APPENDIX A

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES

This Appendix A provides general information about the City's governance structure, budget processes, property taxation system and tax and other revenue sources, City expenditures, labor relations, employment benefits and retirement costs, investments, bonds, and other long-term obligations.

The various reports, documents, websites, and other information referred to herein are not incorporated 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, social media accounts, 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 and should not be considered in making a decision to buy the Certificates.

Certain information contained in this Appendix A may reference other enterprise departments of the City including San Francisco International Airport ("SFO" or the "Airport"), Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC"), and other enterprise departments. Descriptions of such enterprises are included for informational purposes only, but no funds or resources of such enterprises are available or pledged as security for the Certificates.

The information presented in this Appendix A contains, among other information, City budgetary forecasts, projections, estimates and other statements that are based on current expectations as of its date. The words "expects," "forecasts," "projects," "budgets," "intends," "anticipates," "estimates," "assumes" and analogous expressions are intended to identify such information as "forward-looking statements." Such budgetary forecasts, projections and estimates are not intended as representations of fact or intended as guarantees of results. Any such forward-looking statements are inherently subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results or performance to differ materially from those that have been forecast, estimated or projected.

APPENDIX A
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

APPENDIX A TABLE OF CONTENTS 1
CITY FINANCIAL CHALLENGES 3
CITY GOVERNMENT 4
- City Charter 4
- Mayor 5
- Board of Supervisors 6
- Other Elected and Appointed City Officers 6

CITY BUDGET 7
- Overview 7
- Budget Process 10
- Multi-Year Budgeting and Planning 11
- Role of Controller in Budgetary Analysis and Projections 12
- General Fund Results: Audited Financial Statements 12
- Rainy Day Reserve 15
- Budget Stabilization Reserve 15
- Salaries, Benefits and Litigation Reserves 16
- General Reserve 16
- COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve, Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve, and Fiscal Cliff Reserve 17
- Operating Cash Reserve 17
- Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions 19
- Other Budget Updates: Fiscal Year 2023-24 Nine-Month Budget Status Report 24
- Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter 26

BUDGETARY RISKS 27
- Threat of Recession 27
- Impact of Commuting Pattern Changes on Business Taxes 28
- Office Vacancy in San Francisco; Impact on Property Taxes and Other Revenues 29
- Potential City Acquisition of PG&E Distribution Assets 30
- Impact of November 2024 Local Ballot Initiatives 31
- Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances 31
- Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances 32
- Laguna Honda Hospital Medicaid and Medicare Recertification 32

THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY 33
CITY INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICTS 34
GENERAL FUND REVENUES 34
- PROPERTY TAXATION 34
  - Property Taxation System – General 34
  - Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies 35
  - Tax Levy and Collection 40
  - Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property 43
- OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES 43
  - Business Taxes 44
  - Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax) 46

Real Property Transfer Tax 47
Sales and Use Tax 48
Other Local Taxes 50
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES 52
State Subventions Based on Taxes 52
CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES 53
General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area 53
Voter-Mandated Spending Requirements 54
EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS 56
Labor Relations 56
San Francisco Employees' Retirement System 59
Medical Benefits 65
Post-Employment Health Care Benefits 68
Total City Employee Benefits Costs 69
INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS 70
CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS 72
Capital Plan 72
Tax-Supported Debt Service – City General Obligation Bonds 74
Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds 76
Refunding General Obligation Bonds 77
General Fund Lease Obligations 80
Voter-Approved Lease Revenue Bonds 82
Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Certificates of Participation 84
Commercial Paper Program 86
Overlapping Debt 86
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES 88
Article XIIIA of the California Constitution 88
Article XIIIB of the California Constitution 89
Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution 89
Proposition 1A 90
Proposition 22 90
Proposition 26 91
Future Initiatives and Changes in Law 92
LEGAL MATTERS AND RISK MANAGEMENT 92
Pending Litigation 92
Ongoing Investigations 92
Risk Retention Program 95

CITY FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

The City continues to face material financial challenges, including actual and projected revenue losses, resulting from a variety of factors, including continuing remote work by a significant portion of the workforce (which has led to declining property taxes for certain office buildings, lower real estate property transfer taxes, and reductions in taxes based on employees physically located in the City), continuing weakness in the local hospitality and convention industries (resulting in declines in hotel and sales taxes), and general economic conditions. As described herein, these conditions have resulted in projected budget deficits (absent corrective actions) in the hundreds of millions of dollars in future fiscal years, rising to approximately $1.36 billion in fiscal year 2027-28.

FY25 & FY26 Original Budget

The Original Budget for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26 (the "FY25 & FY26 Original Budget") was approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 30, 2024 and signed by the Mayor on August 1, 2024. See "CITY BUDGET – Budget Process" for additional detail. The FY25 & FY26 Original Budget reflects $15.9 billion of expenditures in fiscal year 2024-25 and $15.5 billion in fiscal year 2025-26. The FY25 & FY26 Original Budget addresses the $789.3 million two-year shortfall projected in the March 2024 Joint Report (described below) primarily through the use of $135.7 million of fund balance, $236.6 million in projected revenue increases, and $68.8 million use of special funds, as well as $302.0 million of net departmental budget reductions and other operating savings. Such operating savings were offset through increases in increased capital and information technology costs and new labor costs. In connection with the Proposed FY25 and FY26 Budget, the Controller released the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 Revenue Letter. See "Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter."
The following paragraphs describe significant recent reports which preceded the adoption of the FY25 & FY26 Original Budget.

Recent Reports

In December 2023, the Mayor's Office, Controller's Office, and Board of Supervisor's Budget and Legislative Analyst issued the Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 (the "December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update"), which forecasted General Fund deficits of $244.7 million in fiscal year 2024-25, $554.5 million in fiscal year 2025-26, $945.1 million in fiscal year 2026-27, and $1,349.7 million in fiscal year 2027-28. The projected deficits were primarily due to continued expenditure growth, coupled with slower revenue growth than previously anticipated.

In March 2024, the Mayor's Office, Controller's Office, and Board of Supervisor's Budget and Legislative Analyst issued an additional update to the Five-Year Plan (the "March 2024 Joint Report"). The March 2024 Joint Report projected minor changes to the shortfalls projected in the December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update due to modest improvements in current year fund balance, modest changes to the revenue forecast, higher employee benefit costs, and nominal updates to other citywide expenditures. The March 2024 Joint Report forecast annual shortfalls of $235.9 million in fiscal year 2024-25, $553.3 million in fiscal year 2025-26, $927.0 million in fiscal year 2026-27, and $1,361.6 million in fiscal year 2027-28.

The Nine-Month Budget Status Report for fiscal year 2023-24 (the "Nine-Month Report") was released on May 14, 2024. The Nine-Month Report projected a General Fund ending balance of $494.4 million in fiscal year 2023-24, a $28.5 million improvement from the $465.6 million balance in the March 2024 Joint Report. Application of this additional current year fund balance would decrease the projected shortfall in

the upcoming two-year budget to $760.8 million. The improvement was largely driven by revenue in the Department of Public Health, offset by weakness in tax and other department revenue.

On September 30, 2024, the Controller issued its most recent report on the status of the City economy for September 2024. The Controller's report noted that the San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the Federal Office of Management and Budget, shed 9,900 jobs between June and August 2024, but job losses are typical during this time for seasonal reasons. The Controller's prior report released on August 5 stated that the City had added 8,700 jobs added between April and June. The City's unemployment rate which dipped in May to 3.1%, rose to 4.1% in August. Most government job losses were concentrated in the state and local educational sector, though the tech-heavy Information and Professional Services sectors also lost jobs. Construction and Financial Activities were relative bright spots, adding 700 and 600 jobs, respectively. The City's office vacancy rate continued to rise during the April through June period, and there was little improvement in return to office or downtown BART metrics which along with hotel rates and occupancy remain significantly below pre-pandemic levels. Bridge crossings into and out of the City are also notably lower than pre-pandemic levels but showed slight growth from June to August. Between June and August, city apartment rents continued to rise, though there was no comparable growth in home sales prices.

Recent Labor Agreements

In July 2024, the City entered into 28 MOUs representing miscellaneous bargaining units. The MOUs for all unions cover the period July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2027. The Controller's Office prepared an analysis of the impact of the MOUs which stated that the MOUs affect approximately 27,000 authorized positions with an overall salary and benefits base of approximately $4.3 billion in fiscal year 2024-25. The Controller's Office analysis found that that the MOUs will result in increased costs to the City of $130.8 million (or 3.1%) of base wage and benefit cost in fiscal year 2024-25; $293.3 million (or 6.9%) in Fiscal year 2025-26; and $471.6 million (or 11.1%) in fiscal year 2026-27. In addition, there is a wage increase of 2.5% on June 30, 2027, that has no cost over the three-year term of the MOUs, but will create additional costs in fiscal year 2027-28. Approximately 65% of the increased cost under the MOUs is supported by the General Fund. See "EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS: Labor Relations" and "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES – Business Taxes" herein for a further discussion of such matters.

CITY GOVERNMENT

City Charter

San Francisco is constituted 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, voters approved the current charter, which went into effect in most respects on July 1, 1996 ("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 TK-12) ("SFUSD") and the San Francisco Community College District (post-secondary) ("SFCCD"). Each is a separate legal entity with a separately elected governing board.

Unique among California cities, San Francisco as a charter city and county provides 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 a 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 slightly less than 50% of all City expenditures. In addition, voters have approved Charter amendments that impose certain spending mandates and tax revenue set-asides, which dictate expenditure or service levels for certain programs, and allocate specific revenues or specific proportions thereof to other programs, including transportation services, children's services and public education, and libraries.

Under its original charter, the City committed 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 Mills 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. 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. SFO, the Port, SFPUC (which 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 twenty one 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 enterprise fund departments, including San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and the MTA, annually receive significant General Fund transfers.

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. 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

Mayor London Breed is the 45th Mayor of San Francisco and the first African-American woman to serve in

such capacity in the City's history. In November 2019, Mayor Breed was elected to serve her first full term. Prior to her election, Mayor Breed served as Acting Mayor, leading the City following the sudden passing of Mayor Lee. Mayor Breed previously served as a member of the Board of Supervisors for six years, including the last three years as President of the Board. An election for Mayor will occur on November 5, 2024.

Board of Supervisors

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. Elections for Board seats for Districts 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 will occur on November 5, 2024.

TABLE A-1

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Board of Supervisors

Name	First Elected or Appointed	Current Term Expires
Connie Chan, *District 1*	2021	2025
Catherine Stefani, *District 2*	2018	2027
Aaron Peskin, Board President, *District 3*	2015	2025
Joel Engardio, *District 4*	2023	2027
Dean Preston, *District 5*	2019	2025
Matt Dorsey, *District 6*	2022	2027
Myrna Melgar, *District 7*	2021	2025
Rafael Mandelman, *District 8*	2018	2027
Hillary Ronen, *District 9*	2017	2025
Shamann Walton, *District 10*	2019	2027
Ahsha Safai, *District 11*	2017	2025

Other Elected and Appointed City Officers

The City Attorney, an elected position, represents the City in all legal proceedings in which the City has an interest. On September 29, 2021, Mayor London N. Breed appointed Assemblymember David Chiu to serve as the San Francisco City Attorney. Mr. Chiu replaced the prior City Attorney, Dennis Herrera, who became the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission on November 1, 2021. Mr. Chiu ran and was elected by voters in an election on June 7, 2022 to his current term as City Attorney.

The Assessor-Recorder, a citywide elected position, administers the property tax assessment system of the City. On February 8, 2021, Joaquín Torres, formerly the Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, was sworn in as the new Assessor-Recorder. Mr. Torres ran and was elected by voters in a special election on February 15, 2022 to his current term as Assessor-Recorder.

The Treasurer is responsible for the deposit and investment of all City moneys, and also acts as Tax Collector for the City. José Cisneros was re-elected to a four-year term as Treasurer of the City in November 2019 for a term that extends through January 2025. Mr. Cisneros has served as Treasurer since September 2004, following his appointment by then-Mayor Newsom.

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. On January 10, 2024, Mayor Breed appointed Greg Wagner, formerly the Chief Operating Officer of the City's Department of Public Health, to a ten-year term as Controller of the City. Mr. Wagner's appointment was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors on January 23, 2024, in accordance with the Charter. Mr. Wagner replaced the prior City Controller, Benjamin Rosenfield, who stepped down from the position after serving as City Controller since March 2008.

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. The City Administrator oversees the General Services Agency which consists of 25 departments, divisions, and programs that include the Public Works Department, Department of Technology, Office of Contract Administration/Purchasing, Real Estate, County Clerk, Fleet Management, Convention Facilities, Animal Care and Control, Medical Examiner, and Treasure Island. Carmen Chu was sworn in as the City Administrator on February 2, 2021.

CITY BUDGET

Overview

The City manages the operations of its nearly 60 departments, commissions and authorities, including the enterprise fund departments, and funds such departments and enterprises through its annual budget process. Each year the Mayor prepares budget legislation for the City departments, which must be approved by the Board of Supervisors. General Fund revenues consist largely of local property tax, business tax, sales tax, other local taxes and charges for services. A significant portion of the City's revenue also comes in the form of intergovernmental transfers from the State and federal governments. Thus, the City's fiscal position 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 these factors are almost wholly outside the control of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and other City officials. In addition, the State Constitution limits the City's ability to raise taxes and property-based fees without a vote of City residents. See "CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES" herein. Also, the fact that the City's annual budget must be prepared 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.

The FY25 & FY26 Original Budget was passed by the Board of Supervisors on July 30, 2024, and signed by Mayor Breed on August 1, 2024. The Original Budget for fiscal year 2024-25 appropriates annual revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves of $15.9 billion, of which the City's General Fund accounts for $6.9 billion. The Original Budget for fiscal year 2025-26 appropriates revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves of $15.6 billion, of which $7.1 billion represents the General Fund budget. See "CITY BUDGET – Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter" for further details on the budget. Table A-2 shows Final Revised Budget revenues and appropriations for the City's General Fund for fiscal years 2020-21 through 2022-23, and Original Budgets for fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25. See "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – PROPERTY TAXATION –Tax Levy and Collection," "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" and "CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES"

herein.

See “CITY FINANCIAL CHALLENGES” and “BUDGETARY RISKS” for discussions of factors that have adversely impacted the revenue and expenditure levels assumed in the FY25 & FY26 Original Budget.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Budgeted General Fund Revenues and Appropriations for
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2024-25

(000s)

	2020-21 Final Revised Budget [5]	2021-22 Final Revised Budget [5]	2022-23 Final Revised Budget [5]	2023-24 Original Budget [6]	2024-25 Original Budget [7]
Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves	$2,816,902	$2,803,535	$3,214,031	$224,248	$301,875
Budgeted Revenues					
Property Taxes[1]	$2,161,945	$2,115,600	$2,379,530	$2,510,000	$2,469,580
Business Taxes	798,057	957,307	$902,246	851,100	883,000
Other Local Taxes[2]	657,990	777,750	1,050,820	1,098,880	1,109,170
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	22,977	28,027	26,749	30,291	31,802
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	2,389	4,039	3,088	3,014	3,921
Interest and Investment Earnings	20,732	34,215	38,660	121,071	146,715
Rents and Concessions	11,166	11,820	12,913	14,571	14,145
Grants and Subventions	1,591,756	1,699,946	1,536,227	1,477,115	1,321,363
Charges for Services	254,990	258,939	243,298	272,865	351,423
Other	59,773	37,694	23,307	17,532	19,444
Total Budgeted Revenues	$5,581,775	$5,925,337	$6,216,838	$6,396,439	$6,350,563
Bond Proceeds & Repayment of Loans	-	-	-	-	-
Expenditure Appropriations					
Public Protection	$1,505,780	$1,586,264	$1,681,489	$1,747,204	$1,837,737
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	218,986	244,365	275,941	242,912	232,734
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	1,605,573	1,571,761	1,621,981	1,604,163	1,641,289
Community Health	1,158,599	1,119,891	1,118,010	1,125,977	1,144,476
Culture and Recreation	147,334	161,417	180,475	201,453	190,338
General Administration & Finance	332,997	353,518	351,738	345,406	352,660
General City Responsibilities	126,993	159,299	201,959	184,513	194,821
Total Expenditure Appropriations	$5,096,262	$5,196,515	$5,431,593	$5,451,628	$5,594,055
Budgetary reserves and designations, net	$42,454	$45,567	$46,496	$70,840	$2,160
Transfers In	$417,009	$194,114	$194,984	$211,296	$206,499
Transfers Out[3]	(1,164,927)	(1,181,704)	(1,315,702)	(1,309,516)	(1,250,314)
Net Transfers In/Out	($747,918)	($987,590)	($1,120,718)	($1,098,220)	($1,043,815)
Budgeted Excess (Deficiency) of Sources Over (Under) Uses	2,512,044	2,499,200	2,832,062	-	-
Variance of Actual vs. Budget	291,491	714,831	131,543	-	-
Total Actual Budgetary Fund Balance[4]	2,803,535	3,214,031	2,963,605	-	-

[1] The Budget appropriates Excess ERAF property tax funds in all fiscal years shown on the table. Please see "GENERAL FUND REVENUES -- Property Taxation " sections for more information about Excess ERAF.

[2] Other Local Taxes includes sales, hotel, utility users, parking, transfer, sugar sweetened beverage, stadium admissions, access line, cannabis, and overpaid executive taxes.

[3] Transfers Out is primarily related to transfers to support Charter-mandated spending requirements and hospitals.

[4] Fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 Final Revised Budget reflects prior year *actual* budgetary fund balance.

[5] Fiscal year 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 Final Revised Budgets are based on respective Annual Comprehensive Financial Reports.

[6] Fiscal year 2023-24 amounts represent the Original Budget, adopted July 27, 2023.

[7] Fiscal year 2024-25 amounts represent the Original Budget, adopted July 30, 2024.

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

Budget Process

The following paragraphs contain a description of the City's customary budget process. The City's fiscal year commences on July 1 and ends on June 30. 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 a proposed 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 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 Revenue Letter and other information from the Controller's website are not incorporated herein by reference. The City's Capital Planning Committee (composed of other City officials) 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, each year, 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 approves the budget by adoption of the Budget and Appropriation Ordinance (also referred to herein as the "Original Budget") typically by no later than August 1 of each fiscal year.

The Budget and Appropriation Ordinance becomes effective with or without the Mayor's signature after 10 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 Budget and Appropriation 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 Budget and 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 Budget and 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 upon release of the City's ACFR to reflect the year-end revenue and expenditure appropriations for that fiscal year.

Multi-Year Budgeting and Planning

The City's budget involves multi-year budgeting and financial planning, including:

1. Fixed two-year budgets are approved by the Board of Supervisors. For fiscal year 2025-26, all departments except for MTA, SFPUC, SFO, and the Port will have budgets open again for amendments.

2. Five-year financial plan and update, which forecasts General Fund revenues and expenses and summarizes expected public service levels and funding requirements for that period. An update to the 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, the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors and Controller's Office on March 29, 2024, for fiscal year 2024-25 through fiscal year 2027-28. See "CITY BUDGET: Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY 2024-25 through FY 2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" section below. The Five-Year Financial Plan was most recently updated in December 2023. "CITY BUDGET: Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through 2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" for a summary.

