of October 1, 2017

<u>2017-18 Assessed Valuation</u> (net of non-reimbursable & homeowner exemptions):	\$234,074,596,933	
<u>DIRECT GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND DEBT</u>		
General City Purposes Carried on the Tax Roll	\$2,069,871,743	
GROSS DIRECT DEBT	\$2,069,871,743	
<u>DIRECT LEASE PAYMENT AND LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS</u>		
San Francisco Finance Corporation, Equipment LRBs Series 2012A, and 2013A	\$1,450,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation Emergency Communication Refunding Series, 2010-R1	9,975,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation Moscone Expansion Center, Series, 2008-1, 2008-2	96,020,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation LRBs Open Space Fund (Various Park Projects) Series 2006, 2007	43,940,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation LRBs Library Preservation Fund Series, 2009A	27,030,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009A Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Laguna Honda Hospital)	125,570,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009B Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Street Improvement Project)	31,190,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009C Office Project (525 Golden Gate Avenue) Tax Exempt	23,240,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009D Office Project (525 Golden Gate Avenue) Taxable BABs	129,550,000	
San Francisco Refunding Certificates of Participation, Series 2010A	100,575,000	
San Francisco COPs, Refunding Series 2011AB (Moscone)	25,515,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2012A Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Street Improvement Project)	36,815,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2013A Moscone Center Improvement	-	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2013BC Port Facilities	32,275,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2014-R1 (Courthouse Project), 2014-R2 (Juvenile Hall Project)	38,350,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2015AB War Memorial Veterans Building Seismic Upgrade and Improvements	127,810,000	
San Francisco Refunding COPs, Series 2015-R1 (City Office Buildings-Multiple Properties Project)	118,100,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2016A War Memorial Veterans Building Seismic Upgrade and Improvements	15,170,000	
San Francisco COPs Series 2017A (Hope SF)	28,320,000	
San Francisco COPs Series 2017B (Moscone Convention Center Expansion)	412,355,000	
LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$1,423,250,000	
GROSS DIRECT DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$3,493,121,743	
<u>OVERLAPPING DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS</u>		
Bayshore Hester Assessment District	\$510,000	
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (33%) Sales Tax Revenue Bonds	72,628,333	
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (29%) General Obligation Bonds, Series 2005A, 2007B	100,763,400	
San Francisco Community College District General Obligation Bonds (2001, 2005)	247,520,000	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Hotel Tax Revenue Bonds (2011)	30,995,000	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Obligations (Property Tax Increment)	760,367,853	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Obligations (Special Tax Bonds)	148,875,249	
Association of Bay Area Governments Obligations (Special Tax Bonds)	17,795,000	
Special Tax District No. 2009-1 Improvement Area 1, 2 SF Sustainable Financing	2,999,392	
San Francisco Unified School District General Obligation Bonds (2003, 2006, 2011, 2015R, 2016, 2017)	1,021,010,000	
TOTAL OVERLAPPING DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$2,403,464,227	
GROSS COMBINED TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	\$5,896,585,970 ¹	
<u>Ratios to Assessed Valuation:</u>		
	Actual Ratio	Charter Req.
Gross Direct Debt (General Obligation Bonds)	0.88%	< 3.00% ²
Gross Direct Debt & Long-Term Obligations	1.49%	n/a
Gross Combined Total Obligations	2.52%	n/a

¹ Excludes revenue and mortgage revenue bonds and non-bonded third party financing lease obligations. Also excludes tax allocation bonds sold in August, 2009.

² Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of the assessed value of all taxable real and personal property, located within the City and County.

On November 4, 2003, voters approved Proposition A. Proposition A of 2003 authorized the SFUSD to issue up to \$295.0 million of general obligation bonds to repair and rehabilitate school facilities, and various other improvements. The SFUSD issued \$58.0 million of such authorization in October 2004, \$130.0 million in October 2005, and \$92.0 million in October 2006, leaving \$15.0 million authorized but unissued. In March 2012, the SFUSD issued \$116.1 million in refunding general obligation bonds that refunded \$137.4 million in general obligation bonds authorized under Proposition A of 2003.

On November 2, 2004, voters approved Proposition AA. Proposition AA authorized the San Francisco BART to issue general obligation bonds in one or more series over time in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$980.0 million to strengthen tunnels, bridges, overhead tracks and the underwater Transbay Tube for BART facilities in Alameda and Contra Costa counties and the City. Of the \$980.0 million, the portion payable from the levy of *ad valorem* taxes on property within the City is approximately 29.0% or \$282.0 million. Of such authorization, BART issued \$100.0 million in May 2005 and \$400.0 million in July 2007, of which the allocable City portion is approximately \$29.0 million and \$116.0 million, respectively.

On November 7, 2006, voters approved Proposition A. Proposition A of 2006 authorized the SFUSD to issue an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$450.0 million of general obligation bonds to modernize and repair up to 64 additional school facilities and various other improvements. The SFUSD issued the first series in the aggregate principal amount of \$100 million under the Proposition A authorization in February 2007. The SFUSD issued the second series in the aggregate principal amount of \$150.0 million under the Proposition A authorization in January 2009. The SFUSD issued the third series in the aggregate principal amount of \$185.0 million under the Proposition A authorization in May 2010.

On November 8, 2011, voters approved Proposition A. Proposition A of 2011 authorized the SFUSD to issue an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$531.0 million of general obligation bonds to repair and rehabilitate school facilities to current accessibility, health, safety, and instructional standards, and where applicable, replace worn-out plumbing, electrical and other major building systems, replace aging heating, ventilation and air handling systems, renovate outdated classrooms and training facilities, construct facilities to replace aging modular classrooms. The SFUSD issued the first series in the aggregate principal amount of \$115.0 million under the Proposition A of 2011 authorization in March 2012.

On November 8, 2016, voters approved Proposition A. Proposition A of 2016 authorized the SFUSD to issue an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$744.25 million of general obligation bonds to repair and rehabilitate San Francisco Unified School District facilities to current accessibility, health, safety, seismic and instructional standards, replace worn-out plumbing, electrical, HVAC, and major building systems, renovate outdated classrooms and training facilities, construct school facilities and replace aging modular classrooms, improve information technology systems and food service preparation systems. The SFUSD issued the first series in the aggregate principal amount of \$180.0 million under the Proposition A of 2016 authorization in March 2017.

MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Numerous development and construction projects are in progress throughout the City at any given time. This section describes several of the most significant privately owned and managed real estate developments currently under way in the City in which there is City participation, generally in the form of a public/private partnership. The information in this section has been prepared by the City based on City-approved plans as well as unofficial plans and representations of the developer in each case, and includes forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements consist of expressions of opinion, estimates, predictions, projections, plans and the like; such forward-looking statements in this section are

those of the developers and not of the City. The City makes no prediction, representation or assurance that the plans and projects described will actually be accomplished, or the time frame in which the developments will be completed, or as to the financial impact on City real estate taxes, developer fees, other tax and fee income, employment, retail or real estate activity, or other consequences that might be expected or projected to result from the successful completion of each development project. Completion of development in each case may depend on the local economy, the real estate market, the financial health of the developer and others involved in the project, specific features of each development and its attractiveness to buyers, tenants and others, as well as the financial health of such buyers, tenants, and others. Completion and success of each development will also likely depend on other factors unknown to the City.

Hunters Point Shipyard (Phase 1 and 2) and Candlestick Point

The Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 and 2 and Candlestick Point project area will deliver approximately 12,100 new homes, approximately 32 percent of which will be below market rate and will include the rebuilding of the Alice Griffith public housing development consistent with the City's HOPE SF program, up to 3 million square feet of research and development space, and more than 350 acres of new parks in the southeast portion of San Francisco (the "Project"). In total, the Project will generate over \$6 billion of new economic activity to the City, more than 12,000 permanent jobs, hundreds of new construction jobs each year, new community facilities, new transit infrastructure, and provide approximately \$90 million in community benefits. The Project's full build out will occur over 20 to 30 years. In the next five years over 1,000 units of housing and 26 acres of parks will be completed in the first phase of the Shipyard.

The first phase of development has begun at the Hunters Point Shipyard site with approximately 200 completed units and an additional 350 units currently under construction. An additional 230 units will begin construction in 2017. On Candlestick Point, 306 housing units are under construction which includes a mix of public housing replacement and new, affordable units. In 2016, horizontal infrastructure construction commenced, which will support up to 1,710 units of housing, including 290 stand-alone affordable units and up to 145 inclusionary units, a 635,000 square foot mixed-use retail center, 220-room hotel, and a community facilities parcel. Two hillside open space areas at the base of Bayview Hill will be improved and a new wedge park and plaza will also be constructed, adding a total of 8.6 acres of open space adjacent to the new retail and residential development.

Treasure Island

Former Naval Station Treasure Island is located in the San Francisco Bay and connected to the City by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The former base, which ceased operations in 1997, consists of approximately 405 acres on Treasure Island and 90 acres on adjoining Yerba Buena Island. Development plans for the islands include up to 8,000 new homes, 25% of which will be offered at below-market rates; up to 500 hotel rooms; a 400 slip marina; restaurants; retail and entertainment venues; and a world-class 300-acre parks and open space system. The compact mixed-use transit-oriented development is centered around a new ferry terminal connecting the island to downtown San Francisco and is designed to prioritize walking, biking and public transit. The development plans include green building standards and best practices in low-impact development.

The first major land transfer from the Navy to the Treasure Island Development Authority ("TIDA") occurred in May 2015 and included the northern half of Yerba Buena Island and more than half of the area of Treasure Island. The developer, Treasure Island Community Development ("TICD"), received its first land transfer in February 2016, and demolition and initial infrastructure improvements under

contract are currently underway. The first phase of development will include extensive horizontal infrastructure improvements (utilities, roadway improvements, site preparation, etc.) as well as the initial vertical developments. The complete build-out of the project is anticipated to occur over fifteen to twenty years.

Mission Bay Blocks 29-32– Warriors Multipurpose Recreation and Entertainment Venue

The Golden State Warriors, a National Basketball Association team, is developing a multipurpose recreation and entertainment venue and associated development in Mission Bay. The site is bordered by Third Street to the West, Terry Francois Boulevard to the East, 16th Street to the South and South Street to the North. The Warriors project includes a state-of-the-art multi-purpose recreation and entertainment venue for Warriors' home games, concerts and family shows. The site will also have restaurants, retail, office space, bike valet, public plazas and a limited amount of parking, and trigger the construction of a new 5 acre Bay Front Park between the new event center and the Bay. Environmental review has been completed for the site, and was upheld in a November 2016 decision. The project began construction in January 2017 and the event center is scheduled to open in time for the 2019-2020 basketball season.

Transbay

The Transbay Project Redevelopment Project Area was adopted in 2005 with the purpose of redeveloping 10 acres of property owned by the State in order to generate funding for the new Salesforce Transit Center. In 2012 the Transit Center District Plan, the guiding document for the area surrounding the transit center, was approved by the Planning Commission and by the Board of Supervisors. The Transit Center District Plan includes additional funding sources for the Salesforce Transit Center. The Transbay Program will replace the former Transbay Terminal at First and Mission Streets with a modern transit hub and extend the Caltrain commuter rail line underground 1.3 miles into the Financial District. The Salesforce Transit Center broke ground on August 11, 2010, and is scheduled to commence operations in Spring 2018. Demolition of existing structures on the site was completed in August 2011.

The 10 acres of property formerly owned by the State surrounding the Transbay Transit Center is being redeveloped with plans for 3,300 new homes, 1,400 to be affordable below-market rate homes, over 2 million square feet of new office space, over 9 acres of new parks and open space, and a new retail boulevard on Folsom Street. The first project completed in the neighborhood was Rene Cazenave Apartments, 120 units of permanent affordable housing for formerly homeless individuals. Recently completed was Solaire, 479 residential units of which 70 units are affordable. There are over 1,600 units currently under construction on Folsom Street, 767,000 square feet of office space under construction at Howard and Beale Streets, and 1.4 million square feet of office space under construction at Mission and First Streets.

The Pelli Clarke Pelli Architects-designed transit center will serve more than 100,000 people per day through eleven transportation systems, including future California High Speed Rail, which will be designed to connect San Francisco to Los Angeles in less than 2-1/2 hours. The center is designed to embrace the goals of green architecture and sustainability. The heart of the Salesforce Transit Center, "Salesforce Park," a 5.4-acre public park atop the facility, that will serve as a living green roof for the transit facility. The center will have a LEED rating of at least Silver. The \$6 billion Program is funded by various public funding partners, including the federal government, the State, the Metropolitan Transportation

Commission, the San Francisco County and San Mateo County Transportation Authorities, and AC Transit, among others.

Mission Bay

The development plans for Mission Bay include a new University of California-San Francisco (“UCSF”) research campus containing 3.15 million square feet of building space on 46 acres of land, of which 43 acres were donated by the Mission Bay Master Developer and the City; UCSF’s 550-bed hospital; 3.4 million square feet of biotech, ‘cleantech’ and health care office space; 6,400 housing units, with 1,850 (29%) affordable to moderate-, low-, and very low-income households; 425,000 square feet of retail space; a 250-room hotel with up to 25,000 square feet of retail entertainment uses; 49 acres of public open space, including parks along Mission Creek and San Francisco Bay and eight acres of open space within the UCSF campus; a new 500-student public school; and a new fire and police station and police headquarters. Mission Bay is approximately 50% complete.

Over 5,296 units have been completed with an additional 493 units under construction, along with several new parks. Another 119 affordable housing units, a 250-room hotel and the mixed-use Chase Event Center project will house the Golden State Warriors have broken or will break ground in 2017.

Seawall Lot (SWL) 337 and Pier 48 (Mission Rock)

Mission Rock is a proposed mixed-use development at Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48, Port-owned property comprising approximately 25 acres. The Port, OEWD in its capacity as lead negotiator, and Mission Rock’s competitively-selected master developer, Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, have agreed on a development concept and corresponding financial terms for Mission Rock, which are reflected in a non-binding Term Sheet that the Port Commission and Board of Supervisors have endorsed and which will be finalized in a Development Agreement following environmental review.

The proposed development plan for Mission Rock set forth in the term sheet includes: approximately 8 acres of public parks and open spaces, including a 5-acre regional waterfront park; 650 to 1,500 new housing units, 15 percent of which will be affordable to low-income households; 1.3 to 1.7 million square feet of commercial space; 150,000 to 250,000 square feet of retail space, approximately 3,000 parking spaces within mixed-use buildings and a dedicated parking structure, which will serve San Francisco Giants baseball team patrons as well as Mission Rock occupants and visitors; and the rehabilitation and reuse of historic Pier 48 as a new brewery/distillery for Anchor Steam Brewing Company.

In the wake of the passage of Proposition B on the June 2013 ballot, the developer, Port and OEWD staff have continued to engage relevant agencies and stakeholders to further refine the project plan. The environmental review process was initiated in January 2014 and is expected to last until mid-2017. That process will be accompanied by negotiation of transaction agreements and approval of any needed height limit and zoning changes.

Pier 70

Plans for Pier 70 call for substantial development, including major parks and historic building rehabilitation, on this 69-acre site to achieve a number of goals, including preservation and adaptive reuse of historic structures; retention of the ship repair operations; provision of new open space; reactivation and economic development on the site; and needed infrastructure and site remediation. The Port, which controls Pier 70, and OEWD, in its capacity as lead negotiator, have initiated preliminary negotiations with

Forest City, the developer selected to build a new mixed-use neighborhood on a 28-acre portion of Pier 70 known as the Waterfront Site. The parties have agreed on a development concept and corresponding financial terms for the Waterfront Site, which are reflected in a non-binding Term Sheet that the Port Commission and Board of Supervisors have endorsed and which will be finalized in a Development Agreement following community and environmental review. In November 2014, Proposition F was approved by the voters, authorizing an increase of height limits on Pier 70 from 40 feet to 90 feet.

Current development plans for the Pier 70 Waterfront Site call for 7 acres of parks and up to 3.25 million square feet of above-grade construction (not including parking) which may include up to 1.7 million square feet of office space; up to 400,000 square feet of retail, small-scale production, arts space intended to establish the new district as destination with unique character; and approximately 1600 housing units, with 30% percent of them made available to low- and middle- income households. This built area includes three historic industrial buildings that will be rehabilitated as part of the Waterfront Site development. Conclusion of the environmental review process, transaction agreements and planning approval are expected in mid-2017.

Moscone Convention Center

The Moscone Center Expansion Project will add approximately 300,000 square feet and repurpose an additional 120,000 square feet to the portion of the existing Moscone Center located on Howard Street between 3rd and 4th Streets in the Yerba Buena Gardens neighborhood of San Francisco. Nearly 140,000 square feet of this additional space would be created by excavating and expanding the existing below-grade exhibition halls that connect the Moscone North and South buildings under Howard Street, with the remaining consisting of new and repurposed lobby area, new multi-purpose/meeting room area, and new and repurposed building support area.

In addition to adding new rentable square footage, the project architects propose an iconic sense of arrival that enhances Moscone's civic presence on Howard Street and reconnects it to the surrounding neighborhood through the creation of reintroduced lost mid-block passageways. As such, the project proposes a new mid-block pedestrian entrance from Third Street and a replacement pedestrian bridge connecting Yerba Buena Gardens with the cultural facilities and children's playground to the south. An additional enclosed pedestrian bridge would provide enhanced circulation for Moscone convention attendees and reduce on-street congestion.

A May 2012 analysis by Jones Lang Lasalle Hotels estimated that the City would lose up to \$2 billion in foregone revenue over the next decade if Moscone was not expanded. The project allows the City to recover approximately \$734 million of this future revenue and create 3,480 local jobs through a phased construction schedule that keeps Moscone in continuous revenue generating operation.

The proposed project is a joint partnership between the City and the hotel industry, acting through the Tourist Improvement District Management Corporation, with the City paying approximately one-third of all expansion costs and the hotel community paying approximately two-thirds. The Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the creation of the Moscone Expansion District and the issuance of \$507 million in Certificates of Participation on February 5, 2013 and the Planning Commission unanimously approved the project on August 15, 2014. Project development began in December 2012, with major construction starting in November 2014. The project is expected to reach completion by the end of 2018.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES

Several constitutional and statutory limitations on taxes, revenues and expenditures exist under State law which limit the ability of the City to impose and increase taxes and other revenue sources and to spend such revenues, and which, under certain circumstances, would permit existing revenue sources of the City to be reduced by vote of the City electorate. These constitutional and statutory limitations, and future limitations, if enacted, could potentially have an adverse impact on the City's general finances and its ability to raise revenue, or maintain existing revenue sources, in the future. However, *ad valorem* property taxes required to be levied to pay debt service on general obligation bonds was authorized and approved in accordance with all applicable constitutional limitations. A summary of the currently effective limitations is set forth below.

Article XIII A of the California Constitution

Article XIII A of the California Constitution, known as "Proposition 13," was approved by the California voters in June of 1978. It limits the amount of *ad valorem* tax on real property to 1% of "full cash value," as determined by the county assessor. Article XIII A defines "full cash value" to mean the county assessor's valuation of real property as shown on the 1975-76 tax bill under "full cash value," or thereafter, the appraised value of real property when "purchased, newly constructed or a change in ownership has occurred" (as such terms are used in Article XIII A) after the 1975 assessment. Furthermore, all real property valuation may be increased or decreased to reflect the inflation rate, as shown by the CPI or comparable data, in an amount not to exceed 2% per year, or may be reduced in the event of declining property values caused by damage, destruction or other factors. Article XIII A provides that the 1% limitation does not apply to *ad valorem* taxes to pay interest or redemption charges on 1) indebtedness approved by the voters prior to July 1, 1978, 2) any bonded indebtedness for the acquisition or improvement of real property approved on or after July 1, 1978, by two-thirds of the votes cast by the voters voting on the proposition, or 3) bonded indebtedness incurred by a school district or community college district for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or replacement of school facilities or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities, approved by 55% of the voters of the district voting on the proposition, but only if certain accountability measures are included in the proposition.

The California Revenue and Taxation Code permits county assessors who have reduced the assessed valuation of a property as a result of natural disasters, economic downturns or other factors, to subsequently "recapture" such value (up to the pre-decline value of the property) at an annual rate higher or lower than 2%, depending on the assessor's measure of the restoration of value of the damaged property. The California courts have upheld the constitutionality of this procedure.

Since its adoption, Article XIII A has been amended a number of times. These amendments have created a number of exceptions to the requirement that property be assessed when purchased, newly constructed or a change in ownership has occurred. These exceptions include certain transfers of real property between family members, certain purchases of replacement dwellings for persons over age 55 and by property owners whose original property has been destroyed in a declared disaster, and certain improvements to accommodate persons with disabilities and for seismic upgrades to property. These amendments have resulted in marginal reductions in the property tax revenues of the City. Both the California State Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court have upheld the validity of Article XIII .