3. The Controller's Office proposes 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 the City is required 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. Key financial policies that have been enacted include:

    - Non-Recurring Revenue Policy – This policy limits the Mayor's and Board's ability to use for operating expenses the following nonrecurring revenues: extraordinary year-end General Fund balance, 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.
    - Rainy Day and Budget Stabilization Reserve Policies – These reserves were established to support the City's budget in years when revenues decline. These and other reserves are discussed in detail below. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires deposits into the Rainy Day Reserve if total General Fund revenues for a fiscal year exceed total General Fund revenues for the prior fiscal year by more than five percent. Similarly, if budget year revenues exceed current year revenues by more than five percent, the budget must allocate deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve. The Budget Stabilization Reserve augments the Rainy Day Reserve and is funded through the dedication of 75% of certain volatile revenues. No withdrawals from these reserves were made in fiscal year 2023-24, and none are projected to be made during the forecast period given positive, though slow, revenue growth. These and other reserves are discussed under "Rainy Day Reserve" and "Budget Stabilization Reserve" below.

4. The City is required to submit labor agreements to the Board of Supervisors by May 15, so the fiscal impact of the agreements can be incorporated in the Mayor's proposed June 1 budget. The City negotiated agreements with its public safety employee organizations for fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25. In July 2024, the City entered into 28 MOUs representing miscellaneous bargaining units. The Controller's Office analysis found that that the MOUs will result in increased costs to the City of $130.8 million (or 3.1%) of base wage and benefit cost in fiscal year 2024-25; $293.3 million (or 6.9%) in Fiscal year 2025-26; and $471.6 million (or 11.1%) in fiscal year 2026-27. In addition, there is a wage increase of 2.5% on June 30, 2027, that has no cost over the three-year term of the MOUs, but will create additional costs in fiscal year 2027-28. Approximately 65% of the increased cost under the MOUs is supported by the General Fund.

Role of Controller in 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 actual expenditures are often different from the estimated expenditures in the Original Budget due to supplemental appropriations, continuing appropriations of prior years, and unexpended current-year funds. If the Controller estimates revenue shortfalls that exceed applicable reserves and any other allowances for revenue shortfalls in the adopted City budget, upon receipt of such estimates, the Mayor is to inform the Board of Supervisors of actions to address this shortfall. The Board of Supervisors may adopt an ordinance to reflect the Mayor's proposal or alternative proposals in order to balance the budget.

In addition to the five-year planning responsibilities 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 fiscal year 2023-24 Six Month Report (the "Six Month Report") on February 15, 2024, and issued the Nine Month Report on May 14, 2024. The City Charter also directs the Controller to annually report on the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates in each Mayor's Proposed Budget; the most recent report (Revenue Letter) for fiscal year 2024-25 and 2025-26 was issued on June 10, 2024.

General Fund Results: Audited Financial Statements

The City issued the ACFR, which includes the City's audited financial statements, for fiscal year 2022-23 on December 29, 2023.

Fiscal year 2022-23 General Fund balance decreased from the fiscal year 2021-22. As of June 30, 2023, the net available budgetary basis General Fund fund balance was $852.1 million (see Table A-3), which is

$164.0 million less than the $1,016 million available as of June 30, 2022. This decrease resulted from General Fund expenditures exceeding revenues, as planned for in the fiscal year 2022-23 budget, which assumed the use of $306.7 of budgetary basis fund balance.

On a Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") basis, the General Fund balance as of June 30, 2023 was $2.6 billion (shown in Tables A-3 and A-4) derived from revenues of $6.1 billion. The City prepares its budget on a modified accrual basis, which is also referred to as "budget basis" in the ACFR. 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. Table A-4 focuses on the City's fund balances; General Fund balances are shown on both a budget basis and a GAAP basis with comparative financial information for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2019, through June 30, 2023.

Table A-3, entitled "Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances," is extracted from information in the City's published ACFR. Audited financial statements can be obtained from the City Controller's website https://sf.gov/annual-comprehensive-financial-reports-acfr. 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-3 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. See "CITY BUDGET – Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY 2024-25 through FY 2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" for a summary of the most recent projections.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-3

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Fund Balances[1]

Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2022-23

(000s)

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Revenues:					
Property Taxes[2]	$2,248,004	$2,075,002	$2,332,864	2,336,071	2,459,052
Business Taxes	917,811	822,154	722,642	861,172	850,593
Other Local Taxes[3]	1,215,306	996,180	709,018	1,115,553	1,108,545
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	27,960	25,318	12,332	32,078	28,953
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	4,740	3,705	4,508	5,755	3,191
Interest and Investment Income	88,523	65,459	(1,605)	(93,447)	68,319
Rents and Concessions	14,460	9,816	5,111	10,668	11,775
Intergovernmental	1,069,349	1,183,341	1,607,803	1,795,395	1,339,711
Charges for Services	257,814	229,759	230,048	238,438	243,234
Other	46,254	62,218	46,434	23,265	29,677
Total Revenues	$5,890,221	$5,472,952	$5,669,155	$6,324,948	$6,143,050
Expenditures:					
Public Protection	$1,382,031	$1,479,195	$1,498,514	$1,562,797	$1,654,953
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	202,988	203,350	204,973	232,078	265,019
Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development	1,071,309	1,252,865	1,562,982	1,478,115	1,577,163
Community Health	809,120	909,261	1,056,590	1,002,047	967,381
Culture and Recreation	152,250	155,164	145,405	159,056	172,832
General Administration & Finance	267,997	304,073	314,298	298,742	301,748
General City Responsibilities	144,811	129,941	114,251	273,711	336,280
Total Expenditures	$4,030,506	$4,433,849	$4,897,013	$5,006,546	$5,275,376
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures	$1,859,715	$1,039,103	$772,142	$1,318,402	$867,674
Other Financing Sources (Uses):					
Transfers In	$104,338	$87,618	$343,498	$84,107	$119,361
Transfers Out	(1,468,971)	(1,157,822)	(1,166,855)	(1,209,383)	(1,316,074)
Other	-	-	-	41,913	72,033
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	($1,364,633)	($1,070,204)	($823,357)	($1,083,363)	($1,124,680)
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues and Other Sources Over Expenditures and Other Uses	$495,082	($31,101)	($51,215)	$235,039	($257,006)
Total Fund Balance at Beginning of Year	$2,221,941	$2,717,023	$2,685,922	$2,670,104	$2,905,143
Cumulative effect of accounting change			35,397	-	
Total Fund Balance at End of Year -- GAAP Basis	$2,717,023	$2,685,922	$2,670,104	$2,905,143	$2,648,137
Assigned for Subsequent Year's Appropriations and Unassigned Fund Balance, Year End					
-- GAAP Basis	$326,582	$395,776	$179,077	$325,664	$150,628
-- Budget Basis	$812,687	$896,172	$901,980	$1,016,157	$852,147

1 Summary of financial information derived from City ACFRs. 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 The City recognized $548.0 million of "Excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF)" revenue in FY 2018-19, representing FY16-17, FY17-18, and FY18-19 (3 fiscal years) of ERAF. Please see "GENERAL FUND REVENUES - Property Taxation" for more information about Excess ERAF.

3 Other Local Taxes includes sales, hotel, utility users, parking, transfer, sugar sweetened beverage, stadium admissions, access line, cannabis, and overpaid executive taxes.

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

In addition to the reconciliation of GAAP versus budget-basis fund balance, Table A-4 shows the City's various reserve balances as designations of fund balance. Key reserves are described further as follows:

Rainy Day Reserve

The City maintains a Rainy Day Reserve, as shown on the first and second line of Table A-4 below. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires that if total General Fund revenues for the current year exceed total General Fund revenues for the prior year by more than five percent, then the City must deposit anticipated General Fund revenues in excess of that five percent growth into three accounts within the Rainy Day Reserve (see below) and for other lawful governmental purposes. Similarly, if budgeted revenues exceed current year revenues by more than five percent, the budget must allocate deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve. 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") for SFUSD, with each reserve account receiving 50% of the existing balance at the time. Deposits to the reserve are allocated as follows:

- 37.5% of the excess revenues to the City Reserve;
- 12.5% of the excess revenues to the School Reserve (not shown in Table A-3 because it is not part of the General Fund, it is reserved for SFUSD);
- 25% of the excess revenues to the Rainy Day One-Time or Capital Expenditures account; and
- 25% of the excess revenues to any lawful governmental purpose.

The fiscal year 2022-23 ending balance of the Rainy Day Economic Stabilization City Reserve was $114.5 million, as shown in Table A-4. Under Proposition C, the City is not eligible to withdraw from the Rainy Day Reserve in fiscal years 2023-24, 2024-25 or 2025-26, preserving the balance of $114.5 million in those years.

The combined balances of the Rainy Day Reserve's Economic Stabilization account and the Budget Stabilization Reserve are subject to a cap of 10% of actual total General Fund revenues. Amounts in excess of that cap in any year will be placed in the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve, which is eligible to be allocated to capital and other one-time expenditures. Monies in the City Reserve are available to provide budgetary support 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 One-Time Reserve are available for capital and other one-time spending initiatives.

Budget Stabilization Reserve

The City maintains a Budget Stabilization Reserve, as shown on the third line of Table A-4 below. The Budget Stabilization Reserve augments the 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 rolling five-year annual average (adjusting 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.

The combined value of the Budget Stabilization Reserve and the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve was $330.0 million at the end of fiscal year 2022-23, with an ending balance of $275.2 million in the Budget Stabilization Reserve and $54.8 million in the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve. As with the Rainy Day Reserve under Proposition C, the City is not permitted to withdraw from the Budget Stabilization Reserve in fiscal years 2023-24, 2024-25 or 2025-26, maintaining the fiscal year 2022-23 balance of $275.2 million.

The Budget Stabilization Reserve has the same withdrawal requirements as the Rainy Day Reserve. 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. No deposits are required in years when the City is permitted to withdraw.

Salaries, Benefits and Litigation Reserves

The City maintains two reserves to offset potential expenses, which are available to City departments through a Controller's Office review and approval process. These are shown in the "assigned, not available for appropriation," and "assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation" sections of Table A-4 below. These include the Salaries and Benefit Reserve (balance of $27.9 million as of fiscal year 2022-23) and the Litigation Reserve. The Litigation Reserve and Public Health Management Reserve (balance of $259.2 million in fiscal year 2022-23) are combined for reporting purposes. The purpose of the latter is to manage patient revenue volatility in the Department of Public Health.

General Reserve

The City maintains a General Reserve, shown as part of "Unassigned for General Reserve" in the "assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation" section of Table A-4 below. The fiscal year 2022-23 balance of $64.7 million includes $57.8 million of General Reserve, as well as two smaller, unrelated reserves. The General Reserve is to be used for current-year fiscal pressures not anticipated during the budget process. A City policy, originally adopted on April 13, 2010, set the General 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. 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 in years when the City appropriates a withdrawal from the Rainy Day reserve. The intent of this policy change was to increase reserves available during a multi-year downturn. In fiscal years 2020-21 and 2021-22, the City withdrew from the Rainy Day Reserve and reset its General Fund Reserve deposit requirement to 1.5% of General Fund revenues in those years. The fiscal year 2022-23 ending balance of the General Reserve is $57.8 million. The Original Budget for fiscal year 2023-24 included a deposit of $70.8 million and the Original Budget for fiscal year 2024-25 includes a deposit of $14.6 million, see "CITY BUDGET – Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY 2024-25 through FY 2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" and "Other Budget Updates: Fiscal Year 2023-24 Nine-Month Budget Status Report" for a summary of the most recent projections.

COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve, Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve, and Fiscal Cliff Reserve

The fiscal year 2020-21 Original Budget consolidated the balances of several City reserves into a single COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve of $507.4 million in fiscal year 2019-20. The COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve was available to offset revenue losses or to assist otherwise with balancing of future fiscal year budgets.

At of the end of fiscal year 2020-21, the COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve was split into two new reserves -- $100.0 million for a "Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve," and $293.9 million for a "Fiscal Cliff Reserve"—leaving $113.5 million in the original COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve. By the end of fiscal year 2022-23, the entire balance of the COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve was depleted.

The Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve was created for the purpose of managing revenue shortfalls related to reimbursement disallowances from the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") and other state and federal agencies. In fiscal year 2021-22, $18.7 million of the Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve was appropriated in the Original Budget, leaving a balance of $81.3 million. The fiscal year 2023-24 Original Budget does not appropriate any of this reserve, but the fiscal year 2024-25 Original Budget appropriates $41.3 million, leaving a balance of $40.0 million.

The Fiscal Cliff Reserve was created for the purpose of managing projected budget shortfalls following the spend down of federal and state pandemic stimulus funds and other one-time sources. In fiscal year 2021-22, $64.2 million of the Fiscal Cliff Reserve was appropriated through a supplemental appropriation ordinance for rent relief and social housing. As a result, the fiscal year 2021-22 reserve balance was $229.8 million. The fiscal year 2022-23 and 2023-24 budgets appropriated $9.3 million and $90.2 million respectively, leaving a balance of $130.3 million for fiscal year 2024-25.

Operating Cash Reserve

Although not shown in Table A-4, under the City 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 (which contains cash for all pool participants, including city departments and external agencies such as San Francisco Unified School District and City College). 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. See "INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS – Investment Policy" herein.

TABLE A-4

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Summary of General Fund Fund Balances
Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2022-23
(000s)

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Restricted for rainy day (Economic Stabilization account)[1]	$229,069	$229,069	$114,539	$114,539	$114,539
Restricted for rainy day (One-time Spending account)[2]	95,908	-	-	-	-
Committed for budget stabilization (citywide)[2]	396,760	362,607	320,637	320,637	330,010
Committed for Recreation & Parks savings reserve	803	803	-	-	-
Assigned, not available for appropriation					
Assigned for encumbrances	$351,446	$394,912	$407,137	$462,668	$424,301
Assigned for appropriation carryforward	496,846	630,759	753,776	940,213	840,748
Assigned for budget savings incentive program (Citywide)	86,979	-	-	-	-
Assigned for salaries and benefits [3]	28,965	25,371	5,088	17,921	27,927
Assigned for Self-Insurance [4]	-	-	42,454	45,567	46,496
Assigned for Hotel Tax Loss Contingency	-	-	6,000	3,500	3,500
Total Fund Balance Not Available for Appropriation	$1,686,776	$1,643,521	$1,649,631	$1,905,045	$1,787,521
Assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation					
Assigned for litigation & contingencies[3]	$186,913	$160,314	$173,591	$235,133	$259,230
Assigned for subsequent year's budget	210,638	370,405	173,989	307,743	122,701
Unassigned for General Reserve [5]	130,894	78,498	78,333	57,696	64,707
Unassigned - Budgeted for use second budget year	285,152	84	-	149,695	291,710
Unassigned - Projected for use third and fourth budget year	-	-	-	163,400	81,190
Unassigned - Reserve for Other Contingencies	308,000	-	-	-	-
Unassigned - COVID-19 Contingency Reserve [6]	-	507,400	113,500	13,999	-
Unassigned - Federal & State Emergency Revenue Reserve [6]	-	-	100,000	81,300	81,300
Unassigned - Fiscal Cliff Reserve [6]	-	-	293,900	229,750	220,432
Unassigned - Business Tax Stabilization Reserve	-	-	149,000	29,454	29,454
Unassigned - Gross Receipts Prepayment Reserve	-	-	26,000	-	-
Unassigned - Public Health Use in FY 2023-24	-	-	-	-	21,213
Unassigned - Other Reserve	-	3,000	13,807	1,021	1,021
Unassigned - Available for future appropriation	8,897	18,283	31,784	39,795	3,126
Total Fund Balance Available for Appropriation	$1,130,494	$1,137,984	$1,153,904	$1,308,986	$1,176,084
Total Fund Balance, Budget Basis	$2,817,270	$2,781,505	$2,803,535	$3,214,031	$2,963,605
Budget Basis to GAAP Basis Reconciliation					
Total Fund Balance - Budget Basis	$2,817,270	$2,781,505	$2,803,535	$3,214,031	$2,963,605
Unrealized gain or loss on investments	16,275	36,626	3,978	(156,403)	(158,859)
Nonspendable fund balance	1,259	1,274	2,714	4,134	1,174
Cumulative Excess Property Tax Revenues Recognized on Budget Basis	(23,793)	(20,655)	(31,745)	(32,874)	(40,685)
Cumulative Excess Health, Human Service, Franchise Tax and other Revenues on Budget Basis	(87,794)	(139,590)	(120,569)	(118,791)	(111,163)
Inventories	-	33,212	17,925	-	-
Pre-paid lease revenue	(6,194)	(6,450)	(5,734)	(4,954)	(5,935)
Total Fund Balance, GAAP Basis	$2,717,023	$2,685,922	$2,670,104	$2,905,143	$2,648,137

[1] Additional information in "Rainy Day Reserve" section of Appendix A.

[2] Additional information in "Budget Stabilization Reserve" section of Appendix A.

[3] Additional information in "Salaries, Benefits and Litigation Reserves" section of Appendix A.

[4] Due to GASB 84 implementation, the self-insurance and other general City activities from the former Payroll (Agency) Fund became part of the General Fund. The balance represets a fund collected and restricted for self-insurance purpose.

[5] Additional information in "General Reserve" section of Appendix A.

[6] Additional information in the "COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve, Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve, and Fiscal Cliff Reserve " section of Appendix A.

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

Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions

The Five-Year Financial Plan (the "Five-Year Plan") is required under Proposition A, a charter amendment approved by voters in November 2009. The Charter requires the City 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 Five-Year Plan be adopted every two years. Charter Section 9.119 requires that by March 1 of each odd-numbered year, the Mayor submit a Five-Year Plan to the Board. The City's Administrative Code requires that by March 1 of each even-numbered year, the Mayor, Board of Supervisor's Budget Analyst, and Controller submit an updated estimate for the remaining four years of the most recently adopted Five-Year Plan.

On December 22, 2023, the Mayor, Board of Supervisor's Budget Analyst, and Controller issued the Five-Year Financial Plan Update for fiscal years 2024-25 through 2027-28 (the "December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update"), which projected annual shortfalls of $244.7 million, $554.5 million, $945.1 million, and $1,349.7 million, respectively. The Five-Year Financial Plan Update released on March 29, 2024, (the "March 2024 Joint Report") updated this forecast, with annual shortfalls of $235.9 million, $553.3 million, $927.0 million, and $1,361.6 million in fiscal year 2024-25 through 2027-28, respectively (as shown in Table A-5(a) below). These updates are the result of modest improvement in current year fund balance, modest changes to the revenue forecast, higher employee benefit costs, and nominal updates to other citywide expenditures since the December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update was released.

The Charter requires that each year's budget be balanced. Based on the forecast in the December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update, the Mayor's Budget Office issued instructions to departments in December 2023 to reduce their expenditures by 10% in fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively, in order to close the gap between projected sources and uses. Departments were also required to submit a 5% contingency reduction.

These reductions were in addition to October 2023 instructions from the Mayor's Office to departments to reduce fiscal year 2023-24 General Fund expenditures by 3% in the current fiscal year, as well as propose ongoing cuts in fiscal year 2024-25 and fiscal year 2025-26. Departments proposed, and the Mayor's Office accepted, expenditure reductions and new revenues of approximately $75 million in fiscal year 2023-24 and expenditure savings of $38 million in fiscal year 2024-25 and fiscal year 2025-26. These savings were assumed in the December 2023 Five Year Plan update.

TABLE A-5(a)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Five Year Financial Plan
Fiscal Years 2024-25 through 2027-28
Projections as of March 29, 2024
($ Millions)

	Change from FY 2023-24 Budget	Change from FY 2024-25	Change from FY 2025-26	Change from FY 2026-27
	2024-25	**2025-26**	**2026-27**	**2027-28**
Sources - Increase / (Decrease):	**$3.8**	**$191.4**	**$206.6**	**$203.0**
Uses:				
Baselines & Reserves	($9.9)	($68.8)	($146.3)	($257.0)
Salaries & Benefits	(170.1)	(356.4)	(480.6)	(635.9)
Citywide Operating Budget Costs	(95.2)	(299.3)	(404.1)	(505.1)
Departmental Costs	35.4	(20.3)	(102.5)	(166.7)
Total Uses - (Increase) / Decrease:	**($239.8)**	**($744.7)**	**($1,133.6)**	**($1,564.6)**
Cumulative Projected Surplus / (Shortfall)	**($235.9)**	**($553.3)**	**($927.0)**	**($1,361.6)**
Two-Year Deficit	**($789.3)**			

Key assumptions in the March 2024 Joint Report:

- Net general fund revenues are largely unchanged from the December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update. The December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update forecast General Fund tax revenue to grow year-over-year but slower than previously projected. Total General Fund taxes are projected to grow each year, by 0.4% in fiscal year 2023-24, 0.9% in fiscal year 2024-25, and an average of 2.8% in fiscal year 2025-26 through fiscal year 2027-28. This tepid revenue growth is partly related to structural changes in the local economy. Ongoing patterns of remote work, along with high interest rates, are expected to lead to declining commercial and residential real estate values, affecting property and transfer taxes. Increasing interest rates and depressed levels of venture capital investment have a negative impact on the technology sector, and the City's business tax revenue. The March 2024 Joint Report forecast lowers property tax revenues due to assumption about refunds triggered by reductions in value as appeals are resolved through the Assessment Appeals Board and decreased excess ERAF expectations. However, gross receipts and overpaid executive taxes are higher in the March 2024 Joint Report forecast, largely driven by greater than expected current year receipts.

  In addition, the City is expected to receive its last reimbursement from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for the COVID-19 public health emergency in fiscal year 2025-26. An additional $21.8 million of FEMA reimbursements for 2023 winter storms are assumed in the March 2024 Joint Report. The City's tourism and hospitality sector is expected to continue its recovery through the plan period at a slower pace than previously anticipated and is not expected to recover to pre-pandemic levels until after the plan period, impacting hotel, sales tax, and State sales tax-based subventions.

The March 2024 Joint Report assumes additional public health one-time and operating revenues driven by fee for service, supplemental, and capitation payments.

- Fiscal year 2023-24 mid-year General Fund savings: In October 2023, the Mayor issued instructions to City departments to propose budget reductions in the current fiscal year in anticipation of a significant structural deficit. The Mayor's Office reviewed proposals to pause uninitiated programs, eliminate vacant positions, take advantage of new revenues, and begin scaling back certain programs. As a result, $48 million of expenditures have been placed on reserve in fiscal year 2023-24 and $26 million in new revenues were to be reported in the FY23-24 Six-Month Report. Based on these changes, this forecast assumes an increase in current year ending balance of approximately $75 million, and ongoing savings of approximately $38 million in each year beginning in fiscal year 2024-25.

- Assumes previously negotiated wage increases and inflationary increases for open contracts in line with Consumer Price Index ("CPI"): This projection assumes approved wage increases in collective bargaining agreements for miscellaneous employees through the end of fiscal year 2023-24, and as negotiated for public safety employees through fiscal year 2025-26. Miscellaneous contracts are open beginning in fiscal year 2024-25 and public safety contracts are open beginning in fiscal year 2026-27. All open contracts assume the average of the inflation projections of the California Department of Finance SF Metropolitan Statistical Area CPI and Moody's SF Metropolitan Area CPI, updated in the March 2024 Joint Report to equal 2.54% for fiscal year 2024-25, 2.53% for fiscal year 2025-26, 2.56% for fiscal year 2026-27, and 2.23% for fiscal year 2027-28, applied to the first pay period in January 2025 of fiscal year 2024-25 and the first pay period of each fiscal year thereafter in the projection period. Importantly, these assumptions do not indicate a willingness or ability to negotiate wage increases at these levels and are used solely for projection purposes.

- Pension investment returns of 7.2% per year: This report assumes the actuarially assumed rate of return on pension system investments of 7.2% per year, as affirmed by the Retirement Board in November 2023. Employer contributions to both SFERS and CalPERS are estimated using projected rates provided by these entities.

- Health insurance cost increases: This projection assumes that the employer share of health insurance costs for active employees will increase by 9.3% in fiscal year 2024-25, then 7% in each following year, for an average of 7.6% annually over the projection period. Dental insurance costs are projected to decrease by 2.3% in fiscal year 2024-25, then increase by 3.3% for each remaining year, an average of 1.9% annually for the projection period. Retiree health costs are assumed to grow by 9.0% in fiscal year 2024-25, 7.6% in fiscal year 2025-26, 7.3% in fiscal year 2026-27, and 7.1% in fiscal year 2027-28, an average of 7.7% annually over the projection period.

- Inflationary increase on non-personnel operating costs: This projection assumes that the cost of materials and supplies, professional services, and other non-personnel operating costs will increase by the rate of CPI starting in fiscal year 2024-25 and each fiscal year thereafter at the average of the inflation projections of the California Department of Finance SF Metropolitan Statistical Area CPI and Moody's SF Metropolitan Area CPI, updated in the March 2024 Joint Report forecast to 2.54% for fiscal year 2024-25, 2.53% for fiscal year 2025-26, 2.56% for fiscal year 2026-27, and 2.28% for fiscal year 2027-28. The projection reflects the adopted fiscal year

2023-24 and fiscal year 2024-25 budget, which included a 3.75% cost-of-doing business increase for General Fund nonprofit contracts.

- Ten-Year Capital Plan, Five-Year Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Plan, and inflationary increases on equipment: The projection assumes the adopted fiscal year 2023-24 funding level for capital, equipment, and information technology (IT). For capital, this report assumes the budgeted Capital Plan level of funding in fiscal year 2024-25. In the remaining years the report assumes funding will catch up to the City's fiscal year 2024-33 Ten-Year Capital Plan, which was released in 2023. The IT investment projection assumes full funding of the City's Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Plan in fiscal year 2024-25 through fiscal year 2027-28. For equipment, this plan assumes the budgeted level of funding in fiscal year 2024-25, and growth of CPI in the subsequent three fiscal years.

- Deposits and withdrawals from reserves: The forecast assumes no reserve withdrawals beyond those previously budgeted. The projection assumes deposits to the General Reserve in each fiscal year, consistent with the financial policies adopted by the Board of Supervisors and codified in Administrative Code Section 10.60(b). As the City's economy recovers, the General Reserve value will increase from 2.0% of General Fund revenues in the current year to 3.0% by fiscal year 2027-28. Additionally, the projection assumes deposits of $32.8 million and $99.9 million to the Budget Stabilization Reserve in fiscal year 2026-27 and fiscal year 2027-28 as the City's real property transfer tax is expected to exceed the average five-year transfer tax level in those years, triggering required deposits.

The March 2024 Joint Report and December 2023 Five-Year Plan Update noted key factors that could materially impact the City's financial condition, including the following:

- Recent downward revision to local employment numbers: On March 22, 2024, the Employment Development Department (EDD) released a significant revision to its employment data, showing San Francisco and San Mateo counties lost 34,100 jobs between July 2022 and February 2024, with the largest downward revisions in the information and professional, scientific, and technical services industries, which are the primary office-using sectors in San Francisco. The revised figures reflect technology-sector layoffs since 2022, reversing the City's previous understanding that these job losses were absorbed by overall growth in the technology industry. This additional information increases downside risk to the forecast.

- Elevated interest rates are dampening investment and growth at the state and local levels. Successive Federal Reserve interest rate increases appear to have slowed inflation, and professional "Blue Chip" forecasters believe a "soft landing" will likely be achieved nationally. However, high interest rates have an outsized effect on San Francisco's economy, which is highly concentrated in technology firms. Even if rate cuts occur in 2024, as the Fed has suggested, they will remain high compared to the historically low rates enjoyed in the years before and during the pandemic. Hiring and growth at technology firms is tied to venture capital investment, which has fallen locally to $21 billion for the first three quarters of 2023, compared to $46 billion in 2022 and $81 billion in 2021, as high interest rates make venture capital investment less attractive. Declining venture capital investment in the technology sector and related reductions in tech firm expenditures would most directly affect business taxes, but would also affect sales, hotel, and property-related taxes.

Additionally, high interest rates, along with the "stickiness" of hybrid work, suppress sales and values of both commercial and residential real estate. The handful of recent office sales in the $150-$300 per square foot range represent an average price drop of over 60% from their prior prices and current assessed values, and while average California home prices are rising, those in San Francisco remain flat. The forecast assumes that the City's property and transfer taxes will be significantly impacted as the market adjusts to a new equilibrium over the coming decade.

- Recession risk. While the budget deficit is very large, the underlying revenue forecast does not assume a recession. Overall growth rates of General Fund taxes are projected each year, at 0.4% in fiscal year 2023-24, 0.9% in fiscal year 2024-25, and an average of 2.8% annually in fiscal year 2025-26 through fiscal year 2027-28. Should interest rates or other factors cause employment or wage levels to falter, or there is some other external economic shock, General Fund tax revenue would likely be significantly impacted. A recession scenario is detailed in the last section below. Over the plan period, a recession could worsen the deficit by nearly $1 billion, even accounting for the use of the City's economic stabilization reserves, reductions to General Reserve deposits, and baseline transfers.

- State budget impacts: This report does not assume significant changes in state or federal funding levels. However, on December 7, 2023, the State Legislative Analyst's Office (the "LAO") released their fiscal year 2024-25 fiscal outlook, projecting a $68.0 billion deficit, primarily driven by weaker than anticipated 2023 income tax revenue. The shortfall will require the state to reduce expenditures, potentially in ways that reduce local government revenues such as excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund ("ERAF") revenue, grants, and other programs. Flat or falling state sales tax will reduce subventions of state sales tax for public safety, health, and human services.

  The March 2024 Joint Report forecast does not assume the policy changes proposed in the Governor's January budget, including an increase in the amount of ERAF sent to school districts to distribute to charter schools, which would reduce City excess ERAF revenues by $43 million annually, or proposed reductions to social service subventions. The Governor will introduce changes to the fiscal year 2024-25 state budget in early May, which will be further amended by the state legislature. Given the state's budget shortfall, the City intends to monitor budget legislation for changes that would affect excess ERAF and other local revenues.

- Potential revenue risk from FEMA reimbursements for COVID-19 related expenses. The City assumes it will receive a total of $572.2 million of FEMA reimbursements for its COVID-19-related expenditures, unchanged from the March 2023 Five Year Financial Plan Update. However, fiscal year 2022-23 experience illustrates the risk inherent in these assumptions, when only $2.6 million of the $243.4 million budgeted FEMA revenue was realized by year end. While the City considers this a payment delay versus a disallowance, any changes in guidance or further audits of the City's submissions could be a risk to this revenue.

  The City and dozens of peer jurisdictions in the state are in active discussions with FEMA Region 9 regarding recently published guidance on eligible costs for non-congregate shelter (NCS) services, which San Francisco provided through the Shelter in Place (SIP) hotel program. This new guidance caps reimbursement for stays in SIP hotels to 20 days after June 11, 2021, and states that unoccupied rooms are generally ineligible for reimbursement. The City has reported to the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) that the new guidance could potentially place

$114.0 million of claimed FEMA reimbursement at risk for the cost of SIP hotels for vulnerable populations past the 20-day cap, and an additional $76.0 million at risk for the cost of pre-positioned vacant hotels and will continue working with CalOES and FEMA representatives on next steps.

- Retirement contribution rate: Projections assume the SFERS adopted 7.2% rate of return in fiscal year 2023-24; however, year-to-date returns through February 29, 2024, were 5.7%. Additionally, returns reported in the final audited valuation at the end of the fiscal year can vary from the year-to-date return value due to market volatility and the additional time required to get private market valuations. Final results below the 7.2% assumption will result in higher retirement contribution costs during the forecast period.

- Business tax litigation: As of June 30, 2023, the City has reserved more than $400 million of tax collections for litigation risk, including almost $200 million in gross receipts tax and almost $150 million in homelessness gross receipts tax. The legal issues vary by claimant; however, the recent acceleration of litigation underscores the growing complexity of the City's business tax regime and the impact that a few payers can have on the City's revenue outlook. Although more than 10,000 businesses pay the gross receipts tax that accrues to the General Fund, the top ten payers accounted for 27% of the revenue in tax year 2022. The top ten payers accounted for 31% of all business taxes – including gross receipts, homelessness gross receipts, commercial rents, and overpaid executive taxes – in tax year 2022. The business tax forecast considers all known litigation initiated as of the report publication date.

- Pending Policy Decisions with Fiscal Impact: Legislative or voter-approved increases to existing baselines, set-asides, or other new spending increases without commensurate revenue increases from new funding sources will impact the projections included in this report. For example, in early March, the Mayor introduced legislation to amend the Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and Treasure Island Community Development, LLC ("TICD"), the entity developing Treasure Island, as well as the Disposition and Development Agreement between the Treasure Island Development Authority and TICD. The amendments—which were subsequently approved by the Board in May 2024—altered the financing plan to help fund the development of infrastructure on the island and result in 20-25 years of lease payments from the City's General Fund starting in fiscal year 2025-26 or fiscal year 2026-27, pending final financing details. This would result in increased costs to the General Fund of approximately $11 million to $14 million annually.

Other Budget Updates: Fiscal Year 2023-24 Nine-Month Budget Status Report

The Nine-Month Budget Status Report for fiscal year 2023-24 (the "Nine-Month Report") was released on May 14, 2024. The Nine-Month Report projected a General Fund ending balance of $494.4 million in fiscal year 2023-24, a $28.5 million improvement from the $465.6 million balance in the March 2024 Joint Report. Application of this additional current year fund balance would decrease the projected shortfall in the upcoming two-year budget to $760.8 million. The improvement was largely driven by revenue in the Department of Public Health, offset by weakness in tax and other department revenue.

TABLE A-5(b)

Nine-Month Report
Fiscal Year 2023-24 Projected General Fund Variances to Budget ($ millions)

	Five Year Plan vs FY24 Budget	Six-Month Report vs FY24 Budget	March Joint Report vs FY24 Budget	Nine-Month Report vs FY24 Budget	Change from March Joint Report to Nine-Month Report
FY 2022-23 Ending Fund Balance	417.5	417.5	417.5	417.5	-
Appropriation in the FY 2023-24 Budget	(414.4)	(414.4)	(414.4)	(414.4)	-
Prior Year Fund Balance Above Budgeted Levels	**3.1**	**3.1**	**3.1**	**3.1**	**-**
Citywide Revenue	(42.9)	(117.4)	(112.7)	(103.7)	9.0
Baseline Contributions	(4.3)	22.7	23.8	23.8	-
Departmental Operations	96.4	178.4	178.4	198.0	19.5
Current Year Revenues and Expenditures	**49.3**	**83.7**	**89.5**	**118.1**	**28.5**
Approved Use of General Reserve - Sources	-	-	-	0.5	0.5
Public Health Revenue Management Reserve - Uses	-	-	-	(0.5)	(0.5)
Supplemental Appropriations & Use of Reserves	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Previously Unappropriated Fund Balance	**81.2**	**81.2**	**81.2**	**81.2**	**-**
Fund Balance Previously Appropriated in FY 2024-25	**291.7**	**291.7**	**291.7**	**291.7**	**-**
FY 2023-24 Projected Ending Balance	**425.3**	**459.7**	**465.5**	**494.1**	**28.5**

The following are highlights of fiscal year 2023-24 projections in the Nine-Month Report:

- A $103.7 million projected citywide revenue shortfall compared to budget is due to weakness across numerous sources, though the shortfall is $9.0 million less than prior projections. Property tax projections have been updated to reduce appeals reserves by $19.5 million, given a decline in open appeals, partially offset by $12.5 million in refunds of taxes related to said appeals, as well as the recognition of $37.2 million in excess ERAF revenue available with final state reconciliation of FY 2021- 22 ERAF uses. This improvement in property tax and a true up of prior year interest allocations are sufficient to offset an additional $30.9 million weakness in property transfer tax revenue from our last report, reflecting historically low cash receipts, and continued weakness in sales and hotel taxes.

- Departments are projected to end the year with a $198.0 million net operating surplus, an $19.5 million increase from prior projections. This includes $78.4 million of expenditure savings and additional revenues identified by departments in response to the Mayor's September request for mid-year cuts and other savings, which together totaled $96.4 million. The need to fund $23.1 million in general liability litigation reserves is offset by widespread improvement in operating department performance. A $52.5 million shortfall in patient revenue at Laguna Honda Hospital is driven by significantly reduced census due to the pause on new admissions pending recertification; in addition, the State is expected to finalize a new methodology for nursing facility payments retroactive to January 2023 in fall 2024, shifting revenue from the current to the budget year. This shortfall is offset by revenue surpluses elsewhere, particularly in CalAIM behavioral health payments and patient revenue at Zuckerberg San Francisco General due to higher than expected patient volume and census, and several one-time state payments for safety net programs.

- The Police and Sheriff's departments are expected to require additional supplemental appropriations to reallocate existing expenditure appropriation to overtime, as required by Administrative Code Section 3.17.

- Estimates of FEMA reimbursement revenue for COVID response costs have been reduced by $6.8 million in the current year to reflect actual and expected obligations for testing, vaccination, and other health programs. In October 2023, the FEMA Region 9 Administrator provided updated guidance on eligible costs for non-congregate shelter (NCS) services incurred during the pandemic, which San Francisco provided through the Shelter in Place (SIP) hotel program through May 11, 2023. The City, peer jurisdictions, and California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) are in continued communication with FEMA representatives regarding this issue, which will affect future year forecasts.

Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter

The Original Budget for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26 (the "FY25 & FY26 Original Budget") was approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 30, 2024, and signed by the Mayor on August 1, 2024. See "CITY BUDGET – Budget Process" for additional detail. The FY25 & FY26 Original Budget reflects $15.9 billion expenditures in fiscal year 2024-25 and $15.5 billion in fiscal year 2025-26. The $789.3 million two-year shortfall projected in the March 2024 Joint Report was addressed primarily through the use of $135.7 million of fund balance, $236.6 million in projected revenue increases, and$68.8 million use of special funds, as well as $302.0 million of net departmental budget reductions and other operating savings. (Such operating savings were offset through increases in increased capital and information technology costs and new labor costs.)