Article XIII B of the California Constitution

Article XIII B was enacted by California voters as an initiative constitutional amendment in November 1979. Article XIII B limits the annual appropriations from the proceeds of taxes of the State and any city, county, school district, authority or other political subdivision of the State to the level of appropriations for the prior fiscal year, as adjusted for changes in the cost of living, population, and services rendered by the governmental entity. However, no limit is imposed on the appropriation of local revenues and taxes to pay debt service on bonds existing or authorized by January 1, 1979, or subsequently authorized by the voters. Article XIII B includes a requirement that if an entity's revenues in any year exceed the amount permitted to be spent, the excess would have to be returned by revising tax or fee schedules over the next two years.

Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution

Proposition 218, an initiative constitutional amendment, approved by the voters of the State in 1996, added Articles XII C and XIII D to the State Constitution, which affect the ability of local governments, including charter cities such as the City, to levy and collect both existing and future taxes, assessments, fees and charges. Proposition 218 does not affect the levy and collection of taxes for voter-approved debt. However, Proposition 218 affects the City's finances in other ways. Article XIII C requires that all new local taxes be submitted to the electorate for approval before such taxes become effective. Taxes for general governmental purposes of the City require a majority vote and taxes for specific purposes require a two-thirds vote. Under Proposition 218, the City can only continue to collect taxes that were imposed after January 1, 1995 if voters subsequently approved such taxes by November 6, 1998. All of the City's local taxes subject to such approval have been either reauthorized in accordance with Proposition 218 or discontinued. The voter approval requirements of Article XIII C reduce the City's flexibility to manage fiscal problems through new, extended or increased taxes. No assurance can be given that the City will be able to raise taxes in the future to meet increased expenditure requirements.

In addition, Article XIII C addresses the initiative power in matters of local taxes, assessments, fees and charges. Pursuant to Article XIII C, the voters of the City could, by initiative, repeal, reduce or limit any existing or future local tax, assessment, fee or charge, subject to certain limitations imposed by the courts and additional limitations with respect to taxes levied to repay bonds. The City raises a substantial portion of its revenues from various local taxes which are not levied to repay bonded indebtedness and which could be reduced by initiative under Article XIII C. No assurance can be given that the voters of the City will disapprove initiatives that repeal, reduce or prohibit the imposition or increase of local taxes, assessments, fees or charges. See "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" herein, for a discussion of other City taxes that could be affected by Proposition 218.

With respect to the City's general obligation bonds (City bonds secured by *ad valorem* property taxes), the State Constitution and the laws of the State impose a duty on the Board of Supervisors to levy a property tax sufficient to pay debt service coming due in each year. The initiative power cannot be used to reduce or repeal the authority and obligation to levy such taxes which are pledged as security for payment of the City's general obligation bonds or to otherwise interfere with performance of the duty of the City with respect to such taxes which are pledged as security for payment of those bonds.

Article XIII D contains several provisions making it generally more difficult for local agencies, such as the City, to levy and maintain "assessments" (as defined in Article XIII D) for local services and programs. The City has created a number of special assessment districts both for neighborhood business improvement purposes and community benefit purposes, and has caused limited obligation bonds to be issued in 1996 to finance construction of a new public right of way. The City cannot predict the future impact of

Proposition 218 on the finances of the City, and no assurance can be given that Proposition 218 will not have a material adverse impact on the City's revenues.

Statutory Limitations

On November 4, 1986, California voters adopted Proposition 62, an initiative statute that, among other things, requires (i) that any new or increased general purpose tax be approved by a two-thirds vote of the local governmental entity's legislative body and by a majority vote of the voters, and (ii) that any new or increased special purpose tax be approved by a two-thirds vote of the voters.

In *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino*, 11 Cal. 4th 220 (1995) (the "Santa Clara decision"), the California Supreme Court upheld a Court of Appeal decision invalidating a one-half cent countywide sales tax for transportation purposes levied by a local transportation authority. The California Supreme Court based its decision on the failure of the authority to obtain a two-thirds vote for the levy of a "special tax" as required by Proposition 62. The *Santa Clara* decision did not address the question of whether it should be applied retroactively. In *McBrearty v. City of Brawley*, 59 Cal. App. 4th 1441 (1997), the Court of Appeal, Fourth District, concluded that the *Santa Clara* decision is to be applied retroactively to require voter approval of taxes enacted after the adoption of Proposition 62 but before the *Santa Clara* decision.

The *Santa Clara* decision also did not decide, and the California Supreme Court has not otherwise decided, whether Proposition 62 applies to charter cities. The City is a charter city. Cases decided by the California Courts of Appeal have held that the voter approval requirements of Proposition 62 do not apply to certain taxes imposed by charter cities. See *Fielder v. City of Los Angeles*, 14 Cal. App. 4th 137 (1993) and *Fisher v. County of Alameda*, 20 Cal. App. 4th 120 (1993).

Proposition 62, as an initiative statute, does not have the same level of authority as a constitutional initiative, but is analogous to legislation adopted by the State Legislature, except that it may be amended only by a vote of the State's electorate. Since it is a statute, it is subordinate to the authority of charter cities to impose taxes derived from the State Constitution. Proposition 218 (discussed above), however, incorporates the voter approval requirements initially imposed by Proposition 62 into the State Constitution.

Even if a court were to conclude that Proposition 62 applies to charter cities, the City's exposure under Proposition 62 may not be significant. The effective date of Proposition 62 was November 1986. Proposition 62 contains provisions that apply to taxes imposed on or after August 1, 1985. Since August 1, 1985, the City has collected taxes on businesses, hotel occupancy, utility use, parking, property transfer, stadium admissions and vehicle rentals. See "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" herein. Only the hotel and stadium admissions taxes have been increased since that date. The increases in these taxes were ratified by the voters on November 3, 1998 pursuant to the requirements of Proposition 218. With the exception of the vehicle rental tax, the City continues to collect all of the taxes listed above. Since these remaining taxes were adopted prior to August 1, 1985, and have not been increased, these taxes would not be subject to Proposition 62 even if Proposition 62 applied to a charter city.

Proposition 1A

Proposition 1A, a constitutional amendment proposed by the State Legislature and approved by the voters in November 2004, provides that the State may not reduce any local sales tax rate, limit existing local government authority to levy a sales tax rate, or change the allocation of local sales tax revenues, subject to certain exceptions. As set forth under the laws in effect as of November 3, 2004, Proposition 1A

generally prohibits the State from shifting any share of property tax revenues allocated to local governments for any fiscal year to schools or community colleges. Any change in the allocation of property tax revenues among local governments within a county must be approved by two-thirds of both houses of the Legislature. Proposition 1A provides, however, that beginning in fiscal year 2008-09, the State may shift to schools and community colleges up to 8% of local government property tax revenues, which amount must be repaid, with interest, within three years, if the Governor proclaims that the shift is needed due to a severe State financial hardship, the shift is approved by two-thirds of both houses and certain other conditions are met. The State may also approve voluntary exchanges of local sales tax and property tax revenues among local governments within a county.

Proposition 1A also provides that if the State reduces the annual vehicle license fee rate below 0.65% of vehicle value, the State must provide local governments with equal replacement revenues. Further, Proposition 1A requires the State to suspend State mandates affecting cities, counties and special districts, excepting mandates relating to employee rights, schools or community colleges, in any year that the State does not fully reimburse local governments for their costs to comply with such mandates.

Proposition 1A may result in increased and more stable City revenues. The magnitude of such increase and stability is unknown and would depend on future actions by the State. However, Proposition 1A could also result in decreased resources being available for State programs. This reduction, in turn, could affect actions taken by the State to resolve budget difficulties. Such actions could include increasing State taxes, decreasing aid to cities and spending on other State programs, or other actions, some of which could be adverse to the City.

Proposition 22

Proposition 22 (“Proposition 22”) which was approved by California voters in November 2010, prohibits the State, even during a period of severe fiscal hardship, from delaying the distribution of tax revenues for transportation, redevelopment, or local government projects and services and prohibits fuel tax revenues from being loaned for cash-flow or budget balancing purposes to the State General Fund or any other State fund. In addition, Proposition 22 generally eliminates the State’s authority to temporarily shift property taxes from cities, counties, and special districts to schools, temporarily increase a school and community college district’s share of property tax revenues, prohibits the State from borrowing or redirecting redevelopment property tax revenues or requiring increased pass-through payments thereof, and prohibits the State from reallocating vehicle license fee revenues to pay for State-imposed mandates. In addition, Proposition 22 requires a two-thirds vote of each house of the State Legislature and a public hearing process to be conducted in order to change the amount of fuel excise tax revenues shared with cities and counties. Proposition 22 prohibits the State from enacting new laws that require redevelopment agencies to shift funds to schools or other agencies (but see “San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution” above). While Proposition 22 will not change overall State and local government costs or revenues by the express terms thereof, it will cause the State to adopt alternative actions to address its fiscal and policy objectives.

Due to the prohibition with respect to the State’s ability to take, reallocate, and borrow money raised by local governments for local purposes, Proposition 22 supersedes certain provisions of Proposition 1A (2004). However, borrowings and reallocations from local governments during 2009 are not subject to Proposition 22 prohibitions. In addition, Proposition 22 supersedes Proposition 1A of 2006. Accordingly, the State is prohibited from borrowing sales taxes or excise taxes on motor vehicle fuels or changing the allocations of those taxes among local governments except pursuant to specified procedures involving public notices and hearings.

Proposition 26

On November 2, 2010, the voters approved Proposition 26 (“Proposition 26”), revising certain provisions of Articles XIII and XIII of the California Constitution. Proposition 26 re-categorizes many State and local fees as taxes, requires local governments to obtain two-thirds voter approval for taxes levied by local governments, and requires the State to obtain the approval of two-thirds of both houses of the State Legislature to approve State laws that increase taxes. Furthermore, pursuant to Proposition 26, any increase in a fee beyond the amount needed to provide the specific service or benefit is deemed to be a tax and the approval thereof will require a two-thirds vote. In addition, for State-imposed charges, any tax or fee adopted after January 1, 2010 with a majority vote which would have required a two-thirds vote if Proposition 26 were effective at the time of such adoption is repealed as of November 2011 absent the re-adoption by the requisite two-thirds vote.

Proposition 26 amends Article XIII of the State Constitution to state that a “tax” means a levy, charge or exaction of any kind imposed by a local government, except (1) a charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege; (2) a charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the service or product; (3) a charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to a local government for issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof; (4) a charge imposed for entrance to or use of local government property or the purchase rental or lease of local government property; (5) a fine, penalty, or other monetary charge imposed by the judicial branch of government or a local government as a result of a violation of law, including late payment fees, fees imposed under administrative citation ordinances, parking violations, etc.; (6) a charge imposed as a condition of property development; or (7) assessments and property related fees imposed in accordance with the provisions of Proposition 218. Fees, charges and payments that are made pursuant to a voluntary contract that are not “imposed by a local government” are not considered taxes and are not covered by Proposition 26.

Proposition 26 applies to any levy, charge or exaction imposed, increased, or extended by local government on or after November 3, 2010. Accordingly, fees adopted prior to that date are not subject to the measure until they are increased or extended or if it is determined that an exemption applies.

If the local government specifies how the funds from a proposed local tax are to be used, the approval will be subject to a two-thirds voter requirement. If the local government does not specify how the funds from a proposed local tax are to be used, the approval will be subject to a fifty percent voter requirement. Proposed local government fees that are not subject to Proposition 26 are subject to the approval of a majority of the governing body. In general, proposed property charges will be subject to a majority vote of approval by the governing body although certain proposed property charges will also require approval by a majority of property owners.

Future Initiatives and Changes in Law

The laws and Constitutional provisions described above were each adopted as measures that qualified for the ballot pursuant to the State’s initiative process. From time to time other initiative measures could be adopted, further affecting revenues of the City or the City’s ability to expend revenues. The nature and impact of these measures cannot be anticipated by the City.

On April 25, 2013, the California Supreme Court in *McWilliams v. City of Long Beach* (April 25, 2013, No. S202037), held that the claims provisions of the Government Claims Act (Government Code Section 900 *et. seq.*) govern local tax and fee refund actions (absent another State statute governing the issue), and that local ordinances were without effect. The effect of the *McWilliams* case is that local governments could face class actions over disputes involving taxes and fees. Such cases could expose local governments to significant refund claims in the future. The City cannot predict whether any such class claims will be filed against it in the future, the outcome of any such claim or its impact on the City.

LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Pending Litigation

There are a number of lawsuits and claims routinely pending against the City, including those summarized in Note 16 to the City's CAFR as of June 30, 2016, attached as Appendix B to this Official Statement. Included among these are a number of actions which if successful would be payable from the City's General Fund. In the opinion of the City Attorney, such suits and claims presently pending will not materially impair the ability of the City to pay debt service on the Certificates, its General Fund lease or other debt obligations, nor materially impair the City's ability to fund current operations.

Millennium Tower is a 58-story luxury residential building completed in 2009 and located at 301 Mission Street in downtown San Francisco. On August 17, 2016, some owners of condominiums in Millennium Tower filed a lawsuit (the "Lehman Lawsuit") against the Transbay Joint Powers Authority ("TJPA") and the individual members of the TJPA, including the City. The TJPA is a joint exercise of powers authority created by the City, the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, and Caltrans (ex officio). The TJPA is responsible under State law for developing and operating the Transbay Transit Center, which will be a new regional transit hub located near the Millennium Tower. See "MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS—Transbay".

The TJPA began excavation and construction of the Transbay Transit Center in 2010, after the Millennium Tower was completed. In brief, the Lehman Lawsuit claims that the construction of the Transbay Transit Center harmed the Millennium Tower by causing it to settle into the soil more than planned and tilt toward the west/northwest, and the owners claim unspecified monetary damages for inverse condemnation and nuisance. The TJPA has asserted that the Millennium Tower was already sinking more than planned and tilting before the TJPA began construction of the Transbay Transit Center and that the TJPA took precautionary efforts to avoid exacerbating the situation. In addition to the Lehman Lawsuit, several other lawsuits have been filed against the TJPA related to the subsidence and tilting of the Millennium Tower. Since the Lehman Lawsuit, the City has been named as a defendant in two other lawsuits related to the Millennium Tower including the "Buttery Lawsuit". The BATTERY Lawsuit alleged that the City failed to inform buyers of various conditions of the Millennium Tower property, but all claims against the City in that action have been voluntarily dismissed. On May 4, 2017, a new lawsuit was filed by additional owners, the Montana family and their trust (the "Montana Lawsuit"), against a number of parties, including the TJPA and the City. The City expects that other lawsuits may be filed against the TJPA and the City relating to the Millennium Tower. The City continues to evaluate the lawsuits, and the subject matter of the lawsuits, but cannot now make any prediction as to the outcome of the lawsuits, or whether the lawsuits, if determined adversely to the TJPA or the City, would have a material adverse impact on City finances.

Risk Retention Program

Citywide risk management is coordinated by the Office of Risk Management Division within the City's General Services Agency, which is under the supervision of the City Administrator. With certain exceptions, it is the general policy of the City not to purchase commercial insurance for the risks of losses to which it is exposed but rather to first evaluate self-insurance for such risks. The City's policy in this regard is based on its analysis that it is more economical to manage its risks internally and administer, adjust, settle, defend, and pay claims from budgeted resources (i.e., "self-insurance"). The City obtains commercial insurance in certain circumstances, including when required by bond or lease financing covenants and for other limited purposes. The City actuarially determines liability and workers' compensation risk exposures as permitted under State law. The City does not maintain commercial earthquake coverage, with certain minor exceptions.

The City's property risk management approach varies depending on various factors including whether the facility is currently under construction or if the property is owned by a self-supporting enterprise fund department. For new construction projects, the City has utilized traditional insurance, owner-controlled insurance programs or contractor-controlled insurance programs. Under the latter two approaches, the insurance program provides coverage for the entire construction project. When a traditional insurance program is used, the City requires each contractor to provide its own insurance, while ensuring that the full scope of work be covered with satisfactory levels to limit the City's risk exposure. The majority of the City's commercial insurance coverage is purchased for enterprise fund departments and other similar revenue-generating departments (the Airport, MTA, the SF Public Utilities Commission, the Port and Convention Facilities, etc.). The remainder of the commercial insurance coverage is for General Fund departments that are required to provide coverage for bond-financed facilities, coverage for collections at City-owned museums and to meet statutory requirements for bonding of various public officials, and other limited purposes where required by contract or other agreement.

Through coordination with the City Controller and the City Attorney's Office, the City's general liability risk exposure is actuarially determined and is addressed through appropriations in the City's budget and also reflected in the CAFR. The appropriations are sized based on actuarially determined anticipated claim payments and the projected timing of disbursement.

The City actuarially estimates future workers' compensation costs to the City according to a formula based on the following: (i) the dollar amount of claims; (ii) yearly projections of payments based on historical experience; and (iii) the size of the department's payroll. The administration of workers' compensation claims and payouts are handled by the Workers' Compensation Division of the City's Department of Human Resources. The Workers' Compensation Division determines and allocates workers' compensation costs to departments based upon actual payments and costs associated with a department's injured workers' claims. Statewide workers' compensation reforms have resulted in some City budgetary savings in recent years. The City continues to develop and implement programs to lower or mitigate workers' compensation costs. These programs focus on accident prevention, transitional return to work for injured workers, improved efficiencies in claims handling and maximum utilization of medical cost containment strategies.

The City's estimated liability and workers' compensation risk exposures are summarized in Note 16 to the City's CAFR, attached to this Official Statement as Appendix B.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX B

AMENDED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1
(TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)**

AMENDED AND RESTATED RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT OF SPECIAL TAX

A Special Tax applicable to each Taxable Parcel in the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) shall be levied and collected according to the tax liability determined by the Administrator through the application of the appropriate amount or rate for Square Footage within Taxable Buildings, as described below. All Taxable Parcels in the CFD shall be taxed for the purposes, to the extent, and in the manner herein provided, including property subsequently annexed to the CFD unless a separate Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Tax is adopted for the annexation area.

A. DEFINITIONS

The terms hereinafter set forth have the following meanings:

“**Act**” means the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, as amended, being Chapter 2.5, (commencing with Section 53311), Division 2 of Title 5 of the California Government Code.

“**Administrative Expenses**” means any or all of the following: the fees and expenses of any fiscal agent or trustee (including any fees or expenses of its counsel) employed in connection with any Bonds, and the expenses of the City and TJPA carrying out duties with respect to CFD No. 2014-1 and the Bonds, including, but not limited to, levying and collecting the Special Tax, the fees and expenses of legal counsel, charges levied by the City Controller’s Office and/or the City Treasurer and Tax Collector’s Office, costs related to property owner inquiries regarding the Special Tax, costs associated with appeals or requests for interpretation associated with the Special Tax and this RMA, amounts needed to pay rebate to the federal government with respect to the Bonds, costs associated with complying with any continuing disclosure requirements for the Bonds and the Special Tax, costs associated with foreclosure and collection of delinquent Special Taxes, and all other costs and expenses of the City and TJPA in any way related to the establishment or administration of the CFD.

“**Administrator**” means the Director of the Office of Public Finance who shall be responsible for administering the Special Tax according to this RMA.

“**Affordable Housing Project**” means a residential or primarily residential project, as determined by the Zoning Authority, within which all Residential Units are Below Market Rate Units. All Land Uses within an Affordable Housing Project are exempt from the Special Tax, as provided in Section G and are subject to the limitations set forth in Section D.4 below.

“Airspace Parcel” means a parcel with an assigned Assessor’s Parcel number that constitutes vertical space of an underlying land parcel.

“Apartment Building” means a residential or mixed-use Building within which none of the Residential Units have been sold to individual homebuyers.

“Assessor’s Parcel” or **“Parcel”** means a lot or parcel, including an Airspace Parcel, shown on an Assessor’s Parcel Map with an assigned Assessor’s Parcel number.

“Assessor’s Parcel Map” means an official map of the County Assessor designating Parcels by Assessor’s Parcel number.

“Authorized Facilities” means those public facilities authorized to be funded by the CFD as set forth in the CFD formation proceedings.

“Base Special Tax” means the Special Tax per square foot that is used to calculate the Maximum Special Tax that applies to a Taxable Parcel pursuant to Sections C.1 and C.2 of this RMA. The Base Special Tax shall also be used to determine the Maximum Special Tax for any Net New Square Footage added to a Taxable Building in the CFD in future Fiscal Years.

“Below Market Rate Units” or **“BMR Units”** means all Residential Units within the CFD that have a deed restriction recorded on title of the property that (i) limits the rental price or sales price of the Residential Unit, (ii) limits the appreciation that can be realized by the owner of such unit, or (iii) in any other way restricts the current or future value of the unit.

“Board” means the Board of Supervisors of the City, acting as the legislative body of CFD No. 2014-1.

“Bonds” means bonds or other debt (as defined in the Act), whether in one or more series, issued, incurred, or assumed by the CFD related to the Authorized Facilities.

“Building” means a permanent enclosed structure that is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project.