The Charter requires that the Controller comment on revenue estimates assumed in the Mayor's fiscal year 2024-25 and fiscal year 2025-26 proposed budget. These comments were issued in the Revenue Letter on June 10, 2024. The revenue estimates assumed in the proposed budget were not materially different from the budget finally passed and approved later in the summer.

As described herein, subsequent reports have been issued, which have also identified financial pressures.

While the Controller found the revenue assumptions in the Mayor's proposed budget to be reasonable, the Controller noted that the City faces several key financial risks in coming fiscal years. These risks include: the projected structural budget gap following depletion of one-time funds; economic risk; funding uncertainty at Laguna Honda Hospital; State budget revenue risk; disallowance of claims for federal revenues assumed in the City's emergency response budgets; and potential cost increases resulting from November 2024 ballot measures.

Key findings in the June 2024 Revenue Letter included:

- **Tax revenue projections generally assume a continuing but slow economic recovery from the pandemic, with a significant drag created by the continuing effect of remote office work on economic activity in the City.** Most economically sensitive taxes, such as sales and hotel taxes, are projected to grow slowly during the coming two years, but in most cases remain below pre-pandemic levels. Remote work and high interest rates are projected to continue to have significant impacts on the City's property, business, and property transfer taxes. Tax increases

adopted by the voters in recent years are projected to contribute to modest overall General Fund tax revenue growth of 2.2% in fiscal year 2024-25 compared to the fiscal year 2023-24 Nine Month Report and 3.5% in fiscal year 2025-26 compared to fiscal year 2024-25 projection.

- **The proposed budget assumes $1 billion of General Fund-related one-time solutions over the two budget years.** These include drawdown of $445.5 million in prior year fund balance, including $106.1 million in prior year General Fund appropriations the Mayor's budget proposes to close. While deficit forecasts in the most recent update to the Five-Year Financial Plan assumed available fund balance to be used evenly across the first three years of the forecast, the proposed budget accelerates the use of fund balance, spending $45.2 million previously held to address the FY 2026-27 shortfall. It also assumes $235.7 million of FEMA reimbursement for previously incurred emergency response costs; $138.3 million of reserve drawdowns; and at least $82.5 million of other one-time revenue in General Fund-supported funds. Additionally, the budget proposes at least $137.6 million of short-term cost shifts in other funds, with a significant portion designed to achieve General Fund savings.

- **The budget draws on available reserves but maintains the City's economic stabilization reserves.** The proposed budget uses $138.3 million of reserves funded in prior years and maintains the current balance of $389.7 million in the combined Rainy Day and Budget Stabilization reserves (also known as combined "Economic Stabilization Reserves"), as the City is not expected to be eligible to withdraw from or deposit to these reserves. Required General Reserve funding levels are maintained in the proposed budget. Excluding economic stabilization reserves, by the end of the two-year budget period, the City is expected to have $304.6 million (or 38%) of its roughly $800 million of pre-pandemic reserves available for on-going operations.

- **The proposed budget makes minimal progress towards closing projected structural budget gaps in years beyond the coming two-year budget period.** As one-time solutions are depleted, the structural budget gap will become larger, making future budgets more difficult to close. The March 2024 Joint Report forecasted a structural budget gap of $927 million in fiscal year 2026-27, growing in subsequent years, absent ongoing corrective action by policy makers. Based on the mix of ongoing and one-time solutions proposed in the Mayor's budget, as well as known labor contract costs above the previously assumed levels in fiscal year 2026-27, the shortfall likely remains more than $800 million in fiscal year 2026-27, growing in subsequent years.

    - **The final adopted budget will require active monitoring and management by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors given a number of economic and financial risks.** These risks include the possibility of a slowing economic recovery or a recession, risks associated with both State and Federal revenue streams, and financial impacts of potential November 2024 ballot measures.

BUDGETARY RISKS

In addition to the budgetary risks described below, see "CITY BUDGET – Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter".

Threat of Recession

An economic recession could adversely impact the City's economy and the financial condition of the

General Fund. During the "Great Recession" that occurred nationally from December 2007 to June 2009 (according to the U.S. National Bureau of Economic Research), California real GDP growth slowed for five consecutive quarters from the third quarter of 2008 to the third quarter of 2009 and did not return to pre-recession level of output until three years later in the third quarter of 2012. The unemployment rate rose steadily from 4.9% in the fourth quarter of 2006 to peak at 12.3% in the fourth quarter of 2010 and did not return to the pre-recession level until the second quarter of 2017.

Impact of Commuting Pattern Changes on Business Taxes

The persistence of remote work results in continued pressure on the City's General Fund revenues. Approximately half of workers in major tax-paying sectors such as professional services, financial services, and information live outside of San Francisco. Continued high levels of telecommuting and work from anywhere policies may affect how much of any business's gross receipts are apportionable to the City. Muni metro and downtown BART ridership have not returned to pre-pandemic levels, and both have recently dropped off from summer highs. Indicators of auto use – bridge crossings and freeway speed – both indicate less traffic. As of January 2024, bridge crossings into and out of the City dropped to about 83% of pre-pandemic levels. Comparatively, the bridge crossings were at their post-pandemic peak in August 2023 at approximately 95% of pre-pandemic levels.

Businesses owe gross receipts tax only on their employees physically working within the City. For certain categories of businesses, the gross receipts tax is also dependent on their San Francisco payroll. Thus, the sharp rise in telecommuting has resulted in reduced business taxes and, if the change becomes permanent, could negatively impact the City for the foreseeable future. Although some City residents who previously commuted out of the City are now telecommuting from within the City, many of these residents work for employers who do not have a nexus in the City, and thus are not subject to business taxes.

On July 12, 2023, the Office of the Controller issued a memorandum to the Board of Supervisors in response to a request from one of the Board of Supervisors of how the City's business tax system is being challenged by the recent trends towards remote working (the "Business Tax Memorandum").

The Business Tax Memorandum summarized that during the 2010s, the rapid growth of the tech industry, and the entire City economy, fueled growth in City tax revenues, particularly from business taxes. The City, which started the decade with the highest business tax burden of any city in California, further raised that burden with several rate increases and new taxes. However, none of these changes stopped the City from being one of the fastest growing cities in the country during the 2010s, although it did deepen three sources of risk in the City's finances.

First, the City's business tax revenue increasingly comes from a smaller handful of large taxpayers, mainly in the technology sector. These businesses could potentially reap substantial tax savings by locating in other Bay Area tech centers. With the persistence of hybrid work, most of them are currently reducing their office space needs in the City, and elsewhere.
Secondly, the City is increasingly reliant on taxes on the leasing and sale of commercial office properties. Remote work has led to a reduced volume of transactions of these properties, and there is some evidence of a marked reduction in property values. Both trends lead to revenue weakness for the City.

Finally, the business tax memorandum noted that both structural changes in the City's economy, and policy choices to make the tax system more progressive, have had the effect of raising overall revenue volatility by concentrating revenue in a few payers. This runs counter to a long-standing City policy goal

of minimizing volatility by broadening the tax base.

Following the publication of this memo, at the request of Mayor Breed, President Peskin, and Supervisor Mandelman, the Treasurer, Controller, and Chief Economist conducted a process in summer and fall 2023 with the business community and other stakeholders to develop specific reform recommendations. A public report for the Mayor and Board of Supervisors was provided in February 2024, to frame the development of a measure for the consideration of the voters in November 2024. A summary of final recommendations was published in May 2024, forming the basis of November 2024 ballot initiative Proposition M, Changes to Business Taxes. Among many other things, this measure would shift the calculation of San Francisco gross receipts for most business activities away from payroll expenses toward sales.

See "General Fund Revenues – Other City Tax Revenues" for a discussion of the Business Taxes, Real Property Transfer Tax and Overpaid Executive Tax referenced in the Business Tax Memorandum.

Office Vacancy in San Francisco; Impact on Property Taxes and Other Revenues

The City has experienced the largest increase in office vacancy among major urban office markets in the United States, from 5.6% in the 4th quarter of 2019 to 33.7% in the 2nd quarter of 2024. Because of the prevalence of long-term leases in the commercial real estate industry, sudden reductions in demand often result in increases in sublease vacancy, instead of direct vacancy. Sublease vacancy occurs when existing tenants vacate their space and seek to find sub-lessees, but continue to pay rent under the original lease. A direct vacancy occurs when the original lease has been broken, or has expired and not been renewed. In this case, the property's income declines until a new lease is signed. In the City, sublease vacancies were a very high percentage (80-90%) of office vacancies during 2020 and 2021. In 2022, the sublease vacancy rate declined, while the direct vacancy rate continued to rise, and by mid-2022, direct vacancies accounted for most of the vacant office space in San Francisco, according to Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. If vacancy rates remain at this elevated level, and a large share of these are direct vacancies, then the income, and market value, of office buildings in the City are likely to continue to be negatively affected. The market value of commercial real estate reflects the current and future income that the market expects the property to generate. If expectations of future income streams are reduced, then the market value of office properties will be reduced.

A reduction in demand from tenants is not the only thing that could reduce the market value of San Francisco office buildings in the near future. Using an income valuation approach, the market value of properties is commonly estimated as the property's net operating income, divided by its capitalization rate (its effective rate of return). Capitalization rates are generally calculated from the sales of comparable properties, and vary across markets, and over time, according to changes in investors' perception of risk, and the risk-free rate of return. When investors perceive greater risk, they require a higher rate of return, and the spread between that asset's capitalization rate and the risk-free rate widens. When the capitalization rate rises, for whatever reason, the market value of a property will decline, all other things being equal.

The market value of a property is important for property tax revenue because a property's assessed value – the basis of its property tax liability – may not exceed its market value. If a property owner believes a property is assessed above its market value, they can request a reduction in assessment from the Assessor, and/or appeal a decision to the Assessment Appeals Board. The gap between current market and assessed values is narrowed somewhat by the effect of Prop 13, which caps growth in assessed value

at 2% per year unless a sale or new construction prompts a reassessment. Given that market values have typically increased at much higher rates over the years, properties that have not been recently sold have been assessed below market value. In other words, Proposition 13 effectively cushions the City's property tax base from downturns in property markets, at the cost of reduced growth in property tax revenue during periods of strong economic growth.

Given assessment appeal hearing timelines, there is a significant lag between the filing of appeals and completion of hearings at the Assessment Appeals Board ("AAB"). In the interim, published reports reflect the estimated loss of assessed value due to both currently filed and expected future office appeals through the end of the forecast period, reaching $17.5 billion by fiscal year 2027-28. As of June 30, 2024, the City is holding $217.3 million in AAB reserves for the General Fund's portion of refunds on approximately $37.47 billion in prior years' assessed value reductions, plus interest. Reserve balances are projected to grow given the capacity for hearings and requests for delays from commercial property owners' agents. Total prior assessment year reductions assumed for this projection are $11.46 billion, $21.40 billion, $24.4 billion, $25.07 billion, and $26.45 billion in assessed values for fiscal year 2023-24 through fiscal year 2027-28, respectively. As of the March 2024 5-Year Plan Update, General Fund property tax revenue required to pay refunds that result from AAB decisions is estimated at $63.7 million, 118.9 million, $136.1 million, $139.4 million, and $147.1 million, for fiscal years 2023-24 through 2027-28, respectively, directly reducing property tax revenue in the year of deposit.

The City cannot predict the actual level of revenues losses, however the City will continue to account for these trends in its periodic reports. See "CITY BUDGET — Other Budget Updates: Fiscal Year 2023-24 Six-Month Budget Status Report" and "CITY BUDGET – Original Budget For Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and Revenue Letter" for additional information.

Potential City Acquisition of PG&E Distribution Assets

On January 29, 2019, PG&E filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection to shield itself from potential wildfire liability that was estimated upwards of $30 billion. Taxes and fees paid by PG&E to the City total approximately $75 million annually and include property taxes, franchise fees and business taxes, as well as the utility user taxes it remits on behalf of its customers.

On June 20, 2020, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California confirmed PG&E's Plan of Reorganization, and on July 1, 2020 PG&E announced that it had emerged from Chapter 11 bankruptcy. As part of its restructuring, on June 9, 2020, PG&E announced that it would be relocating its business headquarters, currently located at 245 Market Street and 77 Beale Street in San Francisco, to Oakland. The relocation was expected to occur in June 2022.

During the pendency of the PG&E bankruptcy, on September 6, 2019 the City submitted a non-binding indication of interest to PG&E and PG&E Corporation to purchase substantially all of PG&E's electric distribution and transmission assets needed to provide retail electric service to all electricity customers within the geographic boundaries of the City (the "Target Assets") for a purchase price of $2.5 billion (such transaction, the "Proposed Transaction"). In a letter dated October 7, 2019, PG&E declined the City's offer. On November 4, 2019, the City sent PG&E a follow-up letter reiterating its interest in acquiring the Target Assets. To demonstrate public support for the Proposed Transaction, on January 14, 2020, the City's Board of Supervisors and SFPUC's Commission conditionally authorized the sale of up to $3.065 billion of Power Enterprise Revenue Bonds to finance the acquisition of the Target Assets and related costs, subject to specific conditions set forth in each authorizing resolution.

On July 27, 2021, the City submitted a petition with the California Public Utilities Commission (the "CPUC") seeking formal determination of the value of investor-owned PG&E's local electric infrastructure. The matter is pending before the CPUC and the City can give no assurance about whether or when the CPUC will hold a hearing on the matter.

The City is unable to predict whether it will be able to consummate a final negotiated acquisition price for the Target Assets and, if so, the terms thereof. Any such final terms would be subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors and SFPUC. If consummated, it is expected that such new electric system would be wholly supported by its own revenues, and no revenues of the City's General Fund would be available to pay for system operations, or City General Fund secured bonds issued to acquire the Target Assets. The City is committed to acquiring PG&E's assets and expects to continue its pursuit with the newly reorganized entity.

Impact of November 2024 Local Ballot Initiatives

San Francisco's November 2024 ballot contains several proposals with potential significant ongoing fiscal costs to the General Fund should they pass, including the following (cost estimates made by Controller):

- Proposition F – Police Staffing and Deferred Retirement, estimated to cost up to $ 3 million per year;
- Proposition G – Funding Rental Subsidies for Affordable Housing Development Serving Low Income Seniors, Families, and Persons with Disabilities, estimated to cost up to $8.25 million per year;
- Proposition H – Retirement Benefits for Firefighters, estimated to cost up to $3.7 million per year;
- Proposition I – Retirement Benefits for Nurses and 911 Operators, estimated to cost up to $6.7 million per year; and
- Proposition J – Funding Programs Serving Children, Youth, and Families, estimated to cost up to $64.2 million per year.

Additionally, Proposition L (Additional Business Tax on Transportation Network Companies and Autonomous Vehicle Businesses to Fund Public Transportation) is expected to raise up to $25 million annually for the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) and Proposition M (Changes to Business Taxes) is expected to raise up to $50 million annually in the General Fund when fully implemented.

Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances

Revenues from the State represent approximately 10% of the General Fund revenues appropriated in the Original Budget for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26, and thus changes in State revenues could have a material 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.

The State budget for fiscal year 2024-25, enacted in June 2024, addressed an estimated multi-year shortfall of $46.8 billion. The budget assumes continued but slowing economic growth that stops short of assuming a recession.

Due to the timing of the City's reporting vs the State's estimates, estimated growth rates in state sales tax and VLF (defined herein) revenues contained in the January proposal have been reflected in the City's Nine-Month Report projections of state subventions and are included in the recently adopted FY25 & FY26 Original Budget. As discussed under "CITY BUDGET – Five-Year Financial Plan Update: Fiscal Year 2024-25 through 2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" the Five-Year Plan identifies State changes in ERAF allocation as a key factor that could impact the City's future financial position.

Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances

The City receives substantial federal funds for assistance payments, social service programs and other programs. A portion of the City's assets are also invested in securities of the United States government. The City's finances may be adversely impacted by fiscal matters at the federal level, including but not limited to cuts to federal spending.

In the event Congress and the President fail to enact appropriations, budgets or debt ceiling increases on a timely basis in the future, such events could have a material adverse effect on the financial markets and economic conditions in the United States and an adverse impact on the City's finances. The City cannot predict the outcome of future federal budget deliberations and the impact that such budgets will have on the City's finances and operations. The City's General Fund and hospitals, which are supported by the General Fund, collectively receive over $1 billion annually in federal subventions for entitlement programs, the large majority of which are reimbursements for care provided to Medicaid and Medicare recipients. See "Laguna Honda Hospital Potential Loss of Federal Funding." In addition, tens of thousands of San Franciscans receive federal subsidies to purchase private insurance on the State's health care exchange, Covered California. Efforts to change such subsidies or alter provisions of the Affordable Care Act through regulatory changes could have significant effects on future health care costs.

The federal government provided significant funding to local governments to respond to the public health emergency and mitigate the fiscal effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. The City spent the entirety of its General Fund allocations of Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act and American Rescue Plan Act State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund monies as of fiscal year 2021-22 and is awaiting reimbursement of emergency response costs submitted to the FEMA. In fiscal year 2023-24, the City originally budgeted $170.0 million of FEMA reimbursements. By May 2024, that estimate was revised down to $116.8 million in that fiscal year, and only $73.3 million was recorded by year end. In addition to the timing of reimbursements, the City is in communication with both state and federal officials to understand the fiscal effect of recent changes in FEMA cost eligibility guidelines for non-congregate shelter programs, as described above.

Laguna Honda Hospital Medicaid and Medicare Recertification

The Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center ("Laguna Honda Hospital") is a skilled nursing facility owned and operated by the City through its Department of Public Health, serving up to 660 patients, most of whom are low income or extremely low-income residents. Beginning in March 2022, the City had a series of disputes with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS"), an agency within the

federal Department of Health & Human Services ,over conditions at Laguna Honda Hospital which potentially put federal funding at risk.

On May 18, 2023, CMS, the City, and the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") reached an agreement in principle to settle ongoing administrative proceedings and federal court litigation. This settlement allowed Laguna Honda to continue to receive Medicare and Medicaid payments while addressing the quality improvements needed to ensure resident health and safety. As part of the settlement, CMS extended payments for Medicare and Medicaid services through March 19, 2024, contingent on Laguna Honda meeting requirements aimed at making health and safety improvements at the facility. During this period, Laguna Honda continued to work on quality improvement efforts while aiming to reapply to participate in Medicare and/or Medicaid.

The CDPH and the state's Department of Health Care Services approved Laguna Honda's recertification for Medicaid in August 2023 and CMS approved Laguna Honda's recertification for Medicare in June 2024, which means Laguna Honda is now fully recertified and will continue to receive Medicare and Medicaid payments. Laguna Honda will continue to be reviewed for compliance with conditions of participation in Medicare and Medicaid programs as is normal for facilities regulated by CMS and CDPH.

THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY

Effect of the Dissolution Act

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (the "Former Agency") was organized in 1948 by the Board of Supervisors 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.

As a result of ABx1 26 and the decision of the California Supreme Court in the *California Redevelopment Association* case, as of February 1, 2012, (collectively, the "Dissolution Act"), 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 agencies all under the supervision of a new oversight board, the State Department of Finance and the State Controller.

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 to the Former Agency: the "Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco,"(the "Successor Agency") also referred to as the "Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure" ("OCII"), (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 to implement the surviving redevelopment projects, the replacement housing obligations of the Former Agency and other enforceable obligations and the authority to take actions that ABx1 26 and AB 1484 require or allow and (iv) established the composition and terms of the members of the Successor Agency Commission.

Because of the existence of enforceable obligations, the Successor Agency is authorized to continue to implement, through the issuance of tax allocation bonds, certain major redevelopment projects that were previously administered by the Former Agency. The Successor Agency exercises land use, development and

design approval authority for the developed projects. The Successor Agency, in addition to other various City agencies and entities, also may issue community facilities district bonds from time to time to facilitate development in the major approved development projects in accordance with the terms of such enforceable obligations. See also, Table A-33: "Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations."

CITY INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICTS

San Francisco has formed numerous special financing districts in order to finance infrastructure improvements benefiting the public in newly developing areas of the City. Projects that may be financed by revenues from special finance districts include, but are not limited to streets, water and sewer systems, libraries, parks, and public safety facilities. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 53395 *et seq*. ("IFD Law"), the Board of Supervisors has formed Infrastructure Financing Districts, Infrastructure Revitalization Financing Districts, and Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (collectively "IFDs") within the geographic boundaries of the City.

Under IFD Law, municipalities may fund improvements within the IFD geographic boundary. IFDs capture increases in property tax revenue stemming from growth in assessed value as a result of new development and use that revenue to finance infrastructure projects and improvements. Each district has its own plan of finance for the allocation and use of tax increment.

GENERAL FUND REVENUES

The revenues discussed below are recorded in the General Fund, unless otherwise noted.

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 taxable assessed value of 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 30, the Controller issues a Certificate of Assessed Valuation in August which certifies the taxable assessed value at the beginning of that fiscal year. The Controller also applies the tax rate factors, including the 1.0% tax authorized by Article XIIIA of the State Constitution (and mandated by statute), and tax factors needed to repay voter-approved general obligation bonds on property located in the City. Typically, the Board of Supervisors approves the schedule of tax rates each year by resolution no later than the last working day of September. The Treasurer and Tax Collector prepares and mails tax bills to taxpayers and collects 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

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. Table A-6 provides a recent history of assessed valuations of taxable property within the City. Lingering impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which triggered business changes such as extended work-from-home policies that resulted in less demand for office spaces, and the substantial increases in borrowing costs (interest rates) resulted in a reduction in property values for certain asset classes in the City and may result in future reductions, which could be material.

The total tax rate shown in Table A-6 includes taxes assessed on behalf of the City as well as the SFUSD, County Office of Education ("SFCOE"), SFCCD, Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD"), and San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District ("BART"), all of which are legal entities separate from the City. See also, Table A-33: "Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations." 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 OCII, the successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and a number of increment financing districts. 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 and a portion of administrative costs of the agency, reducing 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. OCII received $134.0 million of property tax increment in fiscal year 2023-24 for recognized obligations, diverting about $74.5 million that would have otherwise been apportioned to the City's General Fund.

The percent collected of property tax (current year levies excluding supplemental) was 98.93% for fiscal year 2023-24.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

TABLE A-6

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Assessed Valuation of Taxable Property
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2024-25
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Net Assessed [1] Valuation (NAV)	% Change from Prior Year	Total Tax Rate per $100 [2]	Total Tax Levy [3]	Total Tax Collected [3]	% Collected June 30
2008-09	141,274,628	8.7%	1.163	1,702,533	1,661,717	97.6%
2009-10	150,233,436	6.3%	1.159	1,808,505	1,764,100	97.5%
2010-11	157,865,981	5.1%	1.164	1,888,048	1,849,460	98.0%
2011-12	158,649,888	0.5%	1.172	1,918,680	1,883,666	98.2%
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	2,492,789	2,471,486	99.1%
2017-18	234,074,597	10.7%	1.172	2,732,615	2,709,048	99.1%
2018-19	259,329,479	10.8%	1.163	2,999,794	2,977,664	99.3%
2019-20	281,073,307	8.4%	1.180	3,509,022	3,475,682	99.0%
2020-21	299,686,811	6.6%	1.198	3,823,246	3,785,038	99.0%
2021-22	307,712,666	2.7%	1.182	3,864,100	3,832,546	99.2%
2022-23	331,431,694	7.7%	1.180	4,067,270	4,032,813	99.2%
2023-24	346,366,619	4.5%	1.178	4,261,226	4,215,823	98.90%
2024-25	351,321,331 [4]	1.4%	1.171	4,113,973	N/A	N/A

[1] Net Assessed Valuation (NAV) is Total Assessed Value for Secured and 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 2023-24 is based on year-end current year secured and unsecured levies as adjusted through roll corrections, excluding supplemental assessments, as included in the statistical report received from the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City and County of San Francisco. Total Tax Levy for fiscal year 2024-25 is based upon intial assessed valuations times the secured property tax rate to provide an estimate.

[4] Based on initial assessed valuations for fiscal year 2024-25.

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

At the start of fiscal year 2024-25, the total net assessed valuation of taxable property within the City was approximately $351.3 billion. Of this total, $334.5 billion (95.2%) represents secured valuations and $16.8 billion (4.8%) 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 the 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 the 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 XIIIA 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. Taxpayers can appeal the Assessor's determination of their property's assessed value, and 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 assessment appeals as the economy rebounds. During the severe economic downturn of fiscal years 2009-10 and 2010-11, reductions of up to approximately 30% of the assessed valuations appealed were granted. When assessment appeals result in revenue refunds the level of refund activity depends on the unique economic circumstances of each fiscal year. Other taxing agencies such as SFUSD, SFCOE, SFCCD, BAAQMD, and BART share proportionately in any refunds paid as a result of successful appeals. To mitigate the financial risk of potential assessment appeal refunds, the City funds appeal reserves from its share of estimated property tax revenues for each fiscal year. In the period following the Great Recession, assessment appeals increased significantly as did associated reductions, and a similar trend is developing post-pandemic. For scale, in the wake of the Great Recession, the reductions in residential property assessed value reached upwards of $2 billion in 2010-11 when the roll topped $157 billion.

The FY25 & FY26 Original Budget assumes declines in commercial assessed values in the City resulting from the continuance of work from home patterns and interest rates currently affecting the City's businesses, and that such declines could be material. The City's most recent economic reports have noted continuation of these trends.

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 2014-15 through 2023-24 are listed in Table A-7 below.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

TABLE A-7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Reduction of Prior Years' Property Tax Revenues
General Fund
Fiscal Years 2014-15 through 2023-24
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Amount Reduced
2014-15	16,304
2015-16	16,199
2016-17	33,397
2017-18	24,401
2018-19	30,071
2019-20	17,900
2020-21*	10,729
2021-22	16,479
2022-23	23,070
2023-24	36,822

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.
*Amount Reduced in FY 2020-21 and forward reflects both Teetered and non-teetered property tax amounts.

A property's annual assessed value is determined as of January 1 preceding the start of the fiscal year for which taxes are billed and paid. Under California's Proposition 13, a property's annual assessed value is the lesser of (1) its base year value (fair market value as of the date of change in ownership or completion of new construction), factored for inflation at no more than two percent per year; or (2) its fair market value as of that January 1. A qualifying taxpayer can seek assessed value adjustment from the Assessment Appeals Board (AAB), from the Assessor's Office, or both. If a property's fair market value falls below its factored base year value, the reduced value is enrolled on a temporary basis (for one year) and is commonly referred to as a "Proposition 8" reduction, after the 1978 initiative, or simple as a "decline in value" reduction. If a property receives such a temporary reduction, the Assessor is required to annually review the property's temporary reduction for each subsequent January 1 lien date, until such time as the market value again exceeds the property's factored base year value, at which point the Assessor reestablishes the factored base year value as the taxable value to be enrolled for that January 1 lien date.

COVID-19's impact on San Francisco real property values first arose on the 2021 Assessment Roll, resulting in an almost 4-times increase in the total count of Proposition 8 reductions granted compared to the 2020 Assessment Roll (up from 2,059 to 8,212) and more than 8-times increase in the value of the reductions (up from $272 million to $2.18 billion). For the January 1, 2024 lien date, the Assessor's Office completed 11,339 "decline-in-value" reviews, which was nearly 40% higher than anticipated. The total count and value of Proposition 8 reductions for the 2024 Assessment Roll were 9,715 and $4.9 billion, respectively.

The two most significant factors driving changes beginning with the 2021 Assessment Roll were Proposition 8 reductions for hotel and condominium properties. In response to COVID-19, the Assessor's Office performed proactive reviews of commercial properties, which resulted in temporary reductions of $1.01 billion for 26 hotel properties on the 2021 Assessment Roll. For the 2024 Assessment Roll, the Assessor reviewed and applied Proposition 8 assessed value reductions for 21 hotel properties, totaling

$1.34 billion. Meanwhile, condominiums accounted for the largest share of new reductions since the onset of the pandemic at over 70% of the total value of temporary reductions excluding hotels on the 2021 and 2022 Assessment Rolls and more than half of the total count for these years. For the 2023 and 2024 Assessment Rolls, condominiums accounted for a declining percentage of total value of temporary reductions at 63% and 54%, respectively, while increasing as a percentage of total count in 2024 to 79%. The percentage of total count associated with single-family dwellings rose from roughly 4% in 2023 to 7.6% in 2024.

In order to more efficiently address a number of regular open appeals on condominium properties with an assessed value below $5 million, in January 2024, the Assessor's Office applied the same regression model it uses for determining Proposition 8 reductions on condominiums to those with open appeals. Stipulation letters were sent to 942 taxpayers containing a recommended value and instructions about how to withdraw their open appeal if they accepted said value. Taxpayers were given three weeks to withdraw their appeals and accept the recommended value, which 591 taxpayers did according to Assessor records. The result is a temporary downward adjustment of the enrolled value for these properties totaling approximately $135 million. This initiative was one among a number aimed at timely addressing the steep increase in open appeals and the Assessor expects to continue the initiative this year with a similar acceptance rate from a larger pool of taxpayers with open appeals for condominiums.

As referenced above, taxpayers may also seek assessed value adjustments from the AAB, whether or not they seek and/or receive such an adjustment from the Assessor through its informal review process. Supplemental and Base Year Appeals are to establish a property's base value. Escape and Regular Appeals are filed to contest a property's value as of January 1. The majority of appeals filed are Regular Appeals. For regular, annual secured property tax assessments, the period for property owners to file an appeal is between July 2nd and September 15th. If September 15th falls on a Saturday or Sunday, applications filed or postmarked the next business day are considered timely. The AAB generally is required to resolve appeals applications within two (2) years of filing, unless the applicant signs a waiver to extend the statutory period. Appeals may also be resolved when the Assessor and a property owner stipulate to a corrected value, which the AAB may approve, or reject and require a hearing in which it determines the value. Upon hearing a supplemental or base year appeal to establish a base value, the AAB may decide to increase, decrease, or not change an assessment. In the case of an escape or regular appeal, the AAB may lower the taxable value or maintain the factored base year value but cannot increase the value above the factored base year value. If an escape or regular appeal results in a change in value, the result is a decline-in-value reduction. The new assessed value will be used to determine the property taxes for the year that was appealed. Subsequently, as with any decline-in-value reduction, each year, the Assessor examines the property to see if the market value has risen back to the Proposition 13 base year value, or higher, and if so, reestablishes the Proposition 13 base year value. This does not apply to appeals to establish a property's base value.

Not all filled appeals receive a hearing or result in a property tax assessment reduction. A large majority are withdrawn and many filled appeals result in no reduction. City revenue estimates take into account projected losses from pending and future assessment appeals that are based on historical results as to appeals.

As of June 30, 2024, the total number of open appeals before the AAB was 6,073 with 8,036 new applications filed in fiscal year 2023-24. As of June 30, 2024, the difference between the assessed value and the taxpayer's opinion of values for all the open applications was $81.8 billion. Assuming the City did not contest any taxpayer appeals and the AAB upheld all the taxpayer's requests, a negative potential

total property tax impact of about $965.3 million would result. The General Fund's portion of that potential $965.3 million would be approximately $455.6 million. In practice, the City has contested virtually all taxpayer appeals. As such, actual reductions have historically been much lower than values asserted by appellant property owners and a majority of appeals are eventually withdrawn. Of the 4,838 appeals closed during fiscal year 2023-24 as of June 30, 2024, 3,749, or 77% of appeals, were withdrawn.

Pending open appeals include a small number of appeals from 2020-21. Nearly all the appeal applications filed during fiscal year 2020-21 challenged the assessed value of property for that fiscal year. However, because the assessed value of secured property for fiscal year 2020-21 was determined by the Assessor as of the January 1, 2020, lien date, which predated the COVID-19 pandemic and its related economic effects, the City does not expect a material reduction in assessed values resulting from COVID-19 impacts for fiscal year 2020-21 appeal applications. However, there was an increase in the number of appeals for fiscal year 2021-22 and a modest increase for fiscal year 2022-23. Appeals for the January 1, 2023 lien date (current values for fiscal year 2023-24) was approximately three times the prior year, totaling 7,508 per AAB reporting. The City is anticipating a similar number of newly filled appeals this year.

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 BAAQMD and BART. The total tax levy for all taxing entities to begin fiscal year 2024-25 was $4.1 billion, not including supplemental, escape and special assessments that may be assessed during the year. Of total property tax revenues allocated in fiscal year 2023-24 (including supplemental and escape property taxes), per pre-audit numbers, the City received $2.5 billion in the General Fund and $283.9 million in special revenue funds designated for children's programs, libraries and open space. SFUSD and SFCCD received approximately $257.5 million and $48.3 million, respectively, and the local ERAF received $455.6 million (before adjusting for the vehicle license fees ("VLF") backfill shift). The Successor Agency received $134.0 million. The remaining portion was allocated to various other governmental bodies, various special funds, 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. The City's General Fund was allocated about 47.2% of total property tax revenue before adjusting for the tax increment financing districts, VLF backfill shift, and excess ERAF.

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. Additionally, 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) in June 2017 (effective fiscal year 2017-18) and for the Bay Restoration Authority Parcel Tax, SFUSD School Facilities Special Tax, SFUSD School Parcel Tax, and City College Parcel Tax in October 2017 (effective fiscal year 2018-19). The Teeter Plan 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-8. The Tax Loss Reserve sets aside 1% of the total of all taxes and assessments levied for which the Teeter Plan is the applicable distribution method. The purpose of the Tax Loss Reserve is to cover losses that may occur. The amount has grown in recent years as the assessed values on the secured roll has grown.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

TABLE A-8

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Teeter Plan
Tax Loss Reserve Fund Balance
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2023-24
(000s)

Year Ended	Amount Funded
2013-14	$19,654
2014-15	20,569
2015-16	22,882
2016-17	24,882
2017-18	25,567
2018-19	29,126
2019-20	31,968
2020-21	35,298
2021-22	35,951
2022-23	38,041
2023-24	39,723

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, 2024 are shown in Table A-9. 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-9

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Top 10 Parcels Total Assessed Value
July 1, 2024

Assessee[1]	Location	Parcel Number	Type	Total Assessed Value[2]	% Basis of Levy[3]
SUTTER BAY HOSPITALS[4]	1101 VAN NESS AVE	0695 007	Hospital	$2,786,422,698	0.792%
TRANSBAY TOWER LLC	415 MISSION ST	3720 009	Office	$1,913,672,794	0.544%
GSW ARENA LLC	1 WARRIORS WAY A	8722 026	ntertainment Com	$1,533,404,672	0.436%
PARK TOWER OWNER LLC	250 HOWARD ST	3718 040	Office	$1,163,207,711	0.331%
KRE EXCHANGE OWNER LLC	1800 OWENS ST	8727 008	Office	$1,158,816,492	0.329%
HWA 555 OWNERS LLC	555 CALIFORNIA ST	0259 026	Office	$1,136,782,374	0.323%
ELM PROPERTY VENTURE LLC	101 CALIFORNIA ST	0263 011	Office	$1,101,967,156	0.313%
PPF PARAMOUNT ONE MARKET PLAZA OWNER LP	55 SPEAR ST	3713 007	Office	$931,075,752	0.265%
SUTTER BAY HOSPITALS DBA CA PACIFIC MED	3555 CESAR CHAVEZ ST/555 SAN JOS	6575 005	Hospital	$769,285,502	0.219%
SFDC 50 FREMONT LLC	50 FREMONT ST	3709 019	Office	$769,162,113	0.219%
				$13,263,797,264	3.769%

[1] Certain parcels fall within RDA project areas.

[2] 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. Values reflect information as January 1, 2024, lien date.

[3] 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).

[4] Nonprofit organization that is exempt from property taxes.

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 countywide rates, and the tax revenues distributed to taxing jurisdictions (including the City itself) according to statutory formula are generally based on the distribution of taxes in the prior year. The fiscal year 2024-25 valuation of property assessed by the State Board of Equalization in the City is approximately $4.6 billion.

OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES

In addition to property taxes, 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. The City's General Fund is also supported by other sources of revenue, including charges for services, fines and penalties, and transfers-in, which are not discussed below.

See Table A-10 below for a summary of revenue source as a percentage of total General Fund revenue based on the Original Budget for fiscal year 2024-25.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

TABLE A-10

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Fund Revenue Overview
Fiscal Year 2024-25
(000s)

Revenues	FY 2024-25 Original Budget	
Property Taxes	$2,469,580	*38.9%*
Business Taxes	883,000	*13.9%*
Other Local Taxes[1]	1,109,170	*17.5%*
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	31,802	*0.5%*
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	3,921	*0.1%*
Interest and Investment Income	146,715	*2.3%*
Rents and Concessions	14,145	*0.2%*
Intergovernmental	1,321,363	*20.8%*
Charges for Services	351,423	*5.5%*
Other	19,444	*0.3%*
Total Revenues	$6,350,563	*100.0%*

[1] Other Local Taxes includes sales, hotel, utility users, parking, transfer, sugar sweetened beverage, stadium admissions, access line, cannabis, and overpaid executive taxes.

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

Business Taxes

Through tax year 2014, businesses in the City were subject to payroll expense and business registration taxes. Proposition E (November 2012) changed business registration tax rates and introduced a gross receipts tax which phased in over a five-year period beginning January 1, 2014, intending to replace the then existing 1.5% tax on business payrolls over the same period. Overall, the ordinance increased the number and types of businesses in the City that pay business tax and registration fees from approximately 7,500 to 15,000. In November 2020, voters passed Proposition F, which eliminated the payroll tax and modified gross receipt tax rates. Most gross receipt tax rates increased by 40% for tax year 2021 over the prior year. Much smaller increases were scheduled for 2023 and 2024, should the City's taxable gross receipts in 2021 and 2022 reach at least 90% and 95%, respectively, of 2019 taxable gross receipts. The 2023 tax increase was suspended for one year because the City's 2021 taxable gross receipts did not reach the 90% threshold and the 2024 tax increase is suspended for one year because the City's 2022 taxable gross receipts did not reach the 95% threshold. In some industries that were particularly hurt during the pandemic, such as retail, trade and food services, Proposition F resulted in lowered tax rates through 2022 for gross receipts under $25 million. Subsequent legislation extended the lowered rate to these businesses for an additional two years. Proposition F also reduced business registration fees for businesses with less than $1 million in gross receipts and raised the small business exemption for gross receipts taxes to $2 million.