“Building Height” means the number of Stories in a Taxable Building, which shall be determined based on the highest Story that is occupied by a Land Use. If only a portion of a Building is a Conditioned Project, the Building Height shall be determined based on the highest Story that is occupied by a Land Use regardless of where in the Building the Taxable Parcels are located. If there is any question as to the Building Height of any Taxable Building in the CFD, the Administrator shall coordinate with the Zoning Authority to make the determination.

“Certificate of Exemption” means a certificate issued to the then-current record owner of a Parcel that indicates that some or all of the Square Footage on the Parcel has prepaid the Special Tax obligation or has paid the Special Tax for thirty Fiscal Years and, therefore, such Square Footage shall, in all future Fiscal Years, be exempt from the levy of Special Taxes in the CFD. The Certificate of Exemption shall identify (i) the Assessor’s Parcel number(s) for the Parcel(s)

on which the Square Footage is located, (ii) the amount of Square Footage for which the exemption is being granted, (iii) the first and last Fiscal Year in which the Special Tax had been levied on the Square Footage, and (iv) the date of receipt of a prepayment of the Special Tax obligation, if applicable.

“Certificate of Occupancy” or **“COO”** means the first certificate, including any temporary certificate of occupancy, issued by the City to confirm that a Building or a portion of a Building has met all of the building codes and can be occupied for residential and/or non-residential use. For purposes of this RMA, “Certificate of Occupancy” shall not include any certificate of occupancy that was issued prior to January 1, 2013 for a Building within the CFD; however, any subsequent certificates of occupancy that are issued for new construction or expansion of the Building shall be deemed a Certificate of Occupancy and the associated Parcel(s) shall be categorized as Taxable Parcels if the Building is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project and a Tax Commencement Letter has been provided to the Administrator for the Building.

“CFD” or **“CFD No. 2014-1”** means the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center).

“Child Care Square Footage” means, collectively, the Exempt Child Care Square Footage and Taxable Child Care Square Footage within a Taxable Building in the CFD.

“City” means the City and County of San Francisco.

“Conditioned Project” means a Development Project that is required to participate in funding Authorized Facilities through the CFD.

“Converted Apartment Building” means a Taxable Building that had been designated as an Apartment Building within which one or more Residential Units are subsequently sold to a buyer that is not a Landlord.

“Converted For-Sale Unit” means, in any Fiscal Year, an individual Market Rate Unit within a Converted Apartment Building for which an escrow has closed, on or prior to June 30 of the preceding Fiscal Year, in a sale to a buyer that is not a Landlord.

“County” means the City and County of San Francisco.

“CPC” means the Capital Planning Committee of the City and County of San Francisco, or if the Capital Planning Committee no longer exists, “CPC” shall mean the designated staff member(s) within the City and/or TJPA that will recommend issuance of Tax Commencement Authorizations for Conditioned Projects within the CFD.

“Development Project” means a residential, non-residential, or mixed-use development that includes one or more Buildings, or portions thereof, that are planned and entitled in a single application to the City.

“Exempt Child Care Square Footage” means Square Footage within a Taxable Building that, at the time of issuance of a COO, is determined by the Zoning Authority to be reserved for one or more licensed child care facilities. If a prepayment is made in association with any Taxable Child Care Square Footage, such Square Footage shall also be deemed Exempt Child Care Square Footage beginning in the Fiscal Year following receipt of the prepayment.

“Exempt Parking Square Footage” means the Square Footage of parking within a Taxable Building that, pursuant to Sections 151.1 and 204.5 of the Planning Code, is estimated to be needed to serve Land Uses within a building in the CFD, as determined by the Zoning Authority. If a prepayment is made in association with any Taxable Parking Square Footage, such Square Footage shall also be deemed Exempt Parking Square Footage beginning in the Fiscal Year following receipt of the prepayment.

“Fiscal Year” means the period starting July 1 and ending on the following June 30.

“For-Sale Residential Square Footage” or **“For-Sale Residential Square Foot”** means Square Footage that is or is expected to be part of a For-Sale Unit. The Zoning Authority shall make the determination as to the For-Sale Residential Square Footage within a Taxable Building in the CFD. For-Sale Residential Square Foot means a single square-foot unit of For-Sale Residential Square Footage.

“For-Sale Unit” means (i) in a Taxable Building that is not a Converted Apartment Building: a Market Rate Unit that has been, or is available or expected to be, sold, and (ii) in a Converted Apartment Building, a Converted For-Sale Unit. The Administrator shall make the final determination as to whether a Market Rate Unit is a For-Sale Unit or a Rental Unit.

“Indenture” means the indenture, fiscal agent agreement, resolution, or other instrument pursuant to which CFD No. 2014-1 Bonds are issued, as modified, amended, and/or supplemented from time to time, and any instrument replacing or supplementing the same.

“Initial Annual Adjustment Factor” means, as of July 1 of any Fiscal Year, the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate published by the Office of the City Administrator’s Capital Planning Group and used to calculate the annual adjustment to the City’s development impact fees that took effect as of January 1 of the prior Fiscal Year pursuant to Section 409(b) of the Planning Code, as may be amended from time to time. If changes are made to the office responsible for calculating the annual adjustment, the name of the inflation index, or the date on which the development fee adjustment takes effect, the Administrator shall continue to rely on whatever annual adjustment factor is applied to the City’s development impact fees in order to calculate adjustments to the Base Special Taxes pursuant to Section D.1 below. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Base Special Taxes shall, in no Fiscal Year, be increased or decreased by more than four percent (4%) of the amount in effect in the prior Fiscal Year.

“Initial Square Footage” means, for any Taxable Building in the CFD, the aggregate Square Footage of all Land Uses within the Building, as determined by the Zoning Authority upon issuance of the COO.

“IPIC” means the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, or if the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee no longer exists, “IPIC” shall mean the designated staff member(s) within the City and/or TJPA that will recommend issuance of Tax Commencement Authorizations for Conditioned Projects within the CFD.

“Land Use” means residential, office, retail, hotel, parking, or child care use. For purposes of this RMA, the City shall have the final determination of the actual Land Use(s) on any Parcel within the CFD.

“Landlord” means an entity that owns at least twenty percent (20%) of the Rental Units within an Apartment Building or Converted Apartment Building.

“Market Rate Unit” means a Residential Unit that is not a Below Market Rate Unit.

“Maximum Special Tax” means the greatest amount of Special Tax that can be levied on a Taxable Parcel in the CFD in any Fiscal Year, as determined in accordance with Section C below.

“Net New Square Footage” means any Square Footage added to a Taxable Building after the Initial Square Footage in the Building has paid Special Taxes in one or more Fiscal Years.

“Office/Hotel Square Footage” or **“Office/Hotel Square Foot”** means Square Footage that is or is expected to be: (i) Square Footage of office space in which professional, banking, insurance, real estate, administrative, or in-office medical or dental activities are conducted, (ii) Square Footage that will be used by any organization, business, or institution for a Land Use that does not meet the definition of For-Sale Residential Square Footage Rental Residential Square Footage, or Retail Square Footage, including space used for cultural, educational, recreational, religious, or social service facilities, (iii) Taxable Child Care Square Footage, (iv) Square Footage in a residential care facility that is staffed by licensed medical professionals, and (v) any other Square Footage within a Taxable Building that does not fall within the definition provided for other Land Uses in this RMA. Notwithstanding the foregoing, street-level retail bank branches, real estate brokerage offices, and other such ground-level uses that are open to the public shall be categorized as Retail Square Footage pursuant to the Planning Code. Office/Hotel Square Foot means a single square-foot unit of Office/Hotel Square Footage.

For purposes of this RMA, “Office/Hotel Square Footage” shall also include Square Footage that is or is expected to be part of a non-residential structure that constitutes a place of lodging, providing temporary sleeping accommodations and related facilities. All Square Footage that shares an Assessor’s Parcel number within such a non-residential structure, including Square Footage of restaurants, meeting and convention facilities, gift shops, spas, offices, and other related uses shall be categorized as Office/Hotel Square Footage. If there are separate Assessor’s Parcel numbers for these other uses, the Administrator shall apply the Base Special Tax for Retail Square Footage to determine the Maximum Special Tax for Parcels on which a restaurant, gift shop, spa, or other retail use is located or anticipated, and the Base Special Tax for Office/Hotel Square Footage shall be used to determine the Maximum Special Tax for Parcels on

which other uses in the building are located. The Zoning Authority shall make the final determination as to the amount of Office/Hotel Square Footage within a building in the CFD.

“Planning Code” means the Planning Code of the City and County of San Francisco, as may be amended from time to time.

“Proportionately” means that the ratio of the actual Special Tax levied in any Fiscal Year to the Maximum Special Tax authorized to be levied in that Fiscal Year is equal for all Taxable Parcels.

“Rental Residential Square Footage” or **“Rental Residential Square Foot”** means Square Footage that is or is expected to be used for one or more of the following uses: (i) Rental Units, (ii) any type of group or student housing which provides lodging for a week or more and may or may not have individual cooking facilities, including but not limited to boarding houses, dormitories, housing operated by medical institutions, and single room occupancy units, or (iii) a residential care facility that is not staffed by licensed medical professionals. The Zoning Authority shall make the determination as to the amount of Rental Residential Square Footage within a Taxable Building in the CFD. Rental Residential Square Foot means a single square-foot unit of Rental Residential Square Footage.

“Rental Unit” means (i) all Market Rate Units within an Apartment Building, and (ii) all Market Rate Units within a Converted Apartment Building that have yet to be sold to an individual homeowner or investor. “Rental Unit” shall not include any Residential Unit which has been purchased by a homeowner or investor and subsequently offered for rent to the general public. The Administrator shall make the final determination as to whether a Market Rate Unit is a For-Sale Unit or a Rental Unit.

“Retail Square Footage” or **“Retail Square Foot”** means Square Footage that is or, based on the Certificate of Occupancy, will be Square Footage of a commercial establishment that sells general merchandise, hard goods, food and beverage, personal services, and other items directly to consumers, including but not limited to restaurants, bars, entertainment venues, health clubs, laundromats, dry cleaners, repair shops, storage facilities, and parcel delivery shops. In addition, all Taxable Parking Square Footage in a Building, and all street-level retail bank branches, real estate brokerages, and other such ground-level uses that are open to the public, shall be categorized as Retail Square Footage for purposes of calculating the Maximum Special Tax pursuant to Section C below. The Zoning Authority shall make the final determination as to the amount of Retail Square Footage within a Taxable Building in the CFD. Retail Square Foot means a single square-foot unit of Retail Square Footage.

“Residential Unit” means an individual townhome, condominium, live/work unit, or apartment within a Building in the CFD.

“Residential Use” means (i) any and all Residential Units within a Taxable Building in the CFD, (ii) any type of group or student housing which provides lodging for a week or more and may or may not have individual cooking facilities, including but not limited to boarding houses,

dormitories, housing operated by medical institutions, and single room occupancy units, and (iii) a residential care facility that is not staffed by licensed medical professionals.

“**RMA**” means this Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Tax.

“**Special Tax**” means a special tax levied in any Fiscal Year to pay the Special Tax Requirement.

“**Special Tax Requirement**” means the amount necessary in any Fiscal Year to: (i) pay principal and interest on Bonds that are due in the calendar year that begins in such Fiscal Year; (ii) pay periodic costs on the Bonds, including but not limited to, credit enhancement, liquidity support and rebate payments on the Bonds, (iii) create and/or replenish reserve funds for the Bonds to the extent such replenishment has not been included in the computation of the Special Tax Requirement in a previous Fiscal Year; (iv) cure any delinquencies in the payment of principal or interest on Bonds which have occurred in the prior Fiscal Year; (v) pay Administrative Expenses; and (vi) pay directly for Authorized Facilities. The amounts referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of the preceding sentence may be reduced in any Fiscal Year by: (i) interest earnings on or surplus balances in funds and accounts for the Bonds to the extent that such earnings or balances are available to apply against such costs pursuant to the Indenture; (ii) in the sole and absolute discretion of the City, proceeds received by the CFD from the collection of penalties associated with delinquent Special Taxes; and (iii) any other revenues available to pay such costs as determined by the Administrator.

“**Square Footage**” means, for any Taxable Building in the CFD, the net saleable or leasable square footage of each Land Use on each Taxable Parcel within the Building, as determined by the Zoning Authority. If a building permit is issued to increase the Square Footage on any Taxable Parcel, the Administrator shall, in the first Fiscal Year after the final building permit inspection has been conducted in association with such expansion, work with the Zoning Authority to recalculate (i) the Square Footage of each Land Use on each Taxable Parcel, and (ii) the Maximum Special Tax for each Taxable Parcel based on the increased Square Footage. The final determination of Square Footage for each Land Use on each Taxable Parcel shall be made by the Zoning Authority.

“**Story**” or “**Stories**” means a portion or portions of a Building, except a mezzanine as defined in the City Building Code, included between the surface of any floor and the surface of the next floor above it, or if there is no floor above it, then the space between the surface of the floor and the ceiling next above it.

“**Taxable Building**” means, in any Fiscal Year, any Building within the CFD that is, or is part of, a Conditioned Project, and for which a Certificate of Occupancy was issued and a Tax Commencement Authorization was received by the Administrator on or prior to June 30 of the preceding Fiscal Year. If only a portion of the Building is a Conditioned Project, as determined by the Zoning Authority, that portion of the Building shall be treated as a Taxable Building for purposes of this RMA.

“Tax Commencement Authorization” means a written authorization issued by the Administrator upon the recommendations of the IPIC and CPC in order to initiate the levy of the Special Tax on a Conditioned Project that has been issued a COO.

“Taxable Child Care Square Footage” means the amount of Square Footage determined by subtracting the Exempt Child Care Square Footage within a Taxable Building from the total net leasable square footage within a Building that is used for licensed child care facilities, as determined by the Zoning Authority.

“Taxable Parcel” means, within a Taxable Building, any Parcel that is not exempt from the Special Tax pursuant to law or Section G below. If, in any Fiscal Year, a Special Tax is levied on only Net New Square Footage in a Taxable Building, only the Parcel(s) on which the Net New Square Footage is located shall be Taxable Parcel(s) for purposes of calculating and levying the Special Tax pursuant to this RMA.

“Taxable Parking Square Footage” means Square Footage of parking in a Taxable Building that is determined by the Zoning Authority not to be Exempt Parking Square Footage.

“TJPA” means the Transbay Joint Powers Authority.

“Zoning Authority” means either the City Zoning Administrator, the Executive Director of the San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, or an alternate designee from the agency or department responsible for the approvals and entitlements of a project in the CFD. If there is any doubt as to the responsible party, the Administrator shall coordinate with the City Zoning Administrator to determine the appropriate party to serve as the Zoning Authority for purposes of this RMA.

B. DATA FOR CFD ADMINISTRATION

On or after July 1 of each Fiscal Year, the Administrator shall identify the current Assessor’s Parcel numbers for all Taxable Parcels in the CFD. In order to identify Taxable Parcels, the Administrator shall confirm which Buildings in the CFD have been issued both a Tax Commencement Authorization and a COO.

The Administrator shall also work with the Zoning Authority to confirm: (i) the Building Height for each Taxable Building, (ii) the For-Sale Residential Square Footage, Rental Residential Square Footage, Office/Hotel Square Footage, and Retail Square Footage on each Taxable Parcel, (iii) if applicable, the number of BMR Units and aggregate Square Footage of BMR Units within the Building, (iv) whether any of the Square Footage on a Parcel is subject to a Certificate of Exemption, and (v) the Special Tax Requirement for the Fiscal Year. In each Fiscal Year, the Administrator shall also keep track of how many Fiscal Years the Special Tax has been levied on each Parcel within the CFD. If there is Initial Square Footage and Net New Square Footage on a Parcel, the Administrator shall separately track the duration of the Special Tax levy in order to ensure compliance with Section F below.

In any Fiscal Year, if it is determined by the Administrator that (i) a parcel map or condominium plan for a portion of property in the CFD was recorded after January 1 of the prior Fiscal Year (or any other date after which the Assessor will not incorporate the newly-created parcels into the then current tax roll), and (ii) the Assessor does not yet recognize the newly-created parcels, the Administrator shall calculate the Special Tax that applies separately to each newly-created parcel, then applying the sum of the individual Special Taxes to the Assessor's Parcel that was subdivided by recordation of the parcel map or condominium plan.

C. DETERMINATION OF THE MAXIMUM SPECIAL TAX

1. Base Special Tax

Once the Building Height of, and Land Use(s) within, a Taxable Building have been identified, the Base Special Tax to be used for calculation of the Maximum Special Tax for each Taxable Parcel within the Building shall be determined based on reference to the applicable table(s) below:

FOR-SALE RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE

<i>Building Height</i>	<i>Base Special Tax Fiscal Year 2013-14*</i>
1 – 5 Stories	\$4.71 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
6 – 10 Stories	\$5.02 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
11 – 15 Stories	\$6.13 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
16 – 20 Stories	\$6.40 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
21 – 25 Stories	\$6.61 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
26 – 30 Stories	\$6.76 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
31 – 35 Stories	\$6.88 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
36 – 40 Stories	\$7.00 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
41 – 45 Stories	\$7.11 per For Sale Residential Square Foot
46 – 50 Stories	\$7.25 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot
More than 50 Stories	\$7.36 per For-Sale Residential Square Foot

RENTAL RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE

<i>Building Height</i>	<i>Base Special Tax Fiscal Year 2013-14*</i>
1 – 5 Stories	\$4.43 per Rental Residential Square Foot
6 – 10 Stories	\$4.60 per Rental Residential Square Foot
11 – 15 Stories	\$4.65 per Rental Residential Square Foot
16 – 20 Stories	\$4.68 per Rental Residential Square Foot
21 – 25 Stories	\$4.73 per Rental Residential Square Foot
26 – 30 Stories	\$4.78 per Rental Residential Square Foot
31 – 35 Stories	\$4.83 per Rental Residential Square Foot
36 – 40 Stories	\$4.87 per Rental Residential Square Foot
41 – 45 Stories	\$4.92 per Rental Residential Square Foot
46 – 50 Stories	\$4.98 per Rental Residential Square Foot
More than 50 Stories	\$5.03 per Rental Residential Square Foot

OFFICE/HOTEL SQUARE FOOTAGE

<i>Building Height</i>	<i>Base Special Tax Fiscal Year 2013-14*</i>
1 – 5 Stories	\$3.45 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
6 – 10 Stories	\$3.56 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
11 – 15 Stories	\$4.03 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
16 – 20 Stories	\$4.14 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
21 – 25 Stories	\$4.25 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
26 – 30 Stories	\$4.36 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
31 – 35 Stories	\$4.47 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
36 – 40 Stories	\$4.58 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
41 – 45 Stories	\$4.69 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
46 – 50 Stories	\$4.80 per Office/Hotel Square Foot
More than 50 Stories	\$4.91 per Office/Hotel Square Foot

RETAIL SQUARE FOOTAGE

<i>Building Height</i>	<i>Base Special Tax Fiscal Year 2013-14*</i>
N/A	\$3.18 per Retail Square Foot

* *The Base Special Tax rates shown above for each Land Use shall escalate as set forth in Section D.1 below.*

2. *Determining the Maximum Special Tax for Taxable Parcels*

Upon issuance of a Tax Commencement Authorization and the first Certificate of Occupancy for a Taxable Building within a Conditioned Project that is not an Affordable Housing Project, the

Administrator shall coordinate with the Zoning Authority to determine the Square Footage of each Land Use on each Taxable Parcel. The Administrator shall then apply the following steps to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the next succeeding Fiscal Year for each Taxable Parcel in the Taxable Building:

- Step 1.* Determine the Building Height for the Taxable Building for which a Certificate of Occupancy was issued.
- Step 2.* Determine the For-Sale Residential Square Footage and/or Rental Residential Square Footage for all Residential Units on each Taxable Parcel, as well as the Office/Hotel Square Footage and Retail Square Footage on each Taxable Parcel.
- Step 3.* ***For each Taxable Parcel that includes only For-Sale Units***, multiply the For-Sale Residential Square Footage by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1 to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel.
- Step 4.* ***For each Taxable Parcel that includes only Rental Units***, multiply the Rental Residential Square Footage by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1 to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel.
- Step 5.* ***For each Taxable Parcel that includes only Residential Uses other than Market Rate Units***, net out the Square Footage associated with any BMR Units and multiply the remaining Rental Residential Square Footage (if any) by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1 to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel.
- Step 6.* ***For each Taxable Parcel that includes only Office/Hotel Square Footage***, multiply the Office/Hotel Square Footage on the Parcel by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1 to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel.
- Step 7.* ***For each Taxable Parcel that includes only Retail Square Footage***, multiply the Retail Square Footage on the Parcel by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1 to determine the Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel.
- Step 8.* ***For Taxable Parcels that include multiple Land Uses***, separately determine the For-Sale Residential Square Footage, Rental Residential Square Footage, Office/Hotel Square Footage, and/or Retail Square Footage. Multiply the Square Footage of each Land Use by the applicable Base Special Tax from Section C.1, and sum the individual amounts to determine the aggregate Maximum Special Tax for the Taxable Parcel for the first succeeding Fiscal Year.

D. CHANGES TO THE MAXIMUM SPECIAL TAX

1. *Annual Escalation of Base Special Tax*

The Base Special Tax rates identified in Section C.1 are applicable for fiscal year 2013-14. Beginning July 1, 2014 and each July 1 thereafter, the Base Special Taxes shall be adjusted by the Initial Annual Adjustment Factor. The Base Special Tax rates shall be used to calculate the Maximum Special Tax for each Taxable Parcel in a Taxable Building for the first Fiscal Year in which the Building is a Taxable Building, as set forth in Section C.2 and subject to the limitations set forth in Section D.3.

2. *Adjustment of the Maximum Special Tax*

After a Maximum Special Tax has been assigned to a Parcel for its first Fiscal Year as a Taxable Parcel pursuant to Section C.2 and Section D.1, the Maximum Special Tax shall escalate for subsequent Fiscal Years beginning July 1 of the Fiscal Year after the first Fiscal Year in which the Parcel was a Taxable Parcel, and each July 1 thereafter, by two percent (2%) of the amount in effect in the prior Fiscal Year. In addition to the foregoing, the Maximum Special Tax assigned to a Taxable Parcel shall be increased in any Fiscal Year in which the Administrator determines that Net New Square Footage was added to the Parcel in the prior Fiscal Year.

3. *Converted Apartment Buildings*

If an Apartment Building in the CFD becomes a Converted Apartment Building, the Administrator shall rely on information from the County Assessor, site visits to the sales office, data provided by the entity that is selling Residential Units within the Building, and any other available source of information to track sales of Residential Units. In the first Fiscal Year in which there is a Converted For-Sale Unit within the Building, the Administrator shall determine the applicable Base Maximum Special Tax for For-Sale Residential Units for that Fiscal Year. Such Base Maximum Special Tax shall be used to calculate the Maximum Special Tax for all Converted For-Sale Units in the Building in that Fiscal Year. In addition, this Base Maximum Special Tax, escalated each Fiscal Year by two percent (2%) of the amount in effect in the prior Fiscal Year, shall be used to calculate the Maximum Special Tax for all future Converted For-Sale Units within the Building. Solely for purposes of calculating Maximum Special Taxes for Converted For-Sale Units within the Converted Apartment Building, the adjustment of Base Maximum Special Taxes set forth in Section D.1 shall not apply. All Rental Residential Square Footage within the Converted Apartment Building shall continue to be subject to the Maximum Special Tax for Rental Residential Square Footage until such time as the units become Converted For-Sale Units. The Maximum Special Tax for all Taxable Parcels within the Building shall escalate each Fiscal Year by two percent (2%) of the amount in effect in the prior Fiscal Year.

4. *BMR Unit/Market Rate Unit Transfers*

If, in any Fiscal Year, the Administrator determines that a Residential Unit that had previously been designated as a BMR Unit no longer qualifies as such, the Maximum Special Tax on the

new Market Rate Unit shall be established pursuant to Section C.2 and adjusted, as applicable, by Sections D.1 and D.2. If a Market Rate Unit becomes a BMR Unit after it has been taxed in prior Fiscal Years as a Market Rate Unit, the Maximum Special Tax on such Residential Unit shall not be decreased unless: (i) a BMR Unit is simultaneously redesignated as a Market Rate Unit, and (ii) such redesignation results in a Maximum Special Tax on the new Market Rate Unit that is greater than or equal to the Maximum Special Tax that was levied on the Market Rate Unit prior to the swap of units. If, based on the Building Height or Square Footage, there would be a reduction in the Maximum Special Tax due to the swap, the Maximum Special Tax that applied to the former Market Rate Unit will be transferred to the new Market Rate Unit regardless of the Building Height and Square Footage associated with the new Market Rate Unit.

5. *Changes in Land Use on a Taxable Parcel*

If any Square Footage that had been taxed as For-Sale Residential Square Footage, Rental Residential Square Footage, Office/Hotel Square Footage, or Retail Square Footage in a prior Fiscal Year is rezoned or otherwise changes Land Use, the Administrator shall apply the applicable subsection in Section C.2 to calculate what the Maximum Special Tax would be for the Parcel based on the new Land Use(s). If the amount determined is greater than the Maximum Special Tax that applied to the Parcel prior to the Land Use change, the Administrator shall increase the Maximum Special Tax to the amount calculated for the new Land Uses. If the amount determined is less than the Maximum Special Tax that applied prior to the Land Use change, there will be no change to the Maximum Special Tax for the Parcel. Under no circumstances shall the Maximum Special Tax on any Taxable Parcel be reduced, regardless of changes in Land Use or Square Footage on the Parcel, including reductions in Square Footage that may occur due to demolition, fire, water damage, or acts of God. In addition, if a Taxable Building within the CFD that had been subject to the levy of Special Taxes in any prior Fiscal Year becomes all or part of an Affordable Housing Project, the Parcel(s) shall continue to be subject to the Maximum Special Tax that had applied to the Parcel(s) before they became part of the Affordable Housing Project. All Maximum Special Taxes determined pursuant to Section C.2 shall be adjusted, as applicable, by Sections D.1 and D.2.

6. *Prepayments*

If a Parcel makes a prepayment pursuant to Section H below, the Administrator shall issue the owner of the Parcel a Certificate of Exemption for the Square Footage that was used to determine the prepayment amount, and no Special Tax shall be levied on the Parcel in future Fiscal Years unless there is Net New Square Footage added to a Building on the Parcel. Thereafter, a Special Tax calculated based solely on the Net New Square Footage on the Parcel shall be levied for up to thirty Fiscal Years, subject to the limitations set forth in Section F below. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any Special Tax that had been levied against, but not yet collected from, the Parcel is still due and payable, and no Certificate of Exemption shall be issued until such amounts are fully paid. If a prepayment is made in order to exempt Taxable Child Care Square Footage on a Parcel on which there are multiple Land Uses, the Maximum Special Tax for the Parcel shall be recalculated based on the exemption of this Child Care Square Footage which shall, after such prepayment, be designated as Exempt Child Care Square Footage and remain exempt in all Fiscal Years after the prepayment has been received.

E. METHOD OF LEVY OF THE SPECIAL TAX

Each Fiscal Year, the Special Tax shall be levied Proportionately on each Taxable Parcel up to 100% of the Maximum Special Tax for each Parcel for such Fiscal Year until the amount levied on Taxable Parcels is equal to the Special Tax Requirement.

F. COLLECTION OF SPECIAL TAX

The Special Taxes for CFD No. 2014-1 shall be collected in the same manner and at the same time as ordinary ad valorem property taxes, provided, however, that prepayments are permitted as set forth in Section H below and provided further that the City may directly bill the Special Tax, may collect Special Taxes at a different time or in a different manner, and may collect delinquent Special Taxes through foreclosure or other available methods.

The Special Tax shall be levied and collected from the first Fiscal Year in which a Parcel is designated as a Taxable Parcel until the principal and interest on all Bonds have been paid, the City's costs of constructing or acquiring Authorized Facilities from Special Tax proceeds have been paid, and all Administrative Expenses have been paid or reimbursed. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Special Tax shall not be levied on any Square Footage in the CFD for more than thirty Fiscal Years, except that a Special Tax that was lawfully levied in or before the final Fiscal Year and that remains delinquent may be collected in subsequent Fiscal Years. After a Building or a particular block of Square Footage within a Building (i.e., Initial Square Footage vs. Net New Square Footage) has paid the Special Tax for thirty Fiscal Years, the then-current record owner of the Parcel(s) on which that Square Footage is located shall be issued a Certificate of Exemption for such Square Footage. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Special Tax shall cease to be levied, and a Release of Special Tax Lien shall be recorded against all Parcels in the CFD that are still subject to the Special Tax, after the Special Tax has been levied in the CFD for seventy-five Fiscal Years.

Pursuant to Section 53321 (d) of the Act, the Special Tax levied against Residential Uses shall under no circumstances increase more than ten percent (10%) as a consequence of delinquency or default by the owner of any other Parcel or Parcels and shall, in no event, exceed the Maximum Special Tax in effect for the Fiscal Year in which the Special Tax is being levied.

G. EXEMPTIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of this RMA, no Special Tax shall be levied on: (i) Square Footage for which a prepayment has been received and a Certificate of Exemption issued, (ii) Below Market Rate Units except as otherwise provided in Sections D.3 and D.4, (iii) Affordable Housing Projects, including all Residential Units, Retail Square Footage, and Office Square Footage within buildings that are part of an Affordable Housing Project, except as otherwise provided in Section D.4, and (iv) Exempt Child Care Square Footage.

H. PREPAYMENT OF SPECIAL TAX

The Special Tax obligation applicable to Square Footage in a building may be fully prepaid as described herein, provided that a prepayment may be made only if (i) the Parcel is a Taxable Parcel, and (ii) there are no delinquent Special Taxes with respect to such Assessor's Parcel at the time of prepayment. Any prepayment made by a Parcel owner must satisfy the Special Tax obligation associated with all Square Footage on the Parcel that is subject to the Special Tax at the time the prepayment is calculated. An owner of an Assessor's Parcel intending to prepay the Special Tax obligation shall provide the City with written notice of intent to prepay. Within 30 days of receipt of such written notice, the City or its designee shall notify such owner of the prepayment amount for the Square Footage on such Assessor's Parcel. Prepayment must be made not less than 75 days prior to any redemption date for Bonds to be redeemed with the proceeds of such prepaid Special Taxes. The Prepayment Amount for a Taxable Parcel shall be calculated as follows:

- Step 1:* Determine the Square Footage of each Land Use on the Parcel.
- Step 2:* Determine how many Fiscal Years the Square Footage on the Parcel has paid the Special Tax, which may be a separate total for Initial Square Footage and Net New Square Footage on the Parcel. If a Special Tax has been levied, but not yet paid, in the Fiscal Year in which the prepayment is being calculated, such Fiscal Year will be counted as a year in which the Special Tax was paid, but a Certificate of Exemption shall not be issued until such Special Taxes are received by the City's Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector.
- Step 3:* Subtract the number of Fiscal Years for which the Special Tax has been paid (as determined in Step 2) from 30 to determine the remaining number of Fiscal Years for which Special Taxes are due from the Square Footage for which the prepayment is being made. This calculation would result in a different remainder for Initial Square Footage and Net New Square Footage within a building.
- Step 4:* Separately for Initial Square Footage and Net New Square Footage, and separately for each Land Use on the Parcel, multiply the amount of Square Footage by the applicable Maximum Special Tax that would apply to such Square Footage in each of the remaining Fiscal Years, taking into account the 2% escalator set forth in Section D.2, to determine the annual stream of Maximum Special Taxes that could be collected in future Fiscal Years.
- Step 5:* For each Parcel for which a prepayment is being made, sum the annual amounts calculated for each Land Use in Step 4 to determine the annual Maximum Special Tax that could have been levied on the Parcel in each of the remaining Fiscal Years.

Step 6. Calculate the net present value of the future annual Maximum Special Taxes that were determined in Step 5 using, as the discount rate for the net present value calculation, the true interest cost (TIC) on the Bonds as identified by the Office of Public Finance. If there is more than one series of Bonds outstanding at the time of the prepayment calculation, the Administrator shall determine the weighted average TIC based on the Bonds from each series that remain outstanding. The amount determined pursuant to this Step 6 is the required prepayment for each Parcel. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if at any point in time the Administrator determines that the Maximum Special Tax revenue that could be collected from Square Footage that remains subject to the Special Tax after the proposed prepayment is less than 110% of debt service on Bonds that will remain outstanding after defeasance or redemption of Bonds from proceeds of the estimated prepayment, the amount of the prepayment shall be increased until the amount of Bonds defeased or redeemed is sufficient to reduce remaining annual debt service to a point at which 110% debt service coverage is realized.

Once a prepayment has been received by the City, a Certificate of Exemption shall be issued to the owner of the Parcel indicating that all Square Footage that was the subject of such prepayment shall be exempt from Special Taxes.

I. INTERPRETATION OF SPECIAL TAX FORMULA

The City may interpret, clarify, and revise this RMA to correct any inconsistency, vagueness, or ambiguity, by resolution and/or ordinance, as long as such interpretation, clarification, or revision does not materially affect the levy and collection of the Special Taxes and any security for any Bonds.

J. SPECIAL TAX APPEALS

Any taxpayer who wishes to challenge the accuracy of computation of the Special Tax in any Fiscal Year may file an application with the Administrator. The Administrator, in consultation with the City Attorney, shall promptly review the taxpayer's application. If the Administrator concludes that the computation of the Special Tax was not correct, the Administrator shall correct the Special Tax levy and, if applicable in any case, a refund shall be granted. If the Administrator concludes that the computation of the Special Tax was correct, then such determination shall be final and conclusive, and the taxpayer shall have no appeal to the Board from the decision of the Administrator.

The filing of an application or an appeal shall not relieve the taxpayer of the obligation to pay the Special Tax when due.

Nothing in this Section J shall be interpreted to allow a taxpayer to bring a claim that would otherwise be barred by applicable statutes of limitation set forth in the Act or elsewhere in applicable law.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FISCAL AGENT AGREEMENT

The following is a summary of certain provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement. This summary does not purport to be comprehensive or definitive and is subject to all of the complete terms and provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement, to which reference is hereby made.

Certain Definitions

“Act” means the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, as amended, being sections 53311 *et seq.* of the California Government Code.

“Administrative Expenses” means costs directly related to the administration of the CFD consisting of: the costs of computing the Special Taxes and preparing the annual Special Tax collection schedules (whether by a City employee or consultant or both) and the costs of collecting the Special Taxes (whether by the City or otherwise); the costs of remitting the Special Taxes to the Fiscal Agent; costs of the Fiscal Agent (including its legal counsel) in the discharge of its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement; the costs of the City or its designee of complying with the disclosure provisions of the Act and the Fiscal Agent Agreement, including those related to public inquiries regarding the Special Tax and disclosures to Owners of the Bonds and the Original Purchaser; the costs of the City or its designee related to an appeal of the Special Tax; any amounts required to be rebated to the federal government; all costs and expenses of the City in any way related to the establishment or administration of the CFD; an allocable share of the salaries of the City staff directly related to the foregoing and a proportionate amount of City general administrative overhead related thereto. Administrative Expenses shall also include amounts advanced by the City for any administrative purpose of the CFD, including costs related to prepayments of Special Taxes, recordings related to such prepayments and satisfaction of Special Taxes, amounts advanced to ensure maintenance of tax exemption of interest on the Bonds, and the costs of prosecuting foreclosure of delinquent Special Taxes.

“Administrative Expense Fund” means the fund designated the “City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Administrative Expense Fund” established and administered under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Agreement” means the Fiscal Agent Agreement, as it may be amended or supplemented from time to time by any Supplemental Agreement adopted pursuant to the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Allocated Bond Proceeds Account” means the account designated “Allocated Bond Proceeds Account” within the Improvement Fund established under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The Allocated Bond Proceeds Account was required to be established by the City pursuant to the JCFA.

“Annual Debt Service” means, for each Bond Year, the sum of (i) the interest due on the Outstanding Bonds in such Bond Year, assuming that the Outstanding Bonds are retired as scheduled, and (ii) the principal amount of the Outstanding Bonds due in such Bond Year (including any mandatory sinking payment due in such Bond Year); provided that for purposes of calculating Annual Debt Service with respect to Parity Bonds proposed to be issued under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, the amount described in the preceding clause (i) for a Bond Year shall be reduced by any capitalized interest applicable to the proposed Parity Bonds for such Bond Year.

“Auditor” means the tax collector of the City, or such other official at the City who is responsible for preparing property tax bills.

“Authorized Officer” means the Mayor, the Controller, the Director of the Office of Public Finance, the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, or any other officer or employee authorized by the Board of Supervisors of the City or by an Authorized Officer to undertake the action referenced in the Fiscal Agent Agreement as required to be undertaken by an Authorized Officer.

“Board” means the Board of Supervisors of the City as the legislative body.

“Bond Counsel” means Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation or any other attorney or firm of attorneys acceptable to the City and nationally recognized for expertise in rendering opinions as to the legality and tax-exempt status of securities issued by public entities.

“Bond” or “Bonds” means the 2017 Bonds and, if the context requires, any Parity Bonds, at any time Outstanding under the Fiscal Agent Agreement or any Supplemental Agreement.

“Bond Fund” means the fund designated the “City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Bond Fund” established and administered under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Bond Year” means the one-year period beginning on September 2nd in each year and ending on September 1 in the following year, except that the first Bond Year shall begin on the related Closing Date and shall end on September 1, 2018.

“Business Day” means any day other than (i) a Saturday or a Sunday or (ii) a day on which banking institutions in the state in which the Fiscal Agent has its principal corporate trust office are authorized or obligated by law or executive order to be closed.

“CFD” means the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) formed under the Resolution of Formation.

“CFD Value” means the market value, as of the date of the appraisal described below and/or the date of the most recent City real property tax roll, as applicable, of all parcels of real property in the CFD subject to the levy of the Special Taxes and not delinquent in the payment of any Special Taxes then due and owing, including with respect to such nondelinquent parcels the value of the then existing improvements and any facilities to be constructed or acquired with any amounts then on deposit in the Improvement Fund and with the proceeds of any proposed series of Parity Bonds, as determined with respect to any parcel or group of parcels by reference to (i) an appraisal performed within six (6) months of the date of issuance of any proposed Parity Bonds by an MAI appraiser (the “Appraiser”) selected by the City, or (ii) in the alternative, the assessed value of all such nondelinquent parcels and improvements thereon as shown on the then current City real property tax roll available to the Finance Director. It is expressly acknowledged that, in determining the CFD Value, the City may rely on an appraisal to determine the value of some or all of the parcels in the CFD and/or the most recent City real property tax roll as to the value of some or all of the parcels in the CFD. Neither the City nor the Finance Director shall be liable to the Owners, the Original Purchaser or any other person or entity in respect of any appraisal provided for purposes of this definition or by reason of any exercise of discretion made by any Appraiser pursuant to this definition.

“City” means the City and County of San Francisco, and any successor thereto.

“Closing Date” means the date upon which there is a physical delivery of the 2017 Bonds in exchange for the amount representing the purchase price of the 2017 Bonds by the Original Purchaser.

“Costs of Issuance” means items of expense payable or reimbursable directly or indirectly by the City and related to the authorization, sale, delivery and issuance of the 2017 Bonds, which items of expense shall include, but not be limited to, printing costs, costs of reproducing and binding documents, closing costs, appraisal costs, filing and recording fees, fees and expenses of counsel to the City, initial fees and charges of the Fiscal Agent including its first annual administration fees and its legal fees and charges, including the allocated costs of in-house attorneys, expenses incurred by the City in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, Bond (underwriter’s) discount, legal fees and charges, including bond counsel and disclosure counsel, financial consultant’s fees, charges for execution, authentication, transportation and safekeeping of the 2017 Bonds and other costs, charges and fees in connection with the foregoing.

“Costs of Issuance Fund” means the fund designated the “City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Costs of Issuance Fund” established and administered under the Agreement.

“Dated Date” means the dated date of the 2017 Bonds, which is the Closing Date.

“Debt Service” means the scheduled amount of interest and amortization of principal payable on the 2017 Bonds and the scheduled amount of interest and amortization of principal payable on any Parity Bonds during the period of computation, in each case excluding amounts scheduled during such period which relate to principal which has been retired before the beginning of such period.

“Fair Market Value” means with respect to Permitted Investments, the price at which a willing buyer would purchase the investment from a willing seller in a bona fide, arm’s length transaction (determined as of the date the contract to purchase or sell the investment becomes binding) if the investment is traded on an established securities market (within the meaning of section 1273 of the Tax Code) and, otherwise, the term “Fair Market Value” means the acquisition price in a bona fide arm’s length transaction (as referenced above) if (i) the investment is a certificate of deposit that is acquired in accordance with applicable regulations under the Tax Code, (ii) the investment is an agreement with specifically negotiated withdrawal or reinvestment provisions and a specifically negotiated interest rate (for example, a guaranteed investment contract, a forward supply contract or other investment agreement) that is acquired in accordance with applicable regulations under the Tax Code, (iii) the investment is a United States Treasury Security—State and Local Government Series that is acquired in accordance with applicable regulations of the United States Bureau of Public Debt, or (iv) any commingled investment fund in which the City and related parties do not own more than a ten percent (10%) beneficial interest if the return paid by such fund is without regard to the source of the investment.

“Federal Securities” means: (a) any direct general obligations of the United States of America (including obligations issued or held in book entry form on the books of the Department of the Treasury of the United States of America), the payment of principal of and interest on which are unconditionally and fully guaranteed by the United States of America; and (b) any obligations the principal of and interest on which are unconditionally guaranteed by the United States of America.