Unaudited business tax revenue (gross receipts, payroll, and business registration) for fiscal year 2023-24 is $853.2 million for all funds, representing an increase of $15.8 million (1.8%) from fiscal year 2022-23.

At the request of Mayor London Breed and Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin, on February 5, 2024, the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector and the Office of the Controller released a memo entitled "Recommended Reforms to the Business Tax System" outlining a series of tax reform recommendations

to inform a potential ballot measure for the November 2024 election (the "Business Tax Reform Memo"). The overall purpose of the measure is to design a business tax system that better reflects a post-COVID economy. The measure would reduce the risk of tax loss from remote work and business relocation by placing greater weight on gross receipts in the City over payroll in the City. By shifting the tax burden across a greater number of businesses to reduce the concentration of business taxes on a small number of payers, it would reduce volatility in revenue. The tax structure will be simplified to create greater predictability for both businesses and the City. Specifically, the measure will decrease the Overpaid Executive Tax by 80% and balance the lost revenue with increases to the Gross Receipts tax rate. Tax collections will decrease initially as the economy recovers until 2027 and 2028 when tax rates will increase by 4% and 3%, respectively. There are a number of changes in tax rates for various business categories to promote equity across categories and between different sizes of businesses.

In this fiscal year, indicators generally showed that the City has not seen robust growth in economic activity, and by some indicators, has even declined. According to data from the California Employment Development Department, from FY 2022-23 to FY 2023-24 the total San Francisco labor force declined 2.3% and the number employed decreased by 3.2%. Over the same time frame, the average unemployment rate increased from 2.7% to 3.6%. Office work is the key driver of San Francisco's GDP and office vacancy rates have steadily increased, from 28.3% in Q2 of 2023 to 33.7% in Q2 of 2024. On the other hand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that total San Francisco wages increased 2.9% over the prior fiscal year, suggesting that although there are fewer workers in the City, those that are here are seeing increased wages. Bridge crossings and BART exits from downtown stations, both indicators of commuters coming into the City, remained approximately the same between this fiscal year and the prior fiscal year.

Remote work occurring outside the City creates fiscal risk because, for certain categories of businesses, the gross receipts tax is dependent in part on their San Francisco payroll, and the firms only need to calculate their San Francisco payroll expense for employees that physically work within the City's geographic boundaries. Approximately half of the workers in major tax-paying sectors such as Professional Services, Financial Services, and Information live outside of San Francisco. Office attendance has remained about the same between FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 suggesting that there will not be significant increases to the San Francisco economy from employees returning from remote work to office work in the foreseeable future. See "BUDGETARY RISKS – Office Vacancy in San Francisco; Impact on Property Taxes and Other Revenues."

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Business Tax Revenues - All Funds [1]
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
(000s)

Fiscal Year[2]	Revenue	Change	Change %
2020-21	$724,140	($100,530)	-12.2%
2021-22	863,510	139,370	19.2%
2022-23	853,154	(10,356)	-1.2%
2023-24 Pre-Audit[3]	871,823	18,669	2.2%
2024-25 Original Budget[3]	883,000	11,177	1.3%
2025-26 Original Budget[4]	954,000	71,000	8.0%

[1] Figures exclude Homelessness Gross Receipts and Commercial Rent taxes.

[2] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals. Includes gross receipts and payroll taxes allocated to special revenue funds for the Community Challenge Grant program as well as business registration tax.

[3] Figures for fiscal year 2023-24 are pre-audit actuals.

[4] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2004.

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 to the City monthly. Hotel tax revenue in fiscal year 2023-24 was $287.6 million (all funds), an increase of $4.1 million (1.4%) from fiscal year 2022-23. The fiscal year 2024-25 budget is $323.4 million, an increase of $35.9 million (12.5%) from the fiscal year 2023-24 pre-audit actuals. The fiscal year 2025-26 budget is $355 million, an increase of $31.6 million (9.8%) from the fiscal year 2024-25 projection. Table A-12 includes hotel tax in all funds. Slightly less than 90% of the City's hotel tax is allocated to the General Fund, with 10.7% allocated to arts and cultural organizations and approximately $5 million for debt service on hotel tax revenue bonds.

Fiscal year 2023-24 hotel tax revenue performed better than fiscal year 2022-23, as leisure visits and convention activity continue to recover. Fiscal year 2023-24 enplanements at SFO increased by 9.0% from the prior year, as international and domestic enplanements improved by 210% and 4.7%, respectively. The return of conferences and conventions has played a key role in the recovery of hotel tax revenues, particularly because conventions drive up hotel tax room rates through compression pricing. In fiscal year 2022-23, there were 33 conferences with over 286,000 attendees. In fiscal year 2023-24, a total of 38 conferences with over 390,000 attendees took place at the Moscone Convention Center.

TABLE A-12

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Transient Occupancy Tax Revenues - All Funds[1]
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
(000s)

Fiscal Year[2]	Tax Rate	Revenue	Change	
2020-21	14.0%	42,195	(239,420)	-85.0%
2021-22	14.0%	179,134	136,939	324.5%
2022-23	14.0%	283,453	104,320	58.2%
2023-24 Pre-Audit[3]	14.0%	287,553	4,100	1.4%
2024-25 Original Budget[4]	14.0%	323,443	35,890	12.5%
2025-26 Original Budget[4]	14.0%	355,047	31,604	9.8%

[1] Amounts include the portion of hotel tax revenue used to pay debt service on hotel tax revenue bonds, as well as the portion of hotel tax revenue dedicated to arts and cultural programming reflecting the passage of Proposition E in November 2018, which took effect January 1, 2019.

[2] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals.

[3] Figures for fiscal year 2023-24 are pre-audit actuals.

[4] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2004.

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

Real Property Transfer Tax

Real property transfer tax ("RPTT") 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 Transfer tax rates are $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; $22.50 per $1,000 for properties valued more than $5.0 million and less than $10.0 million; $55.00 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $10.0 million and less than $25.0 million and $60.00 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $25.0 million.

RPTT revenue for fiscal year 2023-24 are $177.7 million, a $8.5 million (4.6%) decrease from fiscal year 2022-23. The fiscal year 2024-25 budget is $218.9 million, an increase of $41.2 million (23.2%) from fiscal year 2023-24. The fiscal year 2025-26 budget is $267.6 million, an increase of $48.7 million (22.3%) from fiscal year 2024-25. The entirety of RPTT revenue is recorded in the General Fund.

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in spring 2020, businesses in office-using sectors have largely adopted remote and hybrid work practices, precipitating structural changes to where and how we work. As a result, the City has experienced persistently high office vacancies, reaching a high of 33.7% in Q2 2024 according to JLL. Commercial real estate values (which compose the largest value transactions) have fallen, with recent transactions selling at 57% less than currently assessed values. Additionally, the relatively high interest rate environment increases the cost of borrowing. Additional factors affecting transfer tax revenue include credit availability, foreign capital flows, and the relative attractiveness of San Francisco real estate compared to other investment options.

Due to the highly progressive nature of the tax, the volatility of RPTT is attributable mainly to the sales of high-value (largely commercial) properties over $10 million. The overall number of transactions over $10

million dropped from 101 transfers in fiscal year 2021-22 to 55 transfers in fiscal year 2022-23 and 56 transfers in fiscal year 2023-24. The number of transactions under $10 million also declined from 10,086 transfers in FY 2021-22 to 6,714 transfers in FY 2022-23, and further declining to 6,487 transfers in FY 2023-24.

The fiscal year 2024-25 and 2025-26 budget projects slow increases from fiscal year 2023-24 results, anticipating slow increases in transfers as buyers and sellers begin to come into agreement about market prices of large real estate transactions. However, the interest rate environment and uncertainty around the value of office-based real estate with the shift to hybrid models of work is expected to continue to dampen the City's transfer tax receipts.

TABLE A-13

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Real Property Transfer Tax Receipts - All Funds
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
(000s)

Fiscal Year[1]	Revenue	Change	
2020-21	344,683	10,148	3.0%
2021-22	520,359	175,676	51.0%
2022-23	186,247	(334,112)	-64.2%
2023-24 Pre-Audit[2]	177,700	(8,547)	-4.6%
2024-25 Original Budget[3]	218,850	41,150	23.2%
2025-26 Original Budget[3]	267,550	48,700	22.3%

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals.

[2] Figures for fiscal year 2023-24 are pre-audit actuals.

[3] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2024.

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

Sales and Use Tax

The sales tax rate on retail transactions in the City is 8.6250%, of which 1.00% represents the City's local share ("Bradley-Burns" portion). 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 components of San Francisco's 8.6250% sales tax rate are shown in Table A-14. In addition to the 1% portion of local sales tax, the State subvenes portions of sales tax back to counties through 2011 realignment (1.0625%), 1991 realignment (0.5%), and public safety sales tax (0.5%). The subventions are discussed in more detail under "INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES" herein.

TABLE A-14

San Francisco's Sales & Use Tax Rate

State Sales Tax	**6.00%**
State General Fund	3.9375%
Local Realignment Fund 2011*	1.0625%
Local Revenue Fund*	0.50%
(to counties for health & welfare)	
Public Safety Fund (to counties & cities)*	0.50%
Local Sales Tax	**1.25%**
Local Sales Tax (to General Fund)*	1.00%
Local Transportation Tax (TDA)	0.25%
Special District Use Tax	**1.375%**
2020 Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Transactions and Use Tax (JPBF)	0.125%
SF County Transportation Authority	0.50%
Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	0.50%
SF Public Financing Authority (Schools)	0.25%
TOTAL Sales Tax Rate	**8.625%**

* Represents portions of the sales tax allocated to the City.

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

The local sales tax (the 1% portion) revenue in fiscal year 2023-24 is $190.5 million, a decrease of $7.4 million (3.7%) from fiscal year 2022-23. The fiscal year 2024-25 budget is $193.7 million, an increase of $3.2 million (1.7%) from the fiscal year 2023-24 pre-audit actuals. The budget for fiscal year 2025-26 is $198.9 million, an increase of $5.3 million (2.7%) from the fiscal year 2024-25 projection. The entirety of sales tax revenue is recorded in the General Fund.

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 and spending patterns. In recent years, online retailers have contributed significantly to sales tax receipts, offsetting sustained declines in point-of-sale purchases.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-15

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Sales and Use Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
General Fund
(000s)

Fiscal Year[1]	Tax Rate	City Share	Revenue	Change	
2020-21	8.50%	1.00%	146,863	(33,321)	-18.5%
2021-22	8.625%	1.00%	188,337	41,474	28.2%
2022-23	8.625%	1.00%	197,911	9,574	5.1%
2023-24 Pre-Audit[2]	8.625%	1.00%	190,528	(7,383)	-3.7%
2024-25 Original Budget[3]	8.625%	1.00%	193,690	3,162	1.7%
2025-26 Original Budget[3]	8.625%	1.00%	198,940	5,250	2.7%

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals.

[2] Figures for fiscal year 2023-24 are pre-audit actuals.

[3] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2024.

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

Other Local Taxes

The City imposes a number of other general purpose taxes:

- Utility Users Tax ("UUT") - A 7.5% tax on non-residential users of gas, electricity, water, steam and telephone services.

- Access Line Tax ("ALT") – As of July 1, 2023, a charge of $3.96 on every telecommunications line, $29.79 on every trunk line, and $536.32 on every high-capacity line in the City. The ALT replaced the Emergency Response Fee ("ERF") in 2009. The tax is collected from telephone communications service subscribers by the telephone service supplier.

- Parking Tax - A 25% tax for off-street parking spaces. The tax is paid by occupants and remitted monthly to the City by parking facility operators. In accordance with Charter Section 16.110, 80% of parking tax revenues are transferred from the General Fund to the MTA's Enterprise Funds to support public transit.

- Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax – A one cent per ounce tax on the distribution of sugary beverages. This measure was adopted by voters on November 9, 2016 (Proposition V) and took effect on January 1, 2018.

- Stadium Admission Tax – A tax between $0.25 and $1.50 per seat or space in a stadium for any event, with some specific exclusions.

- Cannabis Tax – A gross receipts tax of 1% to 5% on marijuana business and permits the City to tax businesses that do not have a physical presence in the City. This measure was adopted by voters in November 2018 (Proposition D). The tax was originally slated to go into effect on January 1, 2021, but the Board has delayed the imposition of the tax several times. The cannabis tax will now take effect beginning January 1, 2026.

- Franchise Tax – A tax for the use of City streets and rights-of-way on cable TV, electric, natural gas, and steam franchises.

- Overpaid Executives Tax – In November 2020, voters adopted Proposition L, a new tax on businesses in the City, where compensation of the businesses' highest-paid managerial employee compared to the median compensation paid to the businesses' employees based in the City exceeds a ratio of 100:1. The measure took effect on January 1, 2022 for tax year 2022, so revenues were first received in fiscal year 2022-23. Revenue from this tax is expected to be highly volatile due to the narrow base of expected payers, large annual fluctuations in the value and form of executive compensation, which typically includes equity, and tax-avoidance risk associated with tax increases. Estimates based on prior years' activity may not be predictive of future revenues. Fiscal year 2023-24 revenue was $124.4 million and the projection for both 2024-25 and 2025-26 is $140.0 million per year.

Table A-16 reflects the City's actual tax receipts for fiscal years 2019-20 through 2023-24 and budgets for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively.

As with the larger tax revenues described above, the City anticipates these sources will be impacted by the pace of economic recovery. See "CITY BUDGET— Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions " for a summary of the most recent projections.

TABLE A-16

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Other Local Taxes
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
General Fund
(000s)

Tax	2020-21 Actuals[1]	2021-22 Actuals[1]	2022-23 Actuals[1]	2023-24 Pre-Audit[2]	2024-25 Original Budget[3]	2025-26 Original Budget[3]
Utility Users Tax	$81,367	$105,225	$110,661	$121,931	$110,730	$111,830
Access Line Tax	44,700	55,710	53,171	64,609	53,730	55,090
Parking Tax	47,555	71,122	82,716	86,178	86,900	86,800
Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax	10,435	11,973	12,870	11,625	12,700	12,700
Stadium Admissions Tax	182	4,615	5,984	8,567	7,400	74,000
Cannabis Tax	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	
Overpaid Executives Tax	N/A	N/A	206,041	124,424	140,000	140,000

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals.
[2] Fiscal year 2023-24 is pre-audit actuals.
[3] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2004.

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

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES

State Subventions Based on Taxes

The City receives allocations of State sales tax and VLF revenue for 1991 Health and Welfare Realignment, 2011 Public Safety Realignment, and Prop 172 Public Safety Sales Tax. These subventions fund programs that are substantially supported by the General Fund. See "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES – Sales and Use Tax" above.

- Health and Welfare Realignment, enacted in 1991, restructured the state-county partnership by giving counties increased responsibilities and dedicated funding to administer certain public health, mental health and social service programs.

- 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.

- 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. These revenues are allocated to counties by the State separately from the local one-percent sales tax discussed above. 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.

Table A-17 reflects the City's actual receipts for fiscal years 2020-21 through 2023-24 and projection for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

TABLE A-17

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Selected State Subventions - All Funds
Fiscal Years 2020-21 through 2025-26
($millions)

Tax	2020-21 Actuals[1]	2021-22 Actuals[1]	2022-23 Actuals[1]	2023-24 Pre-Audit[2]	2024-25 Original Budget[3]	2025-26 Original Budget[3]
Health and Welfare Realignment						
General Fund	$188.9	$283.5	$290.7	$264.6	$283.6	$290.5
Hospital Fund	48.1	67.1	67.9	63.4	63.6	64.2
Total - Health and Welfare	**$237.1**	**$350.6**	**$358.6**	**$328.0**	**$347.2**	**$354.7**
Backfill Realignment[4]						
General Fund	$22.1					
Non General Fund	6.0					
Total - Backfill Realignment	**$28.0**					
Public Safety Realignment (General Fund)	$38.4	$52.1	$58.6	$55.6	$55.4	$56.8
Public Safety Sales Tax (Prop 172) (General Fund)	$105.0	$ 93.8	$ 94.9	$97.2	$99.6	$102.3

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2020-21 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals.

[2] Fiscal Year 2023-24 is pre-audit actuals.

[3] Original Budget amounts are from the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget, adopted July 31, 2004.

[4] Backfill Realignment is a one-time State funding to fill the shortfall in Health and Welfare Realignment and Public Safety Realignment due to the decrease of sales tax and vehicle license fees.

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

CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area

As a consolidated city and county, the City budgets General Fund expenditures in seven major service areas as described in Table A-18 below:

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-18

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Expenditures by Major Service Area
Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2024-25
(000s)

Major Service Areas	2019-20 Final Budget[1]	2020-21 Final Budget[1]	2021-22 Final Budget[1]	2022-23 Final Budget[1]	2023-24 Original Budget[2]	2024-25 Original Budget[3]
Public Protection	$1,493,240	$1,505,780	$1,586,264	$1,681,489	$1,747,204	$1,837,737
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	1,270,530	218,986	1,571,761	1,621,981	1,604,163	1,641,289
Community Health	1,065,051	1,605,573	1,119,891	1,118,010	1,125,977	1,144,476
General Administration & Finance	332,296	1,158,599	353,518	351,738	345,406	352,660
Culture & Recreation	161,274	147,334	161,417	180,475	201,453	190,338
General City Responsibilities	137,851	332,997	159,299	201,959	184,513	194,821
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	216,824	126,993	244,365	275,941	242,912	232,734
Total[2]	$4,677,066	$5,096,262	$5,196,515	$5,431,593	$5,451,628	$5,594,055

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2019-20 through fiscal year 2022-23 are as reflected in ACFR.

[2] Fiscal year 2023-24 amounts are from Original Budget, adopted July 27, 2023.

[3] Fiscal year 2024-25 amounts are from Original Budget, adopted July 31, 2024.

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—which is primarily responsible for City jails rather than law enforcement. Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development includes the Department of Human Services' aid assistance, aid payments, and City grant programs. Community Health includes the Public Health Department, which also operates San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital.

For budgetary purposes, enterprise funds (which are not shown on the table above) 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 General Hospital Fund, and the Laguna Honda Hospital Fund. These funds are supported by transfers from the General Fund to the extent their dedicated revenue streams are insufficient to support the desired level of services.