“Finance Director” means the Director of the Office of Public Finance, or, in the event such office is eliminated, the official of the City that is responsible for the management of municipal bonds issued by the City.

“Fiscal Agent” means Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association, the Fiscal Agent appointed by the City and acting as an independent fiscal agent with the duties and powers provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, its successors and assigns, and any other corporation or association which may at any time be substituted in its place, as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Fiscal Year” means the twelve-month period extending from July 1 in a calendar year to June 30 of the succeeding year, both dates inclusive.

“Improvement Fund” means the fund designated “City and County of San Francisco, Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), Special Tax Bonds, Improvement Fund,” established under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Independent Financial Consultant” means any consultant or firm of such consultants appointed by the City or the Finance Director, and who, or each of whom: (i) is judged by the Finance Director to have experience in matters relating to the issuance and/or administration of bonds under the Act; (ii) is in fact independent and not under the domination of the City; (iii) does not have any substantial interest, direct or indirect, with or in the City, or any owner of real property in the CFD, or any real property in the CFD; and (iv) is not connected with the City as an officer or employee of the City, but who may be regularly retained to make reports to the City.

“Information Services” means (i) the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board’s Electronic Municipal Market Access website and (ii) in accordance with then current guidelines of the Securities and Exchange Commission, such other addresses and/or such services providing information with respect to called bonds as the City may designate in an Officer’s Certificate delivered to the Fiscal Agent.

“Interest Payment Date” means each September 1 and March 1 of every calendar year, commencing with March 1, 2018.

“JCFA” means the Joint Community Facilities Agreement, dated as of December 1, 2014, by and between the City and the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, as amended from time to time

“Maximum Annual Debt Service” means the largest Annual Debt Service for any Bond Year after the calculation is made through the final maturity date of any Outstanding Bonds.

“Officer’s Certificate” means a written certificate of the City signed by an Authorized Officer of the City.

“Ordinance” means any ordinance of the Board of Supervisors of the City levying the Special Taxes, including but not limited to Ordinance No. 1-15 passed by the Board on January 13, 2015.

“Original Resolution of Issuance” means Resolution No. 2-15, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors on January 13, 2015 and signed by the Mayor on January 20, 2015, authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

“Original Purchaser” means, collectively, Stinson Securities LLC and Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated, the first purchaser of the 2017 Bonds from the City.

“Outstanding,” when used as of any particular time with reference to Bonds, means (subject to the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement) all Bonds except (i) Bonds theretofore canceled by the Fiscal Agent or surrendered to the Fiscal Agent for cancellation; (ii) Bonds paid or deemed to have been paid within the meaning of the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement relating to discharge of the Bonds; and (iii) Bonds in lieu of or in substitution for which other Bonds shall have been authorized, executed, issued and delivered by the City under the Fiscal Agent Agreement or any Supplemental Agreement.

“Owner” or “Bondowner” means any person who shall be the registered owner of any Outstanding Bond.

“Parity Bonds” means additional bonds issued by the City for the CFD and payable on a parity basis with any then Outstanding Bonds pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Permitted Investments” means the following, but only to the extent that the same are acquired at Fair Market Value:

(a) Federal Securities;

(b) any of the following direct or indirect obligations of the following agencies of the United States of America: (i) direct obligations of the Export-Import Bank; (ii) certificates of beneficial ownership issued by the Farmers Home Administration; (iii) participation certificates issued by the General Services Administration; (iv) mortgage-backed bonds or pass-through obligations issued and guaranteed by the Government National Mortgage Association, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation or the Federal Housing Administration; (v) project notes issued by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development; and (vi) public housing notes and bonds guaranteed by the United States of America;

(c) interest-bearing demand or time deposits (including certificates of deposit) or deposit accounts in federal or state chartered savings and loan associations or in federal or State of California banks (including the Fiscal Agent, its parent, if any, and affiliates), provided that (i) the unsecured short-term obligations of such commercial bank or savings and loan association shall be rated in the highest short-term rating category by any Rating Agency, or (ii) such demand or time deposits shall be fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(d) commercial paper rated in the highest short-term rating category by any Rating Agency, issued by corporations which are organized and operating within the United States of America, and which matures not more than 180 days following the date of investment therein;

(e) bankers acceptances, consisting of bills of exchange or time drafts drawn on and accepted by a commercial bank, including its parent (if any), affiliates and subsidiaries, whose short-term obligations are rated in the highest short-term rating category by any Rating Agency, or whose long-term obligations are rated A or better by any Rating Agency, which mature not more than 270 days following the date of investment therein;

(f) obligations the interest on which is excludable from gross income pursuant to Section 103 of the Tax Code and which are either (a) rated A or better by any Rating Agency, or (b) fully secured as to the payment of principal and interest by Federal Securities;

(g) obligations issued by any corporation organized and operating within the United States of America having assets in excess of Five Hundred Million (\$500,000,000), which obligations are rated A or better by any Rating Agency;

(h) money market funds (including money market funds for which the Fiscal Agent, its affiliates or subsidiaries provide investment advisory or other management services) which invest in Federal Securities or which are rated in the highest short-term rating category by any Rating Agency;

(i) any investment agreement representing general unsecured obligations of a financial institution rated A or better by any Rating Agency, by the terms of which the Fiscal Agent is permitted to withdraw all amounts invested therein in the event any such rating falls below A;

(j) the Local Agency Investment Fund established pursuant to Section 16429.1 of the Government Code of the State of California;

(k) the California Asset Management Program; and

(l) any other investment in which the City may invest its funds under California law.

“Principal Office” means such corporate trust office of the Fiscal Agent as may be designated from time to time by written notice from the Fiscal Agent to the City, or such other office designated by the Fiscal Agent from time to time; except that with respect to presentation of Bonds for payment or for registration of transfer and exchange such term shall mean the office or agency of the Fiscal Agent at which, at any particular time, its corporate trust agency business shall be conducted.

“Proceeds” when used with reference to the Bonds, means the face amount of the Bonds, plus any accrued interest and premium, less any original issue and/or underwriter’s discount.

“Project” means those items described as the “Facilities” in the Resolution of Formation.

“Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument” means an irrevocable standby or direct-pay letter of credit, insurance policy, or surety bond issued by a commercial bank or insurance company and deposited with the Fiscal Agent, provided that all of the following requirements are met at the time of acceptance thereof by the Fiscal Agent: (a) in the case of a commercial bank, the long-term credit rating of such bank at the time of delivery of the irrevocable standby or direct-pay letter of credit is at least "A" from S&P or "A" from Moody’s and, in the case of an insurance company, the claims paying ability of such insurance company at the time of delivery of the insurance policy or surety bond is at least "A" from S&P or "A" from Moody’s or, if not rated by S&P or Moody’s but is rated by A.M. Best & Company, is rated at the time of delivery in the highest rating category by A.M. Best & Company; (b) such letter of credit, insurance policy or surety bond has a stated term that extends at least to the final maturity date of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds; (c) such letter of credit or surety bond has a stated amount at least equal to the portion of the Reserve Requirement with respect to which funds are proposed to be released; and (d) the Fiscal Agent is authorized pursuant to the terms of such letter of credit, insurance policy or surety bond to draw thereunder an amount equal to any deficiencies which may exist from time to time in the Bond Fund for the purpose of making payments with respect to all or a portion of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds.

“Rate and Method” means the amended and restated rate and method of apportionment of Special Tax for the CFD, adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the Resolution of Formation, and as it subsequently may be amended in compliance with the provisions of the Agreement and the Act.

“Rating Agency” means any nationally recognized rating agency.

“Record Date” means the fifteenth day of the calendar month next preceding the applicable Interest Payment Date, whether or not such day is a Business Day.

“Refunding Bonds” means bonds issued by the City for the CFD, the net proceeds of which are used to refund all or a portion of the then-Outstanding Bonds; provided that (i) the total interest cost to maturity on the refunding bonds plus the principal amount of the refunding bonds is less than the total interest cost to maturity on the Bonds to be refunded plus the principal amount of the Bonds to be refunded and (ii) the final maturity of the Refunding Bonds is not later than the final maturity of the Bonds being refunded.

“Related Parity Bonds” means any series of Parity Bonds for which (i) the Proceeds are deposited into the Reserve Fund so that the balance therein is equal to the Reserve Requirement following issuance of such Parity Bonds and (ii) the related Supplemental Agreement specifies that the Reserve Fund shall act as a reserve for the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, such series of Parity Bonds.

“Reserve Fund” means the fund designated the “City of Dixon, Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), Special Tax Bonds, Reserve Fund” established and administered under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Reserve Requirement” means, as of the date of calculation, which shall be (A) the date of issuance of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds and (B) the date of defeasance or redemption of any of the 2017 Bonds or Related Parity Bonds, an amount equal to the lesser of (i) Maximum Annual Debt Service on the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds between the date of such calculation and the final maturity of such Bonds or (ii) one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of average Annual Debt Service on the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds between the date of such calculation and the final maturity of such Bonds and (iii) 10% of the original principal amount of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds (or, if the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds have more than a de minimis amount of original issue discount or premium, 10% of the issue price of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds); provided that, with respect to the issuance of any Related Parity Bonds, if the Reserve Fund would have to be increased by an amount greater than ten percent (10%) of the stated principal amount of the Related Parity Bonds (or, if the Related Parity Bonds have more than a de minimis amount of original issue discount or premium, of the issue price of such Related Parity Bonds), then the Reserve Requirement shall be such lesser amount as is determined by a deposit of such ten percent (10%); and provided that accrued interest on any Related Parity Bonds deposited with the Fiscal Agent upon delivery of such Related Parity Bonds shall be excluded for purposes of the calculation of the Reserve Requirement.

“Resolution” or “Resolution of Issuance” means the Original Resolution of Issuance as supplemented by the Supplemental Resolution of Issuance.

“Resolution of Formation” means Resolution No. 350-14, adopted by the Board on September 23, 2014 and signed by the Mayor on September 29, 2014, forming the CFD.

“Special Tax Fund” means the special fund designated “City and County of San Francisco, Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), Special Tax Fund” established and administered under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Special Tax Prepayments” means the proceeds of any Special Tax prepayments received by the City, as calculated pursuant to the Rate and Method, less any administrative fees or penalties collected as part of any such prepayment.

“Special Tax Prepayments Account” means the account by that name established within the Bond Fund by the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Special Tax Revenues” means the proceeds of the Special Taxes received by the City, including any scheduled payments thereof and any Special Tax Prepayments, interest thereon and proceeds of the redemption or sale of property sold as a result of foreclosure of the lien of the Special Taxes to the amount of said lien and interest thereon, but shall not include any interest in excess of the interest due on the Bonds or any penalties collected in connection with any such foreclosure.

“Special Taxes” means the special taxes levied by the Board of Supervisors within the CFD under the Act, the Ordinance and the Fiscal Agent Agreement

“Supplemental Agreement” means an agreement the execution of which is authorized by a resolution which has been duly adopted by the City under the Act and which agreement is amendatory of or supplemental to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, but only if and to the extent that such agreement is specifically authorized under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“Supplemental Resolution of Issuance” means Resolution No. 247-17, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 13, 2017, and signed by the Mayor on June 22, 2017, supplementing the Original Resolution of Issuance and authorizing the issuance of the 2017 Bonds.

“Tax Code” means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect on the date of issuance of the Bonds or (except as otherwise referenced in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) as it may be amended to apply to obligations issued on the date of issuance of the Bonds, together with applicable temporary and final regulations promulgated, and applicable official public guidance published, under the Tax Code.

“Term Bonds” means (i) the 2017A Bonds maturing on September 1, 2037, (ii) the 2017A Bonds maturing on September 1, 2048, (iii) the 2017B Bonds maturing on September 1, 2037 and (iv) the 2017B Bonds maturing on September 1, 2048.

“2017 Bonds” means the 2017A Bonds and the 2017B Bonds.

“2017A Bonds” means the Bonds so designated and authorized to be issued under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“2017A Capitalized Interest Account” means the account of that name held by the Fiscal Agent in the Bond Fund.

“2017A Improvement Account” means the account of that name held by the Fiscal Agent in the Improvement Fund.

“2017B Bonds” means the Bonds so designated and authorized to be issued under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

“2017B Capitalized Interest Account” means the account of that name held by the Fiscal Agent in the Bond Fund.

Certain Provisions Relating to the Bonds

Interest. The 2017 Bonds shall bear interest at the rates set forth above payable on the Interest Payment Dates in each year. Interest on all Bonds shall be calculated on the basis of a 360-day year composed of twelve 30-day months. Each 2017 Bond shall bear interest from the Interest Payment Date next preceding the date of authentication thereof unless (i) it is authenticated on an Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from such date of authentication, or (ii) it is authenticated prior to an Interest Payment Date and after the close of business on the Record Date preceding such Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from such Interest Payment Date, or (iii) it is authenticated on or before the Record Date preceding the first Interest Payment Date, in which event it shall bear interest from the Dated Date; provided, however, that if at the time of authentication of a 2017 Bond, interest is in default thereon, such 2017 Bond shall bear interest from the Interest Payment Date to which interest has previously been paid or made available for payment thereon.

Method of Payment. Interest on the Bonds (including the final interest payment upon maturity or earlier redemption), is payable on the applicable Interest Payment Date by check of the Fiscal Agent mailed by first class mail to the registered Owner thereof at such registered Owner's address as it appears on the registration books maintained by the Fiscal Agent at the close of business on the Record Date preceding the Interest Payment Date, or by wire transfer to an account located in the United States of America made on such Interest Payment Date upon written instructions of any Owner of \$1,000,000 or more in aggregate principal amount of Bonds delivered to the Fiscal Agent prior to the applicable Record Date, which instructions shall continue in effect until revoked in writing, or until such Bonds are transferred to a new Owner. The interest, principal and any premium on the Bonds are payable in lawful money of the United States of America, with principal and any premium payable upon surrender of the Bonds at the Principal Office of the Fiscal Agent. All Bonds paid by the Fiscal Agent shall be canceled by the Fiscal Agent. The Fiscal Agent shall destroy the canceled Bonds and issue a certificate of destruction of such Bonds to the City.

Transfer or Exchange of Bonds Any Bond may, in accordance with its terms, be transferred, upon the books required to be kept under the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement by the person in whose name it is registered, in person or by such person's duly authorized attorney, upon surrender of such Bond for cancellation, accompanied by delivery of a duly written instrument of transfer in a form acceptable to the Fiscal Agent. Bonds may be exchanged at the Principal Office of the Fiscal Agent solely for a like aggregate principal amount of Bonds of authorized denominations and of the same maturity. The cost for any services rendered or any expenses incurred by the Fiscal Agent in connection with any such transfer or exchange shall be paid by the City from amounts in the Administrative Expense Fund. The Fiscal Agent shall collect from the Owner requesting such transfer or exchange any tax or other governmental charge required to be paid with respect to such transfer or exchange. Whenever any Bond or Bonds shall be surrendered for transfer or exchange, the City shall execute and the Fiscal Agent shall authenticate and deliver a new Bond or Bonds, for a like aggregate principal amount. No transfers or exchanges of Bonds shall be required to be made (i) fifteen days prior to the date established by the Fiscal Agent for selection of Bonds for redemption or (ii) with respect to a Bond after such Bond has been selected for redemption; or (iii) between a Record Date and the succeeding Interest Payment Date.

Bond Register. The Fiscal Agent will keep, or cause to be kept, at its Principal Office sufficient books for the registration and transfer of the Bonds which books shall show the series number, date, amount, rate of interest and last known owner of each Bond and shall at all times be open to inspection by the City during regular business hours upon reasonable notice; and, upon presentation for such purpose, the Fiscal Agent shall, under such reasonable regulations as it may prescribe, register or transfer or cause to be registered or transferred, on said books, the ownership of the Bonds as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The City and the Fiscal Agent will treat the Owner of any Bond whose name appears on the

Bond register as the absolute Owner of such Bond for any and all purposes, and the City and the Fiscal Agent shall not be affected by any notice to the contrary. The City and the Fiscal Agent may rely on the address of the Owner as it appears in the Bond register for any and all purposes.

Certain Provisions Relating to Security for the Bonds

Pledge of Special Tax Revenues. The Bonds shall be secured by a first pledge (which pledge shall be effected in the manner and to the extent in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) of all of the Special Tax Revenues and all moneys deposited in the Bond Fund (including the Special Tax Prepayments Account) and, until disbursed as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in the Special Tax Fund. The Special Tax Revenues and all moneys deposited into such funds (except as otherwise provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) are by the Fiscal Agent Agreement dedicated to the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the Bonds as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement and in the Act until all of the Bonds have been paid and retired or until moneys or Federal Securities have been set aside irrevocably for that purpose under the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement relating to discharge of the Bonds.

The 2017 Bonds and all Related Parity Bonds shall be secured by a first pledge (which pledge shall be effected in the manner and to the extent herein provided) of all moneys deposited in the Reserve Fund. The 2017A Bonds shall be secured by a first pledge (which pledge shall be effected in the manner and to the extent herein provided) of all moneys deposited in the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account. The 2017B Bonds shall be secured by a first pledge (which pledge shall be effected in the manner and to the extent herein provided) of all moneys deposited in the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account.

The moneys in the Reserve Fund (except as otherwise provided herein) are hereby dedicated to the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the 2017 Bonds and all Related Parity Bonds as provided herein and in the Act until all of the 2017 Bonds and all related Parity Bonds have been paid and retired or until moneys or Federal Securities have been set aside irrevocably for that purpose under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Amounts in the 2017A Improvement Account, the Allocated Bonds Account, the Administrative Expense Fund and the Costs of Issuance Fund are not pledged to the repayment of the Bonds. The Project is not pledged to the repayment of the Bonds, nor are the proceeds of any condemnation or insurance award received by the City with respect to the Project.

Limited Obligation. The Bonds are limited obligations of the City, secured by and payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor hereunder. The Bonds are not payable from any other source of funds other than Special Tax Revenues and the funds pledged therefor hereunder. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the principal of or interest on the Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City (except to the limited extent set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) or of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the Bonds.

No Acceleration. The principal of the Bonds is not subject to acceleration.

Parity Bonds. In addition to the 2017 Bonds, the City may issue Parity Bonds in such principal amount as shall be determined by the City, under a Supplemental Agreement entered into by the City and the Fiscal Agent. Any such Parity Bonds shall constitute Bonds under the Fiscal Agent Agreement and shall be secured by a lien on the Special Tax Revenues and funds pledged for the payment of the Bonds under the Fiscal Agent Agreement on a parity with all other Bonds Outstanding under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. The City may issue such Parity Bonds subject to the following specific conditions precedent:

(A) Compliance. The City shall be in compliance with all covenants set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement and all Supplemental Agreements, and issuance of the Parity Bonds shall not cause the City to exceed the CFD's limitation on debt (as defined in the Act).

(B) Same Payment Dates. The Supplemental Agreement providing for the issuance of such Parity Bonds shall provide that interest thereon shall be payable on Interest Payment Dates, and principal thereof shall be payable on September 1 in any year in which principal is payable on the Parity Bonds (provided that there shall be no requirement that any Parity Bonds pay interest on a current basis).

(C) Separate Funds; Reserve Fund or Reserve Account. The Supplemental Agreement providing for the issuance of such Parity Bonds may provide for the establishment of separate funds and accounts.

The Supplemental Agreement providing for issuance of the Parity Bonds shall provide for (i) a deposit to the Reserve Fund in an amount necessary such that the amount deposited therein shall equal the Reserve Requirement following issuance of the Parity Bonds, (ii) a deposit to a reserve account for the Parity Bonds (and such other series of Parity Bonds identified by the City) in an amount defined in such Supplemental Agreement, as long as such Supplemental Agreement expressly declares that the Owners of such Parity Bonds will have no interest in or claim to the Reserve Fund and that the Owners of the Bonds covered by the Reserve Fund will have no interest in or claim to such other reserve account or (iii) no deposit to either the Reserve Fund or another reserve account as long as such Supplemental Agreement expressly declares that the Owners of such Parity Bonds will have no interest in or claim to the Reserve Fund or any other reserve account. The Supplemental Agreement may provide that the City may satisfy the reserve requirement for a series of Parity Bonds by the deposit into the reserve account established pursuant to such Supplemental Agreement of an irrevocable standby or direct-pay letter of credit, insurance policy, or surety bond issued by a commercial bank or insurance company as described in the Supplemental Agreement.

(D) Value. The CFD Value shall be at least three (3) times the sum of: (i) the aggregate principal amount of all Bonds then Outstanding, plus (ii) the aggregate principal amount of the series of Parity Bonds proposed to be issued, plus (iii) the aggregate principal amount of any fixed assessment liens on the parcels in the CFD subject to the levy of Special Taxes, plus (iv) a portion of the aggregate principal amount of any and all other community facilities district bonds then outstanding and payable at least partially from special taxes to be levied on parcels of land within the CFD (the "Other District Bonds") equal to the aggregate outstanding principal amount of the Other District Bonds multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount of special taxes levied for the Other District Bonds on parcels of land within the CFD, and the denominator of which is the total amount of special taxes levied for the Other District Bonds on all parcels of land against which the special taxes are levied to pay the Other District Bonds (such fraction to be determined based upon the maximum special taxes which could be levied in the year in which maximum annual debt service on the Other District Bonds occurs), based upon information from the most recent available Fiscal Year.

(E) Coverage. For each Fiscal Year after issuance of the Parity Bonds, the maximum amount of the Special Taxes that, based on Taxable Parcels as of the date of issuance of such Parity Bonds, may be levied for such Fiscal Year under the Ordinance, the Agreement and any Supplemental Agreement for each respective Fiscal Year, shall be at least 110% of the total Annual Debt Service of the then Outstanding Bonds and the proposed Parity Bonds for each Bond Year that commences in each such Fiscal Year, and the aggregate Special Tax Prepayments that could

occur after the issuance of the Parity Bonds shall be not less than the principal amount of the Outstanding Bonds and the proposed Parity Bonds.

(F) Certificates. The City shall deliver to the Fiscal Agent an Officer's Certificate certifying that the conditions precedent to the issuance of such Parity Bonds set forth in paragraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) above have been satisfied.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City may issue Refunding Bonds as Parity Bonds without the need to satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (D) or (E) above, and, in connection therewith, the Officer's Certificate in paragraph (F) above need not make reference to paragraphs (D) and (E).

Nothing in the Fiscal Agent Agreement prohibits the City from issuing any other bonds or otherwise incurring debt secured by a pledge of the Special Tax Revenues subordinate to the pledge thereof under the Fiscal Agreement.

Certain Funds and Accounts

Reserve Fund.

Establishment of Fund. The Reserve Fund is established under the Indenture as a separate fund to be held by the Fiscal Agent to the credit of which a deposit shall be made as required thereunder, which deposit, as of the Closing Date, is equal to the initial Reserve Requirement with respect to the 2017 Bonds, and deposits shall be made as described in paragraph (c) of the section entitled "Parity Bonds" above and paragraphs (a) and (b) of the section entitled "Special Tax Fund." Moneys in the Reserve Fund shall be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the Owners of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds as a reserve for the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds and shall be subject to a lien in favor of the Owners of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds.

Use of Reserve Fund. Except as otherwise provided in the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement relating to the Reserve Fund, all amounts deposited in the Reserve Fund shall be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent solely for the purpose of making transfers to the Bond Fund in the event of any deficiency at any time in the Bond Fund of the amount then required for payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds or, in accordance with the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement relating to the Reserve Fund, for the purpose of redeeming 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds from the Bond Fund. Whenever a transfer is made from the Reserve Fund to the Bond Fund due to a deficiency in the Bond Fund for payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds, the Fiscal Agent shall provide written notice thereof to the Finance Director, specifying the amount withdrawn.

Transfer of Excess of Reserve Requirement. Whenever, on or before any Interest Payment Date, or on any other date at the request of the Finance Director, the amount in the Reserve Fund exceeds the Reserve Requirement, the Fiscal Agent shall provide written notice to the Finance Director of the amount of the excess and shall transfer an amount equal to the excess from the Reserve Fund to the Bond Fund, to be used to pay interest on the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date.

Transfer for Rebate Purposes. Amounts in the Reserve Fund shall be withdrawn for purposes of making rebate payments to the federal government to comply with any obligation to do so under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, upon receipt by the Fiscal Agent of an Officer's Certificate specifying the amount to be withdrawn and to the effect that such amount is needed for rebate purposes; *provided, however*, that no amounts in the Reserve Fund shall be used for rebate unless the amount in the Reserve Fund following such withdrawal equals the Reserve Requirement.

Transfer When Balance Exceeds Outstanding Bonds. Whenever the balance in the Reserve Fund exceeds the amount required to redeem or pay the Outstanding 2017 Bonds and all Outstanding Related Parity Bonds, including interest accrued to the date of payment or redemption and premium, if any, due upon redemption, the Fiscal Agent shall, upon the written request of the Finance Director, transfer any cash or Permitted Investments in the Reserve Fund to the Bond Fund to be applied, on the redemption date to the payment and redemption of all of the Outstanding 2017 Bonds and all Outstanding Related Parity Bonds. In the event that the amount so transferred from the Reserve Fund to the Bond Fund exceeds the amount required to pay and redeem the Outstanding 2017 Bonds and all Outstanding Related Parity Bonds, the balance in the Reserve Fund shall be transferred to the City, at the written direction of the Finance Director, and shall be used by the City for any lawful purpose.

No amounts shall be transferred from the Reserve Fund until after: (i) with respect to any Related Parity Bonds the interest on which is exempt from gross income for federal income tax purposes, the calculation of any rebate amounts due to the federal government and withdrawal of any such amount for purposes of making such payment to the federal government; and (ii) payment of any fees and expenses due to the Fiscal Agent.

Transfer Upon Special Tax Prepayment. Whenever Special Taxes are prepaid and 2017 Bonds or any Related Parity Bonds are to be redeemed with the proceeds of such prepayment or a Supplemental Agreement related to any Related Parity Bonds,, a proportionate amount in the Reserve Fund (determined on the basis of the principal of 2017 Bonds and Related Parity Bonds to be redeemed and the then-Outstanding principal of the 2017 Bonds and Related Parity Bonds, but in any event not in excess of the amount that will leave the balance in the Reserve Fund following the proposed redemption equal to the Reserve Requirement) shall be transferred on the Business Day prior to the redemption date by the Fiscal Agent to the Bond Fund to be applied to the redemption of the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds. The Finance Director shall deliver to the Fiscal Agent an Officer's Certificate specifying any amount to be so transferred, and the Fiscal Agent may rely on any such Officer's Certificate.

Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instruments. The City shall have the right at any time to direct the Fiscal Agent to release funds from the Reserve Fund, in whole or in part, by tendering to the Fiscal Agent: (i) a Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument, and (ii) an opinion of Bond Counsel stating that neither the release of such funds nor the acceptance of such Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument will cause interest on the 2017 Bonds or any Related Parity Bonds the interest on which is excluded from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes to become includable in gross income for purposes of federal income taxation. Upon tender of such items to the Fiscal Agent, and upon delivery by the City to the Fiscal Agent of written calculation of the amount permitted to be released from the Reserve Fund (upon which calculation the Fiscal Agent may conclusively rely), the Fiscal Agent shall transfer such funds from the Reserve Fund to the

City to be deposited in the Improvement Fund and used for the purposes thereof. The Fiscal Agent shall comply with all documentation relating to a Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument as shall be required to maintain such Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument in full force and effect and as shall be required to receive payments thereunder in the event and to the extent required to make any payment when and as required under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. If the Reserve Requirement is being maintained partially in cash and partially with a Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument, the cash shall be first used to meet any deficiency which may exist from time to time in the Bond Fund with respect to the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds. If the Reserve Requirement is being maintained with two or more Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instruments, any draw to meet a deficiency which may exist from time to time in the Bond Fund with respect to the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds shall be pro-rata with respect to each such instrument.

In the event that a Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument is available to be drawn upon for only one or more particular series of Bonds, a separate subaccount in the Reserve Fund may be established for such series, and the calculation of the Reserve Requirement with respect to all other Bonds payable from the Reserve Fund shall exclude the debt service on such issue of Bonds.

The City shall have no obligation to replace the Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument or to fund the Reserve Fund with cash if, at any time that the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds are Outstanding, amounts are not available under the Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument or if the rating of the claims-paying ability of the provider of the Qualified Reserve Fund Credit Instrument is downgraded.

Bond Fund.

Establishment of Bond Fund. The Bond Fund is established pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement as a separate fund to be held by the Fiscal Agent to the credit of which deposits shall be made as required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Moneys in the Bond Fund shall be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the Owners of the Bonds, and shall be disbursed for the payment of the principal of, and interest and any premium on, the Bonds as provided below.

Within the Bond Fund there is established a separate account designated as the “2017A Capitalized Interest Account” to be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and the Owners of the 2017A Bonds into which shall be deposited the amount specified in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Amounts on deposit in the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account shall be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent solely for the payment of interest on the 2017A Bonds.

Within the Bond Fund there is hereby established a separate account designated as the “2017B Capitalized Interest Account” to be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and the Owners of the 2017B Bonds into which shall be deposited the amount specified in Fiscal Agent Agreement. Amounts on deposit in the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account shall be used and withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent solely for the payment of interest on the 2017B Bonds.

Disbursements. At least 10 days before each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall notify the Finance Director in writing as to the principal and premium, if any, and interest due on the Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date (whether as a result of scheduled principal of and interest on the Bonds, optional redemption of the Bonds or a mandatory sinking fund redemption). On each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall withdraw from the Bond Fund and pay to the Owners of the Bonds the principal of, and interest and any premium, due and payable on such Interest Payment Date on the Bonds. Notwithstanding the foregoing, amounts in the Bond Fund as a result of a transfer pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall be immediately disbursed by the Fiscal Agent to pay past due amounts owing on the Bonds.

At least five (5) days prior to each Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall determine if the amounts then on deposit in the Bond Fund are sufficient to pay the debt service due on the Bonds on the next Interest Payment Date. In the event that amounts in the Bond Fund are insufficient for such purpose, the Fiscal Agent promptly shall notify the Finance Director by telephone (and confirm in writing) of the amount of the insufficiency.

In the event that amounts in the Bond Fund are insufficient for the purpose set forth in the preceding paragraph with respect to any Interest Payment Date, the Fiscal Agent shall do the following:

(i) Withdraw from the Reserve Fund, in accordance with the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement, to the extent of any funds or Permitted Investments therein, amounts to cover the amount of such Bond Fund insufficiency related to the 2017 Bonds and any Related Parity Bonds. Amounts so withdrawn from the Reserve Fund shall be deposited in the Bond Fund.

(ii) Withdraw from the reserve funds, if any, established under a Supplemental Agreement related to Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, to the extent of any funds or Permitted Investments therein, amounts to cover the amount of such Bond Fund insufficiency related to such Parity Bonds. Amounts so withdrawn from such reserve funds shall be deposited in the Bond Fund.

If, after the foregoing transfers and application of such funds for their intended purposes, there are insufficient funds in the Bond Fund to make the payments provided for in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, the Fiscal Agent shall apply the available funds first to the payment of interest on the Bonds, then to the payment of principal due on the Bonds other than by reason of sinking payments, if any, and then to payment of principal due on the Bonds by reason of sinking payments. Each such payment shall be made ratably to the Owners of the Bonds based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds, if there are insufficient funds to make the corresponding payment for all of the then Outstanding bonds, subject to the restrictions on the uses of funds set forth in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Any sinking payment not made as scheduled shall be added to the sinking payment to be made on the next sinking payment date.

Any failure by the Fiscal Agent to provide the notices required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall not alter the obligation of the City to make the scheduled payments from amounts in the Bond Fund.

Disbursements from the Special Tax Prepayments Account. Moneys in the Special Tax Prepayments Account shall be transferred by the Fiscal Agent to the Bond Fund on the next date for which notice of redemption of Bonds can timely be given, under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and shall be used (together with any amounts transferred from the Reserve Fund to redeem Bonds on the redemption date selected in accordance with the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Deficiency. If at any time it appears to the Fiscal Agent that there is a danger of deficiency in the Bond Fund and that the Fiscal Agent may be unable to pay Debt Service on the Bonds in a timely manner, the Fiscal Agent shall report to the Finance Director such fact. The City covenants to increase the levy of the Special Taxes in the next Fiscal Year (subject to the maximum amount authorized by the Rate and Method) in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Act for the purpose of curing Bond Fund deficiencies.

Excess. Any excess moneys remaining in the Bond Fund (not including moneys in the Capitalized Interest Account), following the payment of Debt Service on the Bonds on any September 1, shall be transferred to the Special Tax Fund.

Special Tax Fund

Establishment of Special Tax Fund. The Special Tax Fund is established as a separate fund to be held by the Fiscal Agent, to the credit of which the Fiscal Agent shall deposit amounts received from or on behalf of the City consisting of Special Tax Revenues and amounts transferred from the Administrative Expense Fund and the Bond Fund. The City shall promptly remit any Special Tax Revenues received by it to the Fiscal Agent for deposit by the Fiscal Agent to the Special Tax Fund.

Notwithstanding the foregoing,

(i) any Special Tax Revenues constituting the collection of delinquencies in payment of Special Taxes shall be separately identified by the Finance Director and shall be disposed of by the Fiscal Agent first, for transfer to the Bond Fund to pay any past due debt service on the Bonds; second, without preference or priority for transfer to (a) the Reserve Fund to the extent needed to increase the amount then on deposit in the Reserve Fund up to the then Reserve Requirement and (b) the reserve account for any Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds to the extent needed to increase the amount then on deposit in such reserve account up to the amount then required to be on deposit therein (and in the event the collection of delinquencies in payment of Special Taxes are not sufficient for the purposes of this clause, such amounts shall be applied to the Reserve Fund and any other reserve accounts ratably based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds); and third, to be held in the Special Tax Fund for use as described in the Fiscal Agent Agreement; and

(ii) any proceeds of Special Tax Prepayments shall be separately identified by the Finance Director and shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent as follows (as directed in writing by the Finance Director): (a) that portion of any Special Tax Prepayment constituting a prepayment of costs of the Project shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent to the Improvement Fund and (b) the remaining Special Tax Prepayment shall be deposited by the Fiscal Agent in the Special Tax Prepayments Account established pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Moneys in the Special Tax Fund shall be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City and Owners of the Bonds, shall be disbursed as provided below and, pending disbursement, shall be subject to a lien in favor of the Owners of the Bonds.

Disbursements. At least seven (7) days prior to each Interest Payment Date or redemption date, as applicable, the Fiscal Agent shall withdraw from the Special Tax Fund and transfer the following amounts in the following order of priority (i) to the Bond Fund an amount, taking into account any amounts then on deposit in the Bond Fund and any expected transfers from the Improvement Fund, the Reserve Fund and any reserve account for Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, the 2017A Capitalized Interest Account, the 2017B Capitalized Interest Account and the Special Tax Prepayments Account to the Bond Fund such that the amount in the Bond Fund equals the principal (including any sinking payment), premium, if any, and interest due on the Bonds on such Interest Payment Date or redemption date, and any past due principal or interest on the Bonds not theretofore paid from a transfer described in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and (ii) without preference or priority (a) to the Reserve Fund an amount, taking into account amounts then on deposit in the Reserve Fund, such that the amount in the Reserve Fund is equal to the Reserve Requirement, and (b) to the reserve account for any Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds, taking into account amounts then on deposit in the such reserve account, such that the amount in such reserve account is equal to the amount required to be on deposit therein (and in the event that amounts in the Special Tax Fund are not sufficient for the purposes of this paragraph, such amounts shall be applied to the Reserve Fund and any other reserve accounts ratably based on the then Outstanding principal amount of the Bonds).

Each calendar year, following the transfers pursuant to the preceding paragraph for the March 1 Interest Payment Date occurring in such calendar year, when amounts (including investment earnings) have been accumulated in the Special Tax Fund sufficient to make the transfers pursuant to the preceding paragraph for the September 1 Interest Payment Date occurring in such calendar year, the Finance Director, during the period up to but not including December 10 of such calendar year, may in his or her sole discretion direct in writing the disposition of moneys in the Special Tax Fund in excess of the amounts needed for such September 1 Interest Payment Date as follows: (i) direct the Fiscal Agent to transfer money to the Improvement Fund (or the accounts therein) for payment or reimbursement of the costs of the Project, (ii) direct to the Fiscal Agent to transfer money to the Administrative Expense Fund, in an amount not to exceed the amount included in the Special Tax levy for Administrative Expenses for such Fiscal Year and (iii) direct to the Fiscal Agent to transfer money for any other lawful purpose.

Administrative Expense Fund

Establishment of Administrative Expense Fund. The Administrative Expense Fund is established as a separate fund to be held by the Fiscal Agent, to the credit of which deposits shall be made as required by the Agreement. Moneys in the Administrative Expense Fund shall be held by the Fiscal Agent for the benefit of the City, and shall be disbursed as provided below.

Disbursement. Amounts in the Administrative Expense Fund shall be withdrawn by the Fiscal Agent and paid to the City or its order upon receipt by the Fiscal Agent of an Officer's Certificate, stating the amount to be withdrawn, that such amount is to be used to pay an Administrative Expense or a Cost of Issuance and the nature of such Administrative Expense or such Cost of Issuance.

Annually, on the last day of each Fiscal Year, the Fiscal Agent shall withdraw from the Administrative Expense Fund and transfer to the Special Tax Fund any amount in excess of that which is needed to pay any Administrative Expenses incurred but not yet paid, and which are not otherwise encumbered, as identified by the Finance Director in an Officer's Certificate.

Improvement Fund

Establishment of Improvement Fund. The Improvement Fund is established as a separate fund, and within the Improvement Fund there is hereby established a 2017A Improvement Account and an Allocated Bond Proceeds Account, to be held by the Fiscal Agent and to the credit of which fund and account deposits shall be made as required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Moneys in the Improvement Fund shall be disbursed, except as otherwise described in the paragraph entitled "Closing of Fund" below, for the payment or reimbursement of the costs of the Project.

Procedure for Disbursement. Disbursements from the 2017A Improvement Account and the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account shall be made by the Fiscal Agent upon receipt of an Officer's Certificate substantially in the form attached to the Agreement which shall:

- (i) set forth the amount required to be disbursed, the purpose for which the disbursement is to be made (which shall be for payment of a Project cost or to reimburse expenditures of the City or any other party for Project costs previously paid), and the person to which the disbursement is to be paid;
- (ii) certify that no portion of the amount then being requested to be disbursed was set forth in any Officers Certificate previously filed requesting disbursement; and
- (iii) certify that all disbursements from the Improvement Fund are in compliance with the JCFA.

Because the 2017B Bonds have been designated as Green Bonds, proceeds of the 2017B Bonds in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account shall be spent only on Project costs at the Transbay Transit Center. In the event that any moneys in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account are not spent on Project costs at the Transbay Transit Center, the City shall, within thirty (30) days after such expenditure, provide written notice of such expenditure to The Climate Bonds Initiative at the following address:

The Climate Bonds Initiative
72 Muswell Hill Place, London, N10 3RR, United Kingdom
Email: info@climatebonds.net
Attn: Rob Fowler, Head of Certification

Each such requisition shall be sufficient evidence to the Fiscal Agent of the facts stated therein and the Fiscal Agent shall have no duty to confirm the accuracy of such facts.

In addition, the Fiscal Agent shall transfer moneys from the 2017A Improvement Account to the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account in accordance with a written instruction requesting such transfer signed by an Authorized Officer.

Closing of Fund. Upon the filing of an Officer's Certificate stating that the Project has been completed and that all costs of the Project have been paid or are not required to be paid from the Improvement Fund (including the 2017A Improvement Account and the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account), the Fiscal Agent shall transfer the amount, if any, remaining in the 2017A Improvement Account and the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account to the Bond Fund for application to Debt Service payments on the Bonds specified in the Officer's Certificate.

Certain Covenants

Collection of Special Tax Revenues. The City shall comply with all requirements of the Act so as to assure the timely collection of Special Tax Revenues, including without limitation, the enforcement of delinquent Special Taxes.

Processing. On or within 5 Business Days of each June 1, the Fiscal Agent shall provide the Finance Director with a notice stating (i) the amount then on deposit in the Bond Fund, the Reserve Fund and any reserve account for Parity Bonds that are not Related Parity Bonds that is held by the Fiscal Agent, and (ii) if the amount in the Reserve Fund is less than the Reserve Requirement or the amount in such other reserve account held by the Fiscal Agent is less than its required amount, informing the City that replenishment of the Reserve Fund or reserve account is necessary. The receipt of or failure to receive such notice by the Finance Director shall in no way affect the obligations of the Finance Director under the following two paragraphs and the Fiscal Agent shall not be liable for failure to provide such notices to the Finance Director. Upon receipt of such notice, the Finance Director shall communicate with the Auditor to ascertain the relevant parcels on which the Special Taxes are to be levied, taking into account any parcel splits or combinations during the preceding and then current year.

Levy. The Finance Director shall effect the levy of the Special Taxes each Fiscal Year in accordance with the Ordinance by each August 1 that the Bonds are outstanding, or otherwise such that the computation of the levy is complete before the final date on which Auditor will accept the transmission of the Special Tax amounts for the parcels within the CFD for inclusion on the next real property tax roll. Upon the completion of the computation of the amounts of the levy, the Finance Director shall prepare or cause to be prepared, and shall transmit to the Auditor, such data as the Auditor requires to include the levy of the Special Taxes on the next real property tax roll.