Voter-Mandated Spending Requirements

The Charter requires funding for voter-mandated spending requirements, which are also referred to as "baselines," "set-asides," or "mandates". The chart below identifies the required and budgeted levels of funding for key mandates. The spending requirements are formula-driven, variously based on projected aggregate General Fund discretionary revenue, property tax revenues, total budgeted spending, staffing levels, or population growth. Table A-19 reflects fiscal year 2024-25 and 2025-26 spending requirements. These mandates are generally budgeted as transfers out of the General Fund or allocations of revenue.

TABLE A-19

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Baselines & Set-Asides
FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26
($millions)

	2024-25 Original Budget[1]	2025-26 Original Budget[1]
Projected General Fund Aggregate Discretionary Revenue (ADR)	***$4,532.2***	***$4,688.8***
Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)		
MTA - Municipal Railway Baseline: 7.068% ADR	$320.3	$331.4
MTA - Parking & Traffic Baseline: 2.507% ADR	$113.6	$117.6
MTA - Population Adjustment	$74.5	$75.4
MTA - 80% Parking Tax In-Lieu	$69.5	$71.0
Subtotal - MTA	**$577.9**	**$595.3**
Library Preservation Fund		
Library - Baseline: 2.286% ADR	$103.6	$107.2
Library - Property Tax: $0.025 per $100 Net Assessed Valuation (NAV)	$79.3	$79.6
Subtotal - Library	**$182.9**	**$186.8**
Children's Services		
Children's Services Baseline - Requirement: 4.830% ADR	$218.9	$226.5
Children's Services Baseline - Eligible Items Budgeted	220.4	232.7
Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Requirement: 0.580% ADR	26.3	27.2
Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Eligible Items Budgeted	36.9	39.3
Early Care and Education Baseline Requirement (June 2018 Prop C)	77.2	80.1
Early Care and Education - Eligible Items Budgeted	77.2	80.1
Public Education Services Baseline: 0.290% ADR	13.1	13.6
Children and Youth Fund Property Tax Set-Aside: $0.0375-0.4 per $100 NAV	126.9	127.4
Public Education Enrichment Fund: 3.057% ADR	138.5	143.3
1/3 Annual Contribution to Preschool for All	46.2	47.8
2/3 Annual Contribution to SF Unified School District	92.4	95.6
Student Success Fund (SFUSD)	35.0	45.0
Subtotal - Children's Services	**$648.1**	**$681.5**
Recreation and Parks		
Open Space Property Tax Set-Aside: $0.025 per $100 NAV	$79.3	$79.6
Recreation & Parks Baseline - Requirement	85.2	88.2
Recreation & Parks Baseline - Budgeted	88.0	90.2
Subtotal - Recreation and Parks	**$167.4**	**$169.8**
Other		
Housing Trust Fund Requirement	$47.3	$49.0
Housing Trust Fund Budget	47.3	49.0
Dignity Fund	59.1	62.1
Street Tree Maintenance Fund: 0.507% ADR	23.0	23.8
Municipal Symphony Baseline: $0.00125 per $100 NAV	4.4	4.5
City Services Auditor: 0.2% of Citywide Budget	28.1	27.4
Our City, Our Home Baseline Requirement (Nov 2018 Prop C)	215.0	215.0
Our City, Our Home Budget, Estimated	423.2	415.3
Subtotal - Other	**$585.0**	**$582.0**
Total Baselines and Set-Asides	**$2,161.3**	**$2,215.4**

[1] Fiscal year 2024-25 and 2025-26 amounts represent the Mayor's Proposed Budget, June 1, 2024.

EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS

The cost of salaries and benefits for City employees represents slightly less than half of the City's expenditures, totaling $7.3 billion and $7.1 billion in fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26 in the Original Budget. For the General Fund, the combined salary and benefits in the Original Budget is $3.3 billion in fiscal year 2024-25 and $3.2 billion in fiscal year 2025-26.

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-employment health and medical benefits. SFUSD, SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court, called Trial Court below, are not City employees.

Labor Relations

The City's FY24 & FY25 Original Budget includes 40,456 full-time and part-time budgeted City positions. City workers are represented by 36 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.

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, including managerial and executive-level employees, are represented by labor organizations.

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 sworn police officers and fire fighters.

Further, the City Charter requires binding arbitration to resolve negotiations in the event of an impasse. If an impasse is reached, the parties are required to convene a tripartite arbitration panel, chaired by an impartial third-party arbitrator, which sets the disputed terms of the new agreement. The award of the arbitration panel is final and binding. This process applies to all City employees except Registered Nurses and a small group of unrepresented employees, whose working conditions and compensation are established annually by ordinance. Wages, hours and working conditions of nurses are not subject to interest arbitration but are subject to Charter-mandated economic limits.

Since 1976, no City employees have participated in a union-authorized strike, which is prohibited by the Charter. On July 24, 2023, the California Public Employment Relations Board ("PERB") ruled in favor of SEIU and IFPTE, concluding that City Charter sections A8.346 and A8.409 prohibiting strikes by City employees are invalid, affirming an earlier ruling of an administrative law judge that such City Charter provisions violate the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act. The City has filed a notice of appeal to the California Court of Appeal with respect to the PERB decision. The City can give no assurance whether the appeal will be successful.

In May 2024, the City negotiated three-year agreements (for fiscal years 2024-25 through 2026-27) with 27 labor unions. The City negotiated a 1.5% base wage due on July 1, 2024 and 1.5% on January 4, 2025,

with an additional 1% base wage increase at the close of business on June 30, 2025. For fiscal year 2025-26, the parties agreed to a base wage increase of 1% on July 1, 2025, 1.5% on January 3, 2026 and 2% at the close of business on June 30, 2026. For fiscal year 2026-27, the parties agreed to a base wage increase of 2% on January 2, 2027 and 2.5% at the close of business on June 30, 2027. The City additionally negotiated a minimum base wage of $25.00 an hour implemented on July 1, 2024, impacting members of SEIU Local 1021 Citywide and Laborers, Local 261. For fiscal year 2024-25, the Unrepresented Employee Ordinance was passed approving a wage increase of 1.5% on July 1, 2024, 2.25% on January 6, 2024, and 1% at close of business on June 30, 2025.

Also, in May 2024, the MTA negotiated thee-year agreements (for fiscal years 2024-25 through 2026-27) with the unions that represent Transit Operators, Mechanics, Station Agents, Parking Control Officers and others, collectively referred to as Service-Critical. The parties agreed to the same wage increase schedule as provided in the City agreements.

In 2023, the City negotiated a 2.5% base wage increase with labor organizations representing sworn members of the Police and Fire departments due on July 1, 2023 and 2.25% on January 6, 2024. For fiscal year 2024-25, the parties agreed to a base wage increase of 3.0% on January 4, 2025 with a provision to delay the increase by six months if the City's budget deficit for fiscal year 2024-25, as projected in the March 2024 Joint Report, exceeds $300 million. The March 2024 Joint Report forecasted a deficit $235.9 million, below the $300 million threshold. Therefore no wage delay was triggered. For fiscal year 2025-2026, the parties agreed to a base wage increase of 3.0% on July 1, 2025 with a provision to delay the increase by one year if the City's budget deficit for fiscal year 2025-26, as projected in the March 2025 Joint Report, exceeds $300 million. See "CITY BUDGET—Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions" for a summary of the March 2024 Joint Report.

One of the key assumptions in the March 2024 Joint Report was that wages under all open labor contracts would increase during the Five-Year Plan projection period at the average of the inflation projections of the California Department of Finance SF Metropolitan Statistical Area CPI and Moody's SF Metropolitan Area CPI. As of the March 2024 Joint Report, these assumed increased were projected to be 2.54% in FY 2024-25, 2.53% in FY 2025-26, 2.56% in FY 2026-27, and 2.28% in FY 2027-28. Based on the negotiated agreements, the miscellaneous contracts have increases that exceed the CPI assumptions assumed in the March 2024 Joint Report. Unless the City takes other corrective actions, such MOUs would increase the structural deficits projected in the Five-Year Plan.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-20

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (All Funds)
Employee Organizations as of September 20, 2024

Organization	City Budgeted Positions	Expiration Date of MOU
Automotive Machinists, Local 1414	554	30-Jun-27
Bricklayers, Local 3	6	30-Jun-27
Building Inspectors' Association	85	30-Jun-27
Carpenters, Local 22	115	30-Jun-27
Carpet, Linoleum & Soft Tile	4	30-Jun-27
Cement Masons, Local 300	43	30-Jun-27
Deputy Probation Officers' Association (DPOA)	120	30-Jun-27
Deputy Sheriffs' Association (DSA)	793	30-Jun-27
Electrical Workers, Local 6	1,047	30-Jun-27
Firefighters' Association, Local 798	2,028	30-Jun-26
Glaziers, Local 718	14	30-Jun-27
Hod Carriers, Local 36	4	30-Jun-27
Ironworkers, Local 377	14	30-Jun-27
Laborers, Local 261	1,237	30-Jun-27
Municipal Attorneys' Association (MAA)	511	30-Jun-27
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Fire	12	30-Jun-26
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Miscellaneous	1,752	30-Jun-27
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Police	16	30-Jun-26
Operating Engineers, Local 3 Miscellaneous	68	30-Jun-27
Operating Engineers, Local 3 Supervising Probation	28	30-Jun-27
Pile Drivers, Local 34	27	30-Jun-27
Plumbers, Local 38	369	30-Jun-27
Police Officers' Association (POA)	2,399	30-Jun-26
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21	7,396	30-Jun-27
Roofers, Local 40	13	30-Jun-27
SEIU, Local 1021, H-1	1	30-Jun-27
SEIU, Local 1021 Misc	13,609	30-Jun-27
SEIU, Local 1021 Nurses	1,868	30-Jun-27
SF City Workers United	145	30-Jun-27
SFDA Investigators Association	44	30-Jun-27
Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104	39	30-Jun-27
Sheriffs' Supervisory and Management Association (MSA)	119	30-Jun-27
Stationary Engineers, Local 39	707	30-Jun-27
Teamsters, Local 853	192	30-Jun-27
Teamsters, Local 856, Multi	102	30-Jun-27
Teamsters, Local 856, Supervising Nurses	136	30-Jun-27
Theatrical Stage Emp, Local 16	34	30-Jun-27
TWU, Local 200	537	30-Jun-27
TWU, Local 250-A, Auto Service Work	134	30-Jun-27
TWU, Local 250-A, Miscellaneous	108	30-Jun-27
TWU, Local 250-A, Transit Fare Inspectors	45	30-Jun-27
TWU, Local 250-A, Transit Operator	2,670	30-Jun-27
Union of American Physicians and Dentists (UAPD)	212	30-Jun-27
Unrepresented Employees	94	30-Jun-25
Other	1,007	
	40,456	

San Francisco Employees' Retirement System

History and Administration

The San Francisco City & County Employees' Retirement System ("SFERS" or "Retirement System") 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 and Chief Investment Officer of SFERS. 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.

Membership

Retirement System members include eligible employees of the City, SFUSD, SFCCD, and the San Francisco Trial Courts. The Retirement System estimates that the total active membership as of July 1, 2023 was 46,657, compared to 45,284 as of July 1, 2022. Active membership as of July 1, 2023 included 11,461 terminated vested members and 1,180 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 California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") and may be eligible to receive a reciprocal pension from the Retirement System in the future. Monthly retirement allowances are paid to approximately 32,104 retired members and beneficiaries. Benefit recipients include retired members, vested members receiving a vesting allowance, and qualified survivors.

Table A-21 shows various member counts in the total Retirement System (City, SFUSD, SFCCD, and San Francisco Trial Courts) as of the five most recent actuarial valuation dates, July 1, 2019 through July 1, 2023. The number of retirees supported by each active member can be an important indicator of growing plan maturity and sensitivity to investment returns, assumption changes, and other changes to the Retirement System. In particular, if the ratio of retirees to active members grows, it indicates that any actuarial losses on retiree liabilities or assets are likely to place a relatively greater burden on employers and active members. The ratio for SFERS had been relatively stable but increased modestly in 2021 and again in 2022 with the two-year decline in number of active members. Although the City has been actively filling vacant positions, the ratio remains elevated above pre-pandemic levels.

TABLE A-21

San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System
July 1, 2019 through July 1, 2023

As of July 1st	Active Members	Vested Members	Reciprocal Members	Total Non-retired	Retirees & Continuants	Retiree to Active Ratio
2019	34,202	8,911	1,044	44,157	29,490	0.86
2020	34,521	9,478	1,071	45,070	30,128	0.87
2021	33,644	10,066	1,060	44,770	30,854	0.92
2022	33,199	11,066	1,019	45,284	31,719	0.96
2023	34,016	11,461	1,180	46,657	32,104	0.94

Sources: SFERS' annual Actuarial Valuation Report dated July 1st.
See the Retirement System's website, mysfers.org, under Publications. The information on such website is not incorporated herein by reference.

Notes: 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.

The Board adopted the current demographic assumptions at its December 9, 2020 Retirement Board meeting based on the experience study dated August 12, 2020. The current discount rate of 7.20% was adopted at the November 10, 2021 Board meeting, effective for the July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation. The Board voted to maintain these assumptions for the 2022 and 2023 actuarial valuations at its November 17, 2022 and November 8, 2023 meetings, respectively. In the long term, the true cost of a pension plan is determined by actual results and not by assumptions.

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 debt obligations should carefully review and assess the assumptions regarding the performance of the Retirement System. Audited financial statements and actuarial reports may be found on the Retirement System's website, www.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 debt obligations 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.

Annual Valuation and Employer Contribution History

Table A-22 shows total Retirement System liabilities, assets and percent funded for the last five actuarial valuations as well as total contributions for the last five fiscal years ending June 30, 2023. Information is shown for all employers in the Retirement System (City & County, 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" refers to 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 sum of mandated employee and employer contributions received by the Retirement System in the fiscal year ended June 30 prior to the July 1 valuation date.

TABLE A-22

San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System
July 1, 2019 through July 1, 2023
(Dollar amounts in 000s)

As of July 1st	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
2019	$ 28,798,581	$ 26,078,649	$ 25,247,549	90.6%	87.7%	$ 1,026,036	23.31%
2020	29,499,918	26,620,218	26,695,844	90.2%	90.5%	1,143,634	25.19%
2021	31,905,275	35,673,834	30,043,222	111.8%	94.2%	1,245,957	26.90%
2022	33,591,565	32,798,524	32,275,474	97.6%	96.1%	1,191,934	24.41%
2023	35,351,967	33,688,428	34,137,005	95.3%	96.6%	1,086,567	21.35%

[1] Employer contribution rates are shown prior to employer/employee cost-sharing provisions of 2011 Proposition C.
Employer contribution rates for fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25 are 18.24% and 16.91%, respectively.

Sources: SFERS' audited year-end financial statements and required supplemental information.
SFERS' annual Actuarial Valuation Report dated July 1st. See the Retirement System's website, mysfers.org, under Publications.
The information on such website is not incorporated herein by reference.
Note: Information above reflects entire Retirement System, not just the City and County of San Francisco.

Note that at the July 1, 2023 valuation date, the market percent funded ratio is slightly lower than the actuarial percent funded ratio, reflecting net asset returns lower than the long-term rate of return assumptions that have not yet been recognized in the smoothed actuarial value of assets. The Retirement System's investment portfolio return was -2.9% in fiscal year 2021-22, 4.3% in fiscal year 2022-23, and 7.9% in fiscal year 2023-24. Global markets remain volatile due to continued uncertainty about the economy, interest rates, inflation, and geopolitical risk.

The actuarial liability is measured by an 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. The most recent actuarial audit was completed in July 2023.

The fiscal year 2022-23 employer contribution rate was 21.35% (estimated to be 18.76% after cost-sharing). The 2022-23 fiscal year City employer contributions to the Retirement System were $638.0 million, which includes $404.8 million from the General Fund. The fiscal year 2023-24 employer contribution rate was 18.24% (estimated to be 16.12% after cost-sharing), with a total budget of $620.9 million, which includes $381.7 million from the General Fund. The fiscal year 2024-25 employer contribution rate is 16.91% (expected to be 15.27% after cost-sharing), with an estimated total budget of $671.4 million. The continued declines in the contribution rate reflect the completion of prior amortization layers and the five-year phase-in of investment gains from fiscal year 2020-21, offset by the impact of lower investment returns in fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23. Employer contribution rates anticipate annual increases in pensionable payroll of 3.25%. As discussed under "CITY BUDGET–Five-Year Financial Plan Update: FY2024-25 through FY2027-28 and Mayor's Budget Instructions ", increases in retirement costs are projected in the City's Five-Year Financial Plan.

Risks to City's Retirement Plan

In its July 2023 actuarial report, Cheiron identifies three primary risks to the Retirement System as required by Actuarial Standards of Practice No. 51 (Assessment and Disclosure of Risk Associated with Measuring Pension Obligations and Determining Pension Plan Contributions). The material risks identified were as follows: investment risk, interest rate risk, and supplemental cost of living adjustment ("COLA") risk. Investment risk is the potential for investment returns to be different than expected, while interest rate risk is the potential for longer-term trends to impact economic assumptions such as inflation and wage increases but particularly the discount rate. Supplemental COLA risk is the potential for the cost of future supplemental COLAs to increase contribution rates.

Supplemental COLAs are mandated by the Charter when investment returns exceed expectations. If the pension plan is less than fully funded on a market-value basis, certain groups of retirees may not receive a supplemental COLA at all or their supplemental COLA may be limited. Supplemental COLAs are capped at 3.5% less any basic COLA. As the majority of retirees have annual basic COLAs capped at 2.0%, a supplemental COLA when granted typically represents a 1.5% increase in benefit.

Cheiron's July 2023 report provides stress testing of the supplemental COLA provision and shows that the current funding policy of amortizing new supplemental COLAs over five years manages the risk with contributions remaining very close to baseline and a relatively stable funded status.

Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") Disclosures

The Retirement System discloses accounting and financial reporting information under GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*. The City discloses accounting and financial information about the Retirement System under GASB Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*. In general, the City's funding of its pension obligations is not affected by the GASB 68 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 a municipal bond rate, to the extent that the fiduciary net position is unavailable to make payments. There have been no differences between the discount rate and assumed investment return since fiscal-year end 2015. 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 already been granted as of the valuation date.

Table A-23 below shows for the five most recent fiscal years 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-23

Employees' Retirement System
GASB 67/68 Disclosures
Fiscal Years 2018-2019 through 2022-2023
(Dollar amounts in 000s)

As of June 30th	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
2019	$ 30,555,289	7.40%	$ 26,078,649	85.3%	$ 4,476,640	$ 4,213,807
2020	32,031,018	7.40%	26,620,218	83.1%	5,410,800	5,107,271
2021	33,088,765	7.40%	35,673,834	107.8%	(2,585,069)	(2,446,563)
2022	35,489,639	7.20%	32,798,524	92.4%	2,691,115	2,552,997
2023	37,332,835	7.20%	33,688,428	90.2%	3,644,407	3,456,687

Sources: SFERS fiscal year-end GASB 67/68 Reports as of each June 30
Notes: Collective amounts include all employees (City and County, SFUSD, SFCCD, Trial Courts)

NPL can be quite volatile. The increase in NPL at fiscal year-end 2020 was due to lower-than-expected investment returns. The large decline at fiscal year-end 2021 is due to the 33.7% investment portfolio return during that year, while the increase at fiscal year-end 2022 is due to both the -2.9% return and the reduction in discount rate from 7.4% to 7.2%. NPL increased again at year-end 2023 due to asset returns

below the long-term assumed rate, the November 2022 Charter amendment that increased the June 30, 2023 TPL by $59 million, and differences between expected and actual demographic assumptions including salary increases.