Computation. The Finance Director shall fix and levy the amount of Special Taxes within the CFD required for the payment of principal of and interest on any outstanding Bonds of the CFD becoming due and payable during the ensuing calendar year, replenishment of the Reserve Fund or other reserve account and payment of Administrative Expenses, including amounts necessary to discharge any rebate obligation, during such year, taking into account the balances in the applicable funds established under the Fiscal Agent Agreement and in the Special Tax Fund. The Special Taxes so levied shall not exceed the authorized amounts as provided in the proceedings under the Rate and Method.

Collection. Except as set forth in the Ordinance, Special Taxes shall be payable and be collected in the same manner and at the same time and in the same installment as the general taxes on real property are payable, and have the same priority, become delinquent at the same time and in the same proportionate amounts and bear the same proportionate penalties and interest after delinquency as do the ad valorem taxes on real property. The Finance Director is authorized pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement to employ consultants to assist in computing the levy of the Special Taxes under the Fiscal Agent Agreement and any reconciliation of amounts levied to amounts received. The fees and expenses of such consultants and the costs and expenses of the Finance Director (including a charge for City staff time) in conducting its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall be an Administrative Expense under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Covenant to Foreclose. Under the Act, the City covenants under the Fiscal Agent Agreement with and for the benefit of the Owners of the Bonds that it will order, and cause to be commenced as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and thereafter diligently prosecute to judgment (unless such delinquency is theretofore brought current), an action in the superior court to foreclose the lien of any Special Tax or installment thereof not paid when due as provided in the following two paragraphs. The Finance Director shall notify the City Attorney of any such delinquency of which the Finance Director is aware, and the City Attorney shall commence, or cause to be commenced, such proceedings.

On or about September 1 of each Fiscal Year, the Finance Director shall compare the amount of Special Taxes theretofore levied in the CFD to the amount of Special Tax Revenues theretofore received by the City, and:

(A) Individual Delinquencies. If the Finance Director determines that (i) any single parcel subject to the Special Tax in the CFD is delinquent in the payment of Special Taxes in the aggregate amount of \$ 40,000 or more or (ii) any single parcel subject to the Special Tax in the CFD is delinquent in the payment of three or more installments of Special Taxes, then the Finance Director shall send or cause to be sent a notice of delinquency (and a demand for immediate payment thereof) to the property owner within 45 days of such determination, and (if the delinquency remains uncured) foreclosure proceedings shall be commenced by the City within 90 days of such determination.

(B) Aggregate Delinquencies. If the Finance Director determines that the total amount of delinquent Special Tax for the prior Fiscal Year for the entire CFD, (including the total of delinquencies under paragraph (A) above), exceeds 5% of the total Special Tax due and payable for the prior Fiscal Year the Finance Director shall notify or cause to be notified property owners who are then delinquent in the payment of Special Taxes (and demand immediate payment of the delinquency) within 45 days of such determination, and shall commence foreclosure proceedings within 90 days of such determination against each parcel of land in the CFD with a Special Tax delinquency.

The Finance Director and the City Attorney, as applicable, are authorized pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement to employ counsel to conduct any such foreclosure proceedings. The fees and expenses of any such counsel (including a charge for City staff time) in conducting foreclosure proceedings shall be an Administrative Expense under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Books and Records. The City will keep, or cause to be kept, proper books of record and accounts, separate from all other records and accounts of the City, in which complete and correct entries shall be made of all transactions relating to the Special Tax Revenues. Such books of record and accounts shall at all times during business hours be subject to the inspection of the Fiscal Agent and the Owners of not less than ten percent (10%) of the principal amount of the Bonds then Outstanding, or their representatives duly authorized in writing.

Limits on Special Tax Waivers and Bond Tenders. The City covenants not to exercise its rights under the Act to waive delinquency and redemption penalties related to the Special Taxes or to declare Special Tax penalties amnesty program if to do so would materially and adversely affect the interests of the owners of the Bonds.

The City covenants not to permit the tender of Bonds in payment of any Special Taxes except upon receipt of a certificate of an Independent Financial Consultant that to accept such tender will not result in the City having insufficient Special Tax Revenues assuming the Special Taxes are levied and collected in the maximum amount permitted by the Rate and Method, to pay the principal of and interest when due on the Bonds remaining Outstanding following such tender. Subject to the foregoing, in the event Bonds are tendered to the Fiscal Agent, such Bonds shall be cancelled by the Fiscal Agent and shall cease to accrue interest from the date such Bonds are tendered. Upon surrender of a Bond to be tendered in part only, the City shall execute and the Fiscal Agent shall authenticate and deliver to the tendering party a new Bond or Bonds the principal amount of which is equal to the untendered portion of the Bonds and the interest rate and maturity date of which shall be the same as the interest rate and maturity date of the tendered bond. To the extent applicable, the City shall deliver to the Fiscal Agent an Officer's Certificate setting forth any adjustments to the mandatory sinking fund schedule as a result of the tender, which Officer's Certificate must be accompanied by a certificate of an Independent Financial Consultant to the effect that it has reviewed the proposed adjustments in the mandatory sinking fund schedule and that the remaining Special Tax Revenues, if the Special Taxes are levied and collected in the maximum amount permitted by the Rate and Method, will be sufficient to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds when due following such adjustment.

City Bid at Foreclosure Sale. The City will not bid at a foreclosure sale of property in respect of delinquent Special Taxes, unless it expressly agrees to take the property subject to the lien for Special Taxes imposed by the CFD and that the Special Taxes levied on the property are payable while the City owns the property.

Amendment of Rate and Method. The City will not initiate proceedings under the Act to modify the Rate and Method if such modification would adversely affect the security for the Bonds. If an initiative is adopted that purports to modify the Rate and Method in a manner that would adversely affect the security for the Bonds, the City will, to the extent permitted by law, commence and pursue reasonable legal actions to prevent the modification of the Rate and Method in a manner that would adversely affect the security for the Bonds.

Investment of Moneys in Funds

General. Moneys in any fund or account created or established by the Fiscal Agreement and held by the Fiscal Agent shall be invested by the Fiscal Agent in Permitted Investments, which in any event by their terms mature prior to the date on which such moneys are required to be paid out under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, as directed pursuant to an Officer's Certificate filed with the Fiscal Agent at least two (2) Business Days in advance of the making of such investments. In the absence of any such Officer's Certificate, the Fiscal Agent shall hold such funds uninvested.

Moneys in Funds. Moneys in any fund or account created or established by the Fiscal Agent Agreement and held by the Finance Director shall be invested by the Finance Director in any Permitted Investment or in any other lawful investment for City funds, which in any event by its terms matures prior to the date on which such moneys are required to be paid out under the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Obligations purchased as an investment of moneys in any fund shall be deemed to be part of such fund or account, subject, however, to the requirements of the Fiscal Agent Agreement for transfer of interest earnings and profits resulting from investment of amounts in funds and accounts. Whenever in the Fiscal Agent Agreement any moneys are required to be transferred by the City to the Fiscal Agent, such transfer may be accomplished by transferring a like amount of Permitted Investments.

Valuation of Investments. Except as otherwise provided in the next sentence, all investments of amounts deposited in any fund or account created by or pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, or otherwise containing gross proceeds of the Bonds (within the meaning of section 148 of the Tax Code) shall be acquired, disposed of, and valued (as of the date that valuation is required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement or the Tax Code) at Fair Market Value. Investments in funds or accounts (or portions thereof) that are subject to a yield restriction under the applicable provisions of the Tax Code and (unless valuation is undertaken at least annually) investments of funds in the Reserve Fund shall be valued at their present value (within the meaning of section 148 of the Tax Code). The Fiscal Agent shall not be liable for verification of the application of such sections of the Tax Code or for any determination of Fair Market Value or present value and may conclusively rely upon an Officer's Certificate as to such valuations.

Commingled Money. Investments in any and all funds and accounts may be commingled in a separate fund or funds for purposes of making, holding and disposing of investments, notwithstanding provisions in the Fiscal Agent Agreement for transfer to or holding in or to the credit of particular funds or accounts of amounts received or held by the Fiscal Agent or the Finance Director under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, provided that the Fiscal Agent or the Finance Director, as applicable, shall at all times account for such investments strictly in accordance with the funds and accounts to which they are credited and otherwise as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Sale of Investments. The Fiscal Agent or the Finance Director, as applicable, shall sell at Fair Market Value, or present for redemption, any investment security whenever it shall be necessary to provide moneys to meet any required payment, transfer, withdrawal or disbursement from the fund or account to which such investment security is credited and neither the Fiscal Agent nor the Finance Director shall be liable or responsible for any loss resulting from the acquisition or disposition of such investment security in accordance.

Liability of City

General. The City shall not incur any responsibility in respect of the Bonds or the Fiscal Agent Agreement other than in connection with the duties or obligations explicitly in the Fiscal Agent Agreement or in the Bonds assigned to or imposed upon it. The City shall not be liable in connection with the performance of its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, except for its own negligence or willful default. The City shall not be bound to ascertain or inquire as to the performance or observance of any of the terms, conditions, covenants or agreements of the Fiscal Agent in the Fiscal Agent Agreement or of any of the documents executed by the Fiscal Agent in connection with the Bonds, or as to the existence of a default or event of default thereunder.

No General Liability. No provision of the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall require the City to expend or risk its own general funds or otherwise incur any financial liability (other than with respect to the Special Tax Revenues) in the performance of any of its obligations under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, or in the exercise of any of its rights or powers, if it shall have reasonable grounds for believing that repayment of such funds or adequate indemnity against such risk or liability is not reasonably assured to it.

Certain Provisions Relating to the Fiscal Agent

Merger. Any company into which the Fiscal Agent may be merged or converted or with which it may be consolidated or any company resulting from any merger, conversion or consolidation to which it shall be a party or any company to which the Fiscal Agent may sell or transfer all or substantially all of its corporate trust business, provided such company shall be eligible under the following paragraph shall be the successor to such Fiscal Agent without the execution or filing of any paper or any further act, anything in the Fiscal Agent Agreement to the contrary notwithstanding. The Fiscal Agent shall give the Finance Director written notice of any such succession under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Removal. Upon 30 days written notice, the City may remove the Fiscal Agent initially appointed, and any successor thereto, and may appoint a successor or successors thereto, but any such successor shall be a bank, national banking association or trust company having a combined capital (exclusive of borrowed capital) and surplus of at least fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000), and subject to supervision or examination by federal or state authority. If such bank, national banking association or trust company publishes a report of condition at least annually, pursuant to law or to the requirements of any supervising or examining authority above referred to, then for the purposes of this covenant, combined capital and surplus of such bank, national banking association or trust company shall be deemed to be its combined capital and surplus as set forth in its most recent report of condition so published.

Resignation. The Fiscal Agent may at any time resign by giving written notice to the City by certified mail return receipt requested, and by giving to the Owners notice by mail of such resignation. Upon receiving notice of such resignation, the City shall promptly appoint a successor Fiscal Agent by an instrument in writing. Any resignation or removal of the Fiscal Agent shall become effective only upon acceptance of appointment by the successor Fiscal Agent.

No Successor. If no appointment of a successor Fiscal Agent shall be made within forty-five (45) days after the Fiscal Agent shall have given to the City written notice or after a vacancy in the office of the Fiscal Agent shall have occurred by reason of its inability to act, the Fiscal Agent, or any Owner may apply to any court of competent jurisdiction to appoint a successor Fiscal Agent. Said court may thereupon, after such notice, if any, as such court may deem proper, appoint a successor Fiscal Agent.

Court Order. If, by reason of the judgment of any court, the Fiscal Agent is rendered unable to perform its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, all such duties and all of the rights and powers of the Fiscal Agent under the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall be assumed by and vest in the Finance Director in trust for the benefit of the Owners. The City covenants for the direct benefit of the Owners that the Finance Director in such case shall be vested with all of the rights and powers of the Fiscal Agent under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and shall assume all of the responsibilities and perform all of the duties of the Fiscal Agent under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, in trust for the benefit of the Owners of the Bonds.

Liability of Fiscal Agent.

General. The Fiscal Agent shall not be liable in connection with the performance of its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, except for its own negligence or willful misconduct.

No Expenditures. No provision of the Fiscal Agent Agreement shall require the Fiscal Agent to expend or risk its own funds or otherwise incur any financial liability in the performance of any of its duties under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, or in the exercise of any of its rights or powers.

No Action. The Fiscal Agent shall be under no obligation to exercise any of the rights or powers vested in it by the Fiscal Agent Agreement at the request or direction of any of the Owners under the Fiscal Agent Agreement unless such Owners shall have offered to the Fiscal Agent reasonable security or indemnity satisfactory to the Fiscal Agent against the costs, expenses and liabilities which might be incurred by it in compliance with such request or direction.

Amendments Permitted

With Consent. The Fiscal Agent Agreement and the rights and obligations of the City and of the Owners of the Bonds may be modified or amended at any time by a Supplemental Agreement pursuant to the affirmative vote at a meeting of Owners, or with the written consent without a meeting, of the Owners of at least sixty percent (60%) in aggregate principal amount of the Bonds then Outstanding, exclusive of Bonds disqualified as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. No such modification or amendment shall (i) extend the maturity of any Bond or reduce the interest rate thereon, or otherwise alter or impair the obligation of the City to pay the principal of, and the interest and any premium on, any Bond, without the express consent of the Owner of such Bond, or (ii) permit the creation by the City of any pledge or lien upon the Special Taxes superior to or on a parity with the pledge and lien created for the benefit of the Bonds (except as otherwise permitted by the Act, the laws of the State of California or the Fiscal Agent Agreement), or reduce the percentage of Bonds required for the amendment of the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Without Consent. The Fiscal Agent Agreement and the rights and obligations of the City and of the Owners may also be modified or amended at any time by a Supplemental Agreement, without the consent of any Owners, only to the extent permitted by law and only for any one or more of the following purposes:

(i) to add to the covenants and agreements of the City in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, other covenants and agreements thereafter to be observed, or (b) to limit or surrender any right or power in the Fiscal Agent Agreement reserved to or conferred upon the City;

(ii) to make modifications not adversely affecting any Outstanding Bonds in any material respect, including, but not limited to, amending the Rate and Method, so long as the amendment does not result in debt service coverage less than that set forth in clause (E) of the Parity Bonds test;

(iii) to make such provisions for the purpose of curing any ambiguity, or of curing, correcting or supplementing any defective provision contained in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, or in regard to questions arising under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, as the City and the Fiscal Agent may deem necessary or desirable and not inconsistent with the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and which shall not adversely affect the rights of the Owners of the Bonds;

(iv) to make such additions, deletions or modifications as may be necessary or desirable to assure exclusion from gross income for federal income tax purposes of interest on the Bonds;

(v) in connection with the issuance of any Parity Bonds under and pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Fiscal Agent's Consent. Any amendment of the Fiscal Agent Agreement may not modify any of the rights or obligations of the Fiscal Agent without its written consent. The Fiscal Agent shall be furnished an opinion of counsel that any such Supplemental Agreement entered into by the City and the Fiscal Agent complies with the provisions of the Fiscal Agent Agreement and the Fiscal Agent may conclusively rely on such opinion and shall be absolutely protected in so relying.

Procedure for Amendment with Written Consent of Owners. The City and the Fiscal Agent may at any time adopt a Supplemental Agreement amending the provisions of the Bonds or of the Fiscal Agent Agreement or any Supplemental Agreement, to the extent that such amendment is permitted by the Fiscal Agent Agreement, to take effect when and as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. A copy of such Supplemental Agreement, together with a request to Owners for their consent thereto, shall be mailed by first class mail, by the Fiscal Agent, at the expense of the City), to each Owner of Bonds Outstanding, but failure to mail copies of such Supplemental Agreement and request shall not affect the validity of the Supplemental Agreement when assented to as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

Such Supplemental Agreement shall not become effective unless there shall be filed with the Fiscal Agent the written consents of the Owners of at least sixty percent (60%) in aggregate principal amount of the Bonds then Outstanding (exclusive of Bonds disqualified as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) and a notice shall have been mailed provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Each such consent shall be effective only if accompanied by proof of ownership of the Bonds for which such consent is given, which proof shall be such as is permitted by the Fiscal Agent Agreement. Any such consent shall be binding upon the Owner of the Bonds giving such consent and on any subsequent Owner (whether or not such subsequent Owner has notice thereof) unless such consent is revoked in writing by the Owner giving such consent or a subsequent Owner by filing such revocation with the Fiscal Agent prior to the date when the notice provided for in the Fiscal Agent Agreement has been mailed.

After the Owners of the required percentage of Bonds shall have filed their consents to the Supplemental Agreement, the City shall mail a notice to the Owners in the manner provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement for the mailing of the Supplemental Agreement, stating in substance that the Supplemental Agreement has been consented to by the Owners of the required percentage of Bonds and will be effective as provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement (but failure to mail copies of said notice shall not affect the validity of the Supplemental Agreement or consents thereto). Proof of the mailing of such notice shall be filed with the Fiscal Agent. A record, consisting of the papers required by the Fiscal Agent Agreement to be filed with the Fiscal Agent, shall be proof of the matters therein stated until the contrary is proved. The Supplemental Agreement shall become effective upon the filing with the Fiscal Agent of the proof of mailing of such notice, and the Supplemental Agreement shall be deemed conclusively binding (except as otherwise provided in the Fiscal Agent Agreement) upon the City and the Owners of all Bonds at the expiration of sixty (60) days after such filing, except in the event of a final decree of a court of competent jurisdiction setting aside such consent in a legal action or equitable proceeding for such purpose commenced within such sixty-day period.

Discharge of Agreement. If the City shall pay and discharge the entire indebtedness on all or any portion of Bonds Outstanding in any one or more of the following ways:

(A) by paying or causing to be paid the principal of, and interest and any premium on, all Bonds Outstanding, as and when the same become due and payable;

(B) by depositing with the Fiscal Agent, in trust, at or before maturity, money which, together with the amounts then on deposit in the funds and accounts provided for in the Bond Fund and the Reserve Fund, is fully sufficient to pay all Bonds Outstanding, including all principal, interest and redemption premiums; or

(C) by irrevocably depositing with the Fiscal Agent, in trust, cash and/or Federal Securities in such amount as the City shall determine, as confirmed by an independent certified public accountant, will, together with the interest to accrue thereon and moneys then on deposit in the fund and accounts provided for in the Bond Fund and the Reserve Fund (to the extent invested in Federal Securities), be fully sufficient to pay and discharge the indebtedness on all Bonds (including all principal, interest and redemption premiums) at or before their respective maturity dates.

If the City shall have taken any of the actions specified in (A), (B) or (C) above, and if such Bonds are to be redeemed prior to the maturity thereof notice of such redemption shall have been given as in the Fiscal Agent Agreement provided or provision satisfactory to the Fiscal Agent shall have been made for the giving of such notice, then, at the election of the City, and notwithstanding that any such Bonds shall not have been surrendered for payment, the pledge of the Special Taxes and other funds provided for in the Fiscal Agent Agreement and all other obligations of the City under the Fiscal Agent Agreement with respect to such Bonds shall cease and terminate. Notice of such election shall be filed with the Fiscal Agent.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following obligations and pledges of the City shall continue in any event: (i) the obligation of the City to pay or cause to be paid to the Owners of the Bonds not so surrendered and paid all sums due thereon, (ii) the obligation of the City to pay amounts owing to the Fiscal Agent pursuant to the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and (iii) the obligation of the City to assure that no action is taken or failed to be taken if such action or failure adversely affects the exclusion of interest on the Bonds from gross income for federal income tax purposes.

Upon compliance by the City with the foregoing with respect to all Bonds Outstanding, any funds held by the Fiscal Agent after payment of all fees and expenses of the Fiscal Agent, which are not required for the purposes of the preceding paragraph, shall be paid over to the City and any Special Taxes thereafter received by the City shall not be remitted to the Fiscal Agent but shall be retained by the City to be used for any purpose permitted under the Act.

APPENDIX D

FORM OF BOND COUNSEL OPINION

November 9, 2017

City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

OPINION: \$36,095,000 City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A (Federally Taxable) (the “2017A Bonds”)

\$171,405,000 City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B (Federally Taxable - Green Bonds) (the “2017B Bonds”)

Members of the Board of Supervisors:

We have acted as bond counsel to the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”) in connection with the issuance by the City, for and on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), of the captioned bonds, dated the date hereof (the “Bonds”). In such capacity, we have examined such law and such certified proceedings, certifications and other documents as we have deemed necessary to render this opinion.

The Bonds are issued pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, as amended, being sections 53311 et seq. of the California Government Code (the “Act”), Resolution No. 2-15 of the Board of Supervisors of the City adopted on January 13, 2015 and signed by the Mayor on January 20, 2015, and supplemented by Resolution No. 247-17 of the Board of Supervisors adopted on June 13, 2017 and signed by the Mayor on June 22, 2017 (collectively, the “Resolution”) and a Fiscal Agent Agreement (the “Fiscal Agent Agreement”), dated as of November 1, 2017, by and between the City and Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association, as fiscal agent (the “Fiscal Agent”). Under the Fiscal Agent Agreement, the City has pledged certain revenues (“Special Tax Revenues”) for the payment of principal, premium (if any) and interest on the Bonds when due.

Regarding questions of fact material to our opinion, we have relied on representations of the City contained in the Resolution and in the Fiscal Agent Agreement, and in the certified proceedings and other certifications of public officials furnished to us, without undertaking to verify the same by independent investigation.

Based on the foregoing, we are of the opinion that, under existing law:

1. The City is a municipal corporation and chartered city and county, duly organized and existing under its charter and the laws of the State of California, with the power to adopt the Resolution, enter into the Fiscal Agent Agreement and perform the agreements on its part contained therein, and issue the Bonds.

2. The Fiscal Agent Agreement has been duly authorized, executed and delivered by the City, and constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the City, enforceable against the City.

3. The Fiscal Agent Agreement creates a valid lien on the Special Tax Revenues and other funds pledged by the Fiscal Agent Agreement for the security of the Bonds, on a parity with other bonds (if any) issued or to be issued under the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

4. The Bonds have been duly authorized and executed by the City, and are valid and binding limited obligations of the City, payable solely from the Special Tax Revenues and other funds provided therefor in the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

5. The City does not intend for the interest on the Bonds to be excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes. We express no opinion regarding federal tax consequences arising with respect to the Bonds.

6. Interest on the Bonds is exempt from personal income taxation imposed by the State of California.

The rights of the owners of the Bonds and the enforceability of the Bonds and the Fiscal Agent Agreement are limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights generally, and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity.

This opinion is given as of the date hereof, and we assume no obligation to revise or supplement this opinion to reflect any facts or circumstances that may hereafter come to our attention, or any changes in law that may hereafter occur. Our engagement with respect to this matter has terminated as of the date hereof.

Respectfully submitted,

A Professional Law Corporation

APPENDIX E

FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 2014-1
(TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER)**

\$36,095,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A
(Federally Taxable)

\$171,405,000
Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B
(Federally Taxable – Green Bonds)

This Continuing Disclosure Certificate (the “Disclosure Certificate”) is executed and delivered by the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”) with respect to the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) (the “District”) in connection with the issuance of the above captioned respective series of bonds (together, the “Bonds”). The Bonds are issued pursuant to Resolution No. 247-17 adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City on June 13, 2017 and approved by Mayor Ed Lee on June 22, 2017 (the “Resolution”) and Fiscal Agent Agreement, dated as of November 1, 2017 (the “Fiscal Agent Agreement”) by and between City and Zions Bank, a Division of ZB, National Association, as fiscal agent and pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, as amended (Sections 53311 *et seq.* of the Government Code of the State of California). The City covenants and agrees as follows:

SECTION 1. Purpose of the Disclosure Certificate. This Disclosure Certificate is being executed and delivered by the City for the benefit of the Holders and Beneficial Owners of the Bonds and in order to assist the Participating Underwriters in complying with Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12(b)(5).

SECTION 2. Definitions. The following capitalized terms shall have the following meanings:

“Annual Report” shall mean any Annual Report provided by the City pursuant to, and as described in, Sections 3 and 4 of this Disclosure Certificate.

“Beneficial Owner” shall mean any person which: (a) has or shares the power, directly or indirectly, to make investment decisions concerning ownership of any Bonds (including persons holding Bonds through nominees, depositories or other intermediaries) including, but not limited to, the power to vote or consent with respect to any Bonds or to dispose of ownership of any Bonds; or (b) is treated as the owner of any Bonds for federal income tax purposes.

“Dissemination Agent” shall mean Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc., acting in its capacity as Dissemination Agent under this Disclosure Certificate, or any successor Dissemination Agent designated in writing by the City and which has filed with the City a written acceptance of such designation.

“Holder” shall mean either the registered owners of the Bonds, or, if the Bonds are registered in the name of The Depository Trust Company or another recognized depository, any applicable participant in such depository system.

“Listed Events” shall mean any of the events listed in Section 5(a) and 5(b) of this Disclosure Certificate.

“MSRB” shall mean the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board or any other entity designated or authorized by the Securities and Exchange Commission to receive reports pursuant to the Rule. Until otherwise designated by the MSRB or the Securities and Exchange Commission, filings with the MSRB are to be made through the Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) website of the MSRB currently located at <http://emma.msrb.org>.

“Participating Underwriter” shall mean any of the original underwriters or purchasers of the Bonds required to comply with the Rule in connection with offering of the Bonds.

“Rule” shall mean Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as the same may be amended from time to time.

“Salesforce Transit Center” shall mean the one million square foot transit center which will replace the former Transbay Terminal in downtown San Francisco.

“Train Box” shall mean the core and shell of the two below-grade levels of the Salesforce Transit Center, that were built to accommodate the downtown rail extension that will extend the Caltrain rail tracks from 4th & King Streets to the Salesforce Transit Center.

Capitalized terms used and not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Fiscal Agent Agreement.

SECTION 3. Provision of Annual Reports.

(a) The City shall, or shall cause the Dissemination Agent to, not later than nine months after the end of the City’s fiscal year (which is June 30), commencing with the report for the 2016-17 Fiscal Year (which is due not later than March 31, 2018), provide to the MSRB an Annual Report which is consistent with the requirements of Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate. If the Dissemination Agent is not the City, the City shall provide the Annual Report to the Dissemination Agent not later than 15 days prior to such date. The Annual Report must be submitted in electronic format and accompanied by such identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB, and may cross-reference other information as provided in Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate; *provided*, that if the audited financial statements of the City are not available by the date required above for the filing of the Annual Report, the City shall submit unaudited financial statements and submit the audited financial statements as soon as they are available. If the City’s Fiscal Year changes, it shall give notice of such change in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(f).

(b) If the City is unable to provide to the MSRB an Annual Report by the date required in subsection (a), the City shall send a notice to the MSRB in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A.

(c) The Dissemination Agent shall (if the Dissemination Agent is other than the City), file a report with the City certifying the date that the Annual Report was provided to the MSRB pursuant to this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 4. Content of Annual Reports. The City’s Annual Report shall contain or incorporate by reference the following information, as required by the Rule:

(a) the audited general purpose financial statements of the City prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to governmental entities. The financial statements required by this subsection (a) shall be accompanied by the following statement:

THE CITY'S ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT IS PROVIDED SOLELY TO COMPLY WITH THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION STAFF'S INTERPRETATION OF RULE 15C2-12. NO FUNDS OR ASSETS OF THE CITY ARE REQUIRED TO BE USED TO PAY DEBT SERVICE ON THE BONDS, AND THE CITY IS NOT OBLIGATED TO ADVANCE AVAILABLE FUNDS TO COVER ANY DELINQUENCIES. INVESTORS SHOULD NOT RELY ON THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE CITY IN EVALUATING WHETHER TO BUY, HOLD OR SELL THE BONDS.

(b) the principal amount of the Bonds of each series outstanding as of June 30 next preceding the date of the Annual Report.

(c) the balances in the 2017A Improvement Fund and the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account as of June 30 next preceding the date of the Annual Report.

(d) the balance in the Reserve Fund for the Bonds as of June 30 next preceding the date of the Annual Report.

(e) the total assessed value of all parcels subject to the Special Taxes and the current year's assessed value for the District.

(f) concerning delinquent parcels:

- number of parcels delinquent in payment of Special Tax,
- amount of total delinquency and as a percentage of total Special Tax levy, and
- status of the District's actions on covenants to pursue foreclosure proceedings upon

delinquent properties.

(g) identity of any delinquent taxpayer obligated for more than 10% of the annual Special Tax levy, together with the assessed value of the applicable properties and a summary of the results of any foreclosure sales, if available.

(h) for the Fiscal Year for which the Annual Report is being issued, identify any Certificate of Occupancy or Tax Commencement Authorization that has been issued on a parcel subject to the Special Taxes.

(i) to the extent not otherwise provided pursuant to the preceding items a-h, annual information required to be filed with respect to the District since the last Annual Report with the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission pursuant to Sections 50075.1, 50075.3, 53359.5(b), 53410(d) or 53411 of the California Government Code.

(j) updated Table 1 (only Section A) and Table 2 in the Official Statement, dated October 26, 2017 relating to the Bonds.

(k) a statement confirming that, during the most recent fiscal year, proceeds of the 2017B Bonds in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account were spent only on Project costs at the Salesforce Transit Center. The City shall no longer be obligated to include this statement in its Annual Report beginning with the Annual Report for the fiscal year that follows the earliest to occur of (i) the expenditure of all of the proceeds of the 2017B Bonds in the Allocated Bond Proceeds Account and (ii) completion of the Salesforce Transit Center.

Any or all of the items listed above may be set forth in a document or set of documents, or may be included by specific reference to other documents, including official statements of debt issues of the City or related public entities, which are available to the public on the MSRB website. If the document included by reference is a final official statement, it must be available from the MSRB. The City shall clearly identify each such other document so included by reference.

SECTION 5. Reporting of Significant Events.

(a) The City shall give, or cause to be given, notice of the occurrence of any of the following events numbered 1-9 with respect to the Bonds not later than ten business days after the occurrence of the event:

1. Principal and interest payment delinquencies;
2. Unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;
3. Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;
4. Substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform;
5. Issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determination of taxability or of a Notice of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701 TEB) or adverse tax opinions;
6. Tender offers;
7. Defeasances;
8. Rating changes; or
9. Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership or similar event of the obligated person.

Note: for the purposes of the event identified in subparagraph (9), the event is considered to occur when any of the following occur: the appointment of a receiver, fiscal agent or similar officer for an obligated person in a proceeding under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code or in any other proceeding under State or federal law in which a court or governmental authority has assumed jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the obligated person, or if such jurisdiction has been assumed by leaving the existing governmental body and officials or officers in possession but subject to the supervision and orders of a court or governmental authority, or the entry of an order confirming a plan of reorganization, arrangement or liquidation by a court or governmental authority having supervision or jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the obligated person.

(b) The City shall give, or cause to be given, notice of the occurrence of any of the following events numbered 10-16 with respect to the Bonds not later than ten business days after the occurrence of the event, if material:

10. Unless described in paragraph 5(a)(5), other material notices or determinations by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to the tax status of the Bonds or other material events affecting the tax status of the Bonds;
11. Modifications to rights of Bond holders;
12. Unscheduled or contingent Bond calls;
13. Release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the Bonds;
14. Non-payment related defaults;
15. The consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving an obligated person or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the obligated person, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms; or

16. Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee.

(c) Within ten (10) business days after the City receives a written statement from the Climate Bonds Initiative to the effect that the 2017B Bonds are no longer certified in accordance with the “Low Carbon Land Transport Criteria” under the Climate Bonds Standard, the City will post, or cause to be posted, notice of such written statement with the MSRB.

(d) Within ten (10) business days after the District is removed from the Teeter Plan, the City will post, or cause to be posted, notice of such event with the MSRB.

(e) The City shall give, or cause to be given, in a timely manner, notice of a failure to provide the annual financial information on or before the date specified in Section 3, as provided in Section 3(b).

(f) Whenever the City obtains knowledge of the occurrence of a Listed Event described in Section 5(b), the City shall determine if such event would be material under applicable federal securities laws.

(g) If the City learns of the occurrence of a Listed Event described in Section 5(a), or determines that knowledge of a Listed Event described in Section 5(b) would be material under applicable federal securities laws, the City shall within ten business days of occurrence file a notice of such occurrence with the MSRB in electronic format, accompanied by such identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB. Notwithstanding the foregoing, notice of the Listed Event described in subsection 5(b)(12) need not be given under this subsection any earlier than the notice (if any) of the underlying event is given to Holders of affected Bonds pursuant to the Resolution.

SECTION 6. Termination of Reporting Obligation. The City’s obligations under this Disclosure Certificate shall terminate upon the legal defeasance, prior redemption or payment in full of all of the Bonds. If such termination occurs prior to the final maturity of the Bonds, the City shall give notice of such termination in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(f).

SECTION 7. Dissemination Agent. The City may, from time to time, appoint or engage a Dissemination Agent to assist it in carrying out its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate, and may discharge any such Agent, with or without appointing a successor Dissemination Agent. The Dissemination Agent shall have only such duties as are specifically set forth in this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 8. Amendment; Waiver. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the City may amend or waive this Disclosure Certificate or any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) If the amendment or waiver relates to the provisions of Sections 3(a), 3(b), 4, 5(a) or 5(b), it may only be made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, change in law, or change in the identity, nature or status of an obligated person with respect to the Bonds or the type of business conducted;

(b) The undertaking, as amended or taking into account such waiver, would, in the opinion of the City Attorney or nationally recognized bond counsel, have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of the original issuance of the Bonds, after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances; and

(c) The amendment or waiver either (i) is approved by the owners of a majority in aggregate principal amount of the Bonds or (ii) does not, in the opinion of the City Attorney or nationally recognized bond counsel, materially impair the interests of the Holders.

In the event of any amendment or waiver of a provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the City shall describe such amendment in the next Annual Report, and shall include, as applicable, a narrative explanation of the reason for the amendment or waiver and its impact on the type (or in the case of a change of accounting principles, on the presentation) of financial information or operating data being presented by the City. In addition, if the amendment relates to the accounting principles to be followed in preparing financial statements: (i) notice of such change shall be given in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5; and (ii) the Annual Report for the year in which the change is made should present a comparison (in narrative form and also, if feasible, in quantitative form) between the financial statements as prepared on the basis of the new accounting principles and those prepared on the basis of the former accounting principles.

SECTION 9. Additional Information. Nothing in this Disclosure Certificate shall be deemed to prevent the City from disseminating any other information, using the means of dissemination set forth in this Disclosure Certificate or any other means of communication, or including any other information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event, in addition to that which is required by this Disclosure Certificate. If the City chooses to include any information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event in addition to that which is specifically required by this Disclosure Certificate, the City shall have no obligation under this Disclosure Certificate to update such information or include it in any future Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event.

SECTION 10. Remedies. In the event of a failure of the City to comply with any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, any Participating Underwriter, Holder or Beneficial Owner of the Bonds may take such actions as may be necessary and appropriate to cause the City to comply with its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate; provided that any such action may be instituted only in a federal or state court located in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and that the sole remedy under this Disclosure Certificate in the event of any failure of the City to comply with this Disclosure Certificate shall be an action to compel performance.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

SECTION 11. Beneficiaries. This Disclosure Certificate shall inure solely to the benefit of the City, the Dissemination Agent, the Participating Underwriters and Holders and Beneficial Owners from time to time of the Bonds, and shall create no rights in any other person or entity.

Date: November 9, 2017.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Benjamin Rosenfield
Controller

Approved as to form:

DENNIS J. HERRERA
CITY ATTORNEY

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

AGREED AND ACCEPTED:

GOODWIN CONSULTING GROUP, INC., as Dissemination Agent

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE EXHIBIT A

**FORM OF NOTICE TO THE
MUNICIPAL SECURITIES RULEMAKING BOARD
OF FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT**

Name of City: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Name of Bond Issue: City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A (Federally Taxable) and Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B (Federally Taxable – Green Bonds)

Date of Issuance: November 9, 2017

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board that the City has not provided an Annual Report with respect to the above-named Bonds as required by Section 3 of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate of the City and County of San Francisco, dated November 9, 2017. The City anticipates that the Annual Report will be filed by _____.

Dated: _____, 20__

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____ [to be signed only if filed]
Title: _____

APPENDIX F

BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM

The information in this section concerning DTC; and DTC's book-entry system has been obtained from sources that City believes to be reliable, but City takes no responsibility for the accuracy thereof.

The Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), New York, NY, will act as securities depository for the 2017 Bonds. The 2017 Bonds will be issued as fully-registered securities registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC's partnership nominee) or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. One fully-registered certificate will be issued for the each issue of the 2017 Bonds, each in the aggregate principal amount of such issue, and will be deposited with DTC.

DTC, the world's largest depository, is a limited-purpose trust company organized under the New York Banking Law, a "banking organization" within the meaning of the New York Banking Law, a member of the Federal Reserve System, a "clearing corporation" within the meaning of the New York Uniform Commercial Code, and a "clearing agency" registered pursuant to the provisions of Section 17A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. DTC holds and provides asset servicing for over 2.2 million issues of U.S. and non-U.S. equity corporate and municipal debt issues, and money market instruments from over 100 countries that DTC's participants ("Direct Participants") deposit with DTC. DTC also facilitates the post-trade settlement among Direct Participants of sales and other securities transactions in deposited securities through electronic computerized book-entry transfers and pledges between Direct Participants' accounts. This eliminates the need for physical movement of securities certificates. Direct Participants include both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, clearing corporations, and certain other organizations. DTC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation ("DTCC"). DTCC, in turn, is owned by a number of Direct Participants of DTC and Members of the National Securities Clearing Corporation, Fixed Income Clearing Corporation and Emerging Markets Clearing Corporation, (NSCC, FICC and EMCC, also subsidiaries of DTCC), as well as by the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the American Stock Exchange LLC, and the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Access to the DTC system is also available to others such as both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, and clearing corporations that clear through or maintain a custodial relationship with a Direct Participant, either directly or indirectly ("Indirect Participants"). DTC has a Standard & Poor's rating of AA+. The DTC Rules applicable to its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. More information about DTC can be found at www.dtcc.com. *Information on such website is not incorporated by reference herein.*

Purchases of 2017 Bonds under the DTC system must be made by or through Direct Participants, which will receive a credit for the 2017 Bonds on DTC's records. The ownership interest of each actual purchaser of each 2017 Bond ("Beneficial Owner") is in turn to be recorded on the Direct and Indirect Participants' records. Beneficial Owners will not receive written confirmation from DTC of their purchase. Beneficial Owners are, however, expected to receive written confirmations providing details of the transaction, as well as periodic statements of their holdings, from the Direct or Indirect Participant through which the Beneficial Owner entered into the transaction. Transfers of ownership interests in the 2017 Bonds are to be accomplished by entries made on the books of Direct and Indirect Participants acting on behalf of Beneficial Owners. Beneficial Owners will not receive certificates representing their ownership interests in the 2017 Bonds, except in the event that use of the book-entry system for the 2017 Bonds is discontinued.

To facilitate subsequent transfers, all 2017 Bonds deposited by Direct Participants with DTC are registered in the name of DTC's partnership nominee, Cede & Co., or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. The deposit of 2017 Bonds with DTC and their registration in the name of Cede & Co. or such other DTC nominee do not effect any change in beneficial ownership. DTC has no knowledge of the actual Beneficial Owners of the 2017 Bonds: DTC's records reflect only the identity of the Direct Participants to whose accounts such 2017 Bonds are credited, which may or may not be the Beneficial Owners. The Direct and Indirect Participants will remain responsible for keeping account of their holdings on behalf of their customers.

Conveyance of notices and other communications by DTC to Direct Participants, by Direct Participants to Indirect Participants, and by Direct Participants and Indirect Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by arrangements among them, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Beneficial Owners of 2017 Bonds may wish to take certain steps to augment the transmission to them of notices of significant events with respect to the 2017 Bonds, such as redemptions, tenders, defaults, and proposed amendments to the 2017 Bond documents. For example, Beneficial Owners of 2017 Bonds may wish to ascertain that the nominee holding the 2017 Bonds for their benefit has agreed to obtain and transmit notices to Beneficial Owners. In the alternative, Beneficial Owners may wish to provide their names and addresses to the registrar and request that copies of notices be provided directly to them.

Redemption notices shall be sent to DTC. If less than all of the 2017 Bonds within an issue are being redeemed, DTC's practice is to determine by lot the amount of the interest of each Direct Participant in such issue to be redeemed.

Neither DTC nor Cede & Co. (nor any other DTC nominee) will consent or vote with respect to the 2017 Bonds unless authorized by a Direct Participant in accordance with DTC's Procedures. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an Omnibus Proxy to City as soon as possible after the record date. The Omnibus Proxy assigns Cede & Co.'s consenting or voting rights to those Direct Participants to whose accounts the 2017 Bonds are credited on the record date (identified in a listing attached to the Omnibus Proxy).

Redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments on the 2017 Bonds will be made to Cede & Co., or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. DTC's practice is to credit Direct Participants' accounts upon DTC's receipt of funds and corresponding detail information from the City or Fiscal Agent, on payable date in accordance with their respective holdings shown on DTC's records. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name," and will be the responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC nor its nominee, Fiscal Agent, or City, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Payment of redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments to Cede & Co. (or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC) is the responsibility of the City or the Fiscal Agent, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners will be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

DTC may discontinue providing its services as depository with respect to the 2017 Bonds at any time by giving reasonable notice to the City or the Fiscal Agent. Under such circumstances, in the event that a successor depository is not obtained, bond certificates are required to be printed and delivered.

The City may decide to discontinue use of the system of book-entry transfers through DTC (or a successor securities depository). In that event, bond certificates will be printed and delivered.



FOR ADDITIONAL BOOKS: ELABRA.COM OR (888) 935-2272