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 assets, absolute return strategies (including hedge funds), and an array of alternative investments including private equity, venture capital limited partnerships, and private credit.

Annualized investment return (net of fees and expenses) for the Retirement System for the five years ending June 30, 2023 was 8.48%. For the ten-year and twenty-year periods ending June 30, 2023, annualized investment returns were 9.05% and 8.36% 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) 487-7000. These documents are not incorporated herein by reference.

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.

The most recent amendment, Proposition A, was approved by voters in November 2022. This amendment made certain retirees who commenced benefits before November 6, 1996 eligible for a supplemental COLA even if SFERS is not fully funded. For these retirees, in years when SFERS is not fully funded, the supplemental COLA would be limited to $200 per month for retirees who have an annual pension of more than $50,000.

Proposition C was approved by voters in November 2011 to reduce future pension costs and introduced new benefit tiers effective for employees hired on and after January 7, 2012.

In August 2012, then-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.

Impact on the Retirement System from Changes in the Economic Environment

As of June 30, 2023, the audited market value of Retirement System assets was $33.7 billion. As of August 31, 2024, the estimated value of SFERS' investment portfolio was $36.4 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 lower or higher. 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. Section A8.510 of the Charter requires the City to pay the full amount required by the actuarial valuations. The actual total employer contributions to CalPERS were $52.0 million in fiscal year 2021-22. In addition to the required amounts, the City elected to pay an additional amount of $8.4 million in fiscal years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-2020; $5.0 million in fiscal year 2021-22; and $16.7 million in fiscal year 2022-23 in order to reduce its unfunded liability. A discussion of other post-employment benefits, including retiree medical benefits, is provided below under "Medical Benefits – Post-Employment Health Care Benefits" and "GASB 75 Reporting Requirements."

Medical Benefits

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

Medical and COBRA 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 SFHSS also administers medical benefits to active and retired employees of SFUSD, SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court; however, the City is only required to fund medical benefits for City Beneficiaries.

The San Francisco Health Service System is overseen by the City's Health Service Board (the "Health Service Board"). The plans (the "SFHSS Medical Plans") for providing medical care to the City 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 System Trust Fund") established pursuant to Charter Sections 12.203 and A8.428 through which medical benefits for the City Beneficiaries are funded. The San Francisco Health Service System issues an annual, publicly available, independently audited financial report that includes financial statements for the Health Service System Trust Fund. This report may be obtained through the SFHSS website at sfhss.org, by writing to the San Francisco Health Service System, 1145 Market Street, Third Floor, San Francisco, California 94103. Audited annual financial statements for prior years are posted to the SFHSS website, however the information available on the SFHSS website is not incorporated in this Official Statement by reference.

Under the City Charter, the Health Service System Trust Fund is not a fund through which assets are accumulated to finance post-employment healthcare benefits (an "OPEB Trust Fund"). Thus, GASB Statement Number 45, *Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefit Plans Other Than Pensions* ("GASB 45") and GASB Statement Number 75, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefits Other than Pensions* ("GASB 75"), which apply to OPEB Trust Funds, do not apply to the San Francisco Health Service System Trust Fund. However, the City has been funding post-employment healthcare benefits ("OPEB") in a separate fund, the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund ("RHCTF") for the purpose of prefunding future OPEB payments as described below.

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 an annual survey of the amount of premium contributions provided by the ten most populous counties in California (other than the City) for health care. The survey is commonly called the 10-County Average Survey and is 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." The "average contribution" is used to calculate the City's required contribution to the Health Service System Trust Fund for retirees.

Unions representing the majority of City employees negotiate through collective bargaining rather than applying the "average contribution" to determine the amount the City is required to contribute for active employees. 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. 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.*"

City Contribution for Retirees

The City contributes the full employer contribution amount for medical coverage for eligible retirees who were hired on or before January 9, 2009 pursuant to Charter Section A8.428. For retirees who were hired on or after January 10, 2009, the City contributes a portion of the medical coverage costs based on five coverage / employer contribution classifications that reflect certain criteria outlined in the Table below.

Retiree Medical Coverage / Employer Contribution for Those Hired On or After January 10, 2009	
Years of Credited Service at Retirement	Percentage of Employer Contribution Established in Charter Section A8.428 Subsection (b)(3)
Less than 5 years of Credited Service with the Employers (except for the surviving spouses or surviving domestic partners of active employees who died in the line of duty)	No Retiree Medical Benefits Coverage
At least 5 but less than 10 years of Credited Service with the Employers; or greater than 10 years of Credited Service with the Employers but not eligible to receive benefits under Subsections (a)(4), (b)(5) **(A8.428 Subsection (b)(6))**	0% - Access to Retiree Medical Benefits Coverage. Including Access to Dependent Coverage
At least 10 but less than 15 years of Credited Service with the Employers **(AB.428 Subsection (b)(5))**	50%
At least 15 but less than 20 years pf Credited Service with the Employers **(AB.428 Subsection (b)(5))**	75%
At least 20 years of Credited Service with the Employer; Retired Persons who retired for disability; surviving spouses or surviving domestic partners of active employees who died in the line of duty **(AB.428 Subsection (b)(4))**	100%

Health Care Reform

The following discussion is based on the current status of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (the "ACA"). Many attempts have been made to completely repeal the ACA; however full repeal has been unsuccessful thus far.

Three ACA taxes and one fee have impacted SFHSS rates for medical coverage. The three ACA taxes were repealed in 2020 and 2021; however, Congress revived and extended the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute ("PCORI") Fee, which had expired in 2019. The PCORI fee, adopted in the ACA, is paid by issuers of health insurance policies and plan sponsors of self-insured health plans to help fund the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute. The fee is based on the average number of lives covered under the policy or plan. The fee applies to policy or plan years ending on or after October 1, 2012, and before October 1, 2029.

Employer Contributions for San Francisco Health Service System Benefits

For fiscal year 2022-23, based on the most recent audited financial statements, the San Francisco Health Service System received approximately $874 million from participating employers for San Francisco Health Service System benefit costs. Of this total, the City contributed approximately $738 million; approximately $215 million of this $738 million amount was for health care benefits for approximately 24,269 retired City employees and their eligible dependents, and approximately $523 million was for benefits for

approximately 32,023 active City employees and their eligible dependents.

The 2023 aggregate (employee and employer) cost of medical benefits offered by SFHSS to the City increased by 2.9%. The increase is favorable compared to benchmarks due to several factors including contracting by SFHSS that maintains competition among the health plans, implementing value-based models such as Accountable Care Organizations, use of generic prescription, and implementing flex-funded plans using narrow networks. Flex-funding eliminates the typical margins added by health plans; however, more risk is assumed by the city, and reserves are required to protect against this risk.

Post-Employment Health Care Benefits

The eligibility of former City employees for retiree health care benefits ("OPEB Benefits") and City and employee contributions to the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund ("RHCTF") are governed by the Charter (Section A8.432(a-b)). San Francisco voters have passed three different propositions to set these eligibility and contribution requirements: Proposition B passed on June 3, 2008; Proposition C passed on November 8, 2011; and Proposition A passed on November 5, 2013.

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. OPEB Benefit coverage and the City's required contributions for employees hired on or after January 10, 2009, is described above under "Medical Benefits: City Contribution for Retirees". Unlike employee pension contributions that are made to individual accounts, contributions to the RHCTF are non-refundable, even if an employee separates from the City and does not receive OPEB Benefits from the City.

Employee and City contributions to the RHCTF are a fixed percentage of pay that varies depending on the employee's hire date, the year in which the payment is made, and whether the RHCTF is fully funded. Employees hired before January 10, 2009, are required to make contributions equal to 1% of their salary to the RHCTF and employees hired on or after January 10, 2009, are required to make contributions equal to 2% of their salary. The City pays all OPEB Benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis each year and is required to contribute an amount equal to 1% of total pay to the RHCTF.
The City may not make disbursements from the RHCTF until it is fully funded, subject to the following exception. If the sum of the City's annual RHCTF contributions and OPEB Benefit payments (together, the "OPEB Cost") is projected to exceed 10% of payroll, the RHCTF Board may authorize stabilization disbursements from the RHCTF to the extent necessary to reduce the City's OPEB Cost to 10% of payroll provided that such stabilization disbursement does not exceed 10% of the balance in the RHCTF as of the prior year. The City has never had to make a disbursement from the RHCTF, and OPEB Cost as a percentage of payroll for fiscal year 2022-23 was 6.2%.

GASB 75 Reporting Requirements

In June 2015, GASB issued GASB 75. GASB 75 revises and establishes new accounting and financial reporting requirements for governments that provide their employees with OPEBs. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 2017. The City implemented the provisions of GASB 75 in its audited financial statements for fiscal year 2017-18. According to GASB's Summary of GASB 75, GASB 75 requires recognition of the entire OPEB liability, a more comprehensive measure of OPEB expense, and new note disclosures and required supplementary information to enhance decision-usefulness and accountability.

City's Estimated Liability

The City is required by GASB 75 to prepare a new actuarial study of its OPEB Benefits obligation at least once every two years. As of the measurement date of June 30, 2022 (issued December 2023), used in the most recent actuarial valuation report dated June 30, 2022, the retiree health care fiduciary plan net position as a percentage of the total OPEB liability was 16.5%. This reflects the net position of the RHCTF in the amount of $739.9 million divided by the total OPEB liability of $4.5 billion. The estimated covered payroll (annual payroll of active employees covered by the plan) was $4.18 billion, and the ratio of the Net OPEB liability to the covered payroll was 89.5%.

Under GASB 75, the annual OPEB Expense can be calculated as the change in the City's Net OPEB liability plus the changes in deferred outflows and inflows plus employee contributions. As stated above, employee and City contributions to the RHCTF are set by the Charter and are not actuarially determined. The annual OPEB Expense is included in the five-year trend information displayed in Table A-24 below purely for informational purposes.

TABLE A-24

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Post-Employment Health Care Benefits
Fiscal Years 2018-19 to 2022-23
(000s)

Fiscal Year	(A) Paygo Benefit Payments	(B) Trust Contributions	(A + B = C) Annual OPEB Cost	(D) Annual OPEB Expense	(C / D = E) Annual OPEB Cost as % of Annual OPEB Expense	Plan Fiduciary Net Position	Plan Fiduciary Net Position as % of TOL	Net OPEB Liability
2018-19	$185,839	$32,786	$218,625	$320,331	68.2%	$255,964	6.6%	$3,600,967
2019-20	196,445	39,518	235,963	330,673	71.4%	366,602	8.6%	3,915,815
2020-21	206,439	39,555	245,994	320,684	76.7%	488,989	11.3%	3,823,335
2021-22	211,025	41,841	252,866	272,001	93.0%	718,777	16.3%	3,691,121
2022-23	215,408	45,241	260,649	256,974	101.4%	739,880	16.5%	3,746,270

Source: Postretirement Health Plan GASB 74/75 Reports produced by Cheiron in November 2019, December 2021, and December 2023

Total City Employee Benefits Costs

Table A-25 provides historical and budget information for all health benefits costs paid including pension, health, dental and other miscellaneous benefits. Historically, approximately 50% of health benefit costs are paid from the General Fund. For all fiscal years shown, a "pay-as-you-go" approach was used by the City for health care benefits.

Table A-25 below provides a summary of the City's employee benefit actual costs for fiscal years 2018-19 through 2022-23 and budgeted costs for 2023-24.

TABLE A-25

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Employee Benefit Costs, All Funds
Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2023-24
(000s)

	2018-19 Actual[1]	2019-20 Actual[1]	2020-21 Actual[1]	2021-22 Actual[1]	2022-23 Actual[1]	2023-24 Budget[1]
SFERS and PERS Retirement Contributions	$650,011	$759,933	$823,317	$771,705	$755,995	$685,222
Social Security & Medicare	$219,176	$231,557	$229,044	$241,735	$260,233	$289,837
Health - Medical + Dental, active employees [2]	$522,006	$555,780	$564,453	$570,262	$583,588	$644,225
Health - Retiree Medical [2]	$186,677	$196,641	$216,916	$222,556	$215,885	$239,051
Other Benefits [3]	$26,452	$28,493	$24,111	$20,766	$19,149	$76,761
Total Benefit Costs	$1,604,322	$1,772,403	$1,857,841	$1,827,024	$1,834,849	$1,935,097

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2018-19 through fiscal year 2022-23 are actuals. Figures for fiscal year 2023-24 are from the Final Budget, July 25, 2023.
[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 (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, which is established by the Board of Supervisors. The Committee consists of the following members, who are nominated by the Treasurer and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors:

- Seat 1 is held by the Controller or the Controller's designee.
- Seat 2 is held by the County Superintendent of Schools or the Superintendent's designee.
- Seat 3 is held by the Chancellor of the Community College District or the Chancellor's designee.
- Seats 4 and 5 are held by employees of City departments or local agencies that participate in the

City's pooled fund. These are currently held by the San Francisco International Airport and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

- Seats 6 and 7 are held by members of the public who have expertise in, or an academic background in public finance

A complete copy of the Treasurer's Investment Policy, dated September 2023, is included as an Appendix to this Official Statement.

Investment Portfolio

As of August 31, 2024, the City's surplus investment fund consisted of the investments classified in Table A-26 and had the investment maturity distribution presented in Table A-27.

TABLE A-26

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Portfolio
Pooled Funds
As of August 31, 2024

Type of Investment	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	$3,780,000,000	$3,761,387,083	$3,677,706,186
Federal Agencies	7,065,637,000	7,060,107,563	7,023,799,140
Public Time Deposits	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	1,487,000,000	1,487,000,000	1,488,604,190
Commercial Paper	1,317,000,000	1,295,395,346	1,296,020,807
Medium Term Notes	34,461,000	33,929,826	34,313,365
Money Market Funds	1,775,137,948	1,775,137,948	1,775,137,948
Supranationals	465,037,000	464,283,433	460,978,811
Secured Bank Deposit	101,100,091	101,100,091	101,100,091
Total	$16,055,373,039	$16,008,341,290	$15,887,660,538

August Earned Income Yield: 3.688%

Sources: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City and County of San Francisco
From Citibank-Custodial Safekeeping, MaxQ Analytics.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-27

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Maturity Distribution
Pooled Funds
As of August 31, 2024

Maturity in Months			Par Value	Percentage
0	to	1	3,151,238,039	19.63%
1	to	2	950,000,000	5.92%
2	to	3	436,000,000	2.72%
3	to	4	788,000,000	4.91%
4	to	5	823,374,000	5.13%
5	to	6	592,407,000	3.69%
6	to	12	2,328,178,000	14.50%
12	to	24	3,021,475,000	18.82%
24	to	36	2,284,409,000	14.23%
36	to	48	848,655,000	5.29%
48	to	60	831,637,000	5.18%
			$16,055,373,039	100.00%

Weighted Average Maturity: 456 Days

Sources: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City and County of San Francisco
From Citibank-Custodial Safekeeping, MaxQ Analytics

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.

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 10-year capital expenditure plan for City-owned facilities and infrastructure. It also created the Capital Planning Committee (the "CPC") and the Capital Planning Program ("CPP"). The CPC makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on the City's capital expenditures and plans. The CPC reviews and submits the Capital Plan, Capital Budget, and issuances of long-term debt for approval. The CPC is chaired by the City Administrator and includes the President of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor's Budget Director, the Controller, the City Planning Director, the Director of Public Works, the Airport Director, the Executive Director of the MTA, the General Manager of the SFPUC, the General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department, and the Executive Director of the Port. To help inform CPC recommendations, the CPC 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 10-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 and other funding needs over 10 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 years 2024-2033 Capital Plan (the "Adopted Capital Plan") was approved by the CPC on February 27, 2023, and was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 9, 2023. The Adopted Capital Plan contains $41.4 billion in capital investments over the coming decade for all City departments, including $5.8 billion in projects for General Fund-supported departments. The Adopted Capital Plan proposes $2.2 billion for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects through fiscal year 2032-33. Major capital projects for General Fund-supported departments included in the Capital Plan consist of critical seismic projects, and relocation of staff from seismically vulnerable facilities; upgrades to public health, police, and fire facilities; transportation and utility system improvements; street and right-of-way improvements; the removal of barriers to accessibility; and park improvements, among other capital projects. $2.7 billion of the capital projects of General Fund supported departments are expected to be financed with general obligation bonds and other long-term obligations, subject to planning policy constraints. 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 Adopted Capital Plan recommends over $19.0 billion in enterprise fund department projects to continue major transit, economic development and public utility projects such as MTA facilities, seawall strengthening, terminal 1 and 3 upgrades at San Francisco International Airport, water, sewer, and power enterprise improvements, and building adequate facilities to support the City's growing transit fleet, among others. Approximately $8.3 billion of enterprise fund department capital projects are anticipated to be financed with revenue bonds. The balance is expected to be funded by general obligation bonds, 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 $6.7 billion in capital needs including enhancements are deferred from the plan's horizon.

Failure to make the capital improvements and repairs recommended in the City's Adopted 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 – City General Obligation Bonds

Under the State Constitution and the Charter, City bonds secured by *ad valorem* property taxes ("general obligation bonds" or "GO bonds") can only be authorized with a two-thirds approval of the voters. As of October 15, 2024, the City had approximately $2.2 billion aggregate principal amount of GO bonds outstanding. In addition to the City's general obligation bonds, BART, SFUSD and SFCCD also have outstanding general obligation bonds as shown in Table A-33.

Table A-28 shows the annual amount of debt service payable on the City's outstanding GO bonds.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-28

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds Debt Service
As of October 15, 2024 [1] [2]

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Debt Service
2024-25	156,061,476	94,821,899	250,883,375
2025-26	160,466,279	86,699,562	247,165,841
2026-27	155,115,840	79,384,534	234,500,374
2027-28	159,544,035	72,290,137	231,834,172
2028-29	167,841,751	64,989,710	232,831,461
2029-30	176,075,095	57,181,381	233,256,475
2030-31	144,076,950	49,031,589	193,108,539
2031-32	150,005,000	42,795,765	192,800,765
2032-33	119,490,000	36,482,707	155,972,707
2033-34	102,195,000	31,599,847	133,794,847
2034-35	96,675,000	27,570,657	124,245,657
2035-36	62,450,000	23,836,143	86,286,143
2036-37	52,250,000	21,551,763	73,801,763
2037-38	54,075,000	19,722,911	73,797,911
2038-39	48,340,000	17,815,652	66,155,652
2039-40	48,355,000	16,131,920	64,486,920
2040-41	43,040,000	14,422,231	57,462,231
2041-42	44,675,000	12,790,188	57,465,188
2042-43	46,380,000	11,078,137	57,458,137
2043-44	48,165,000	9,296,299	57,461,299
2044-45	50,020,000	7,438,235	57,458,235
2045-46	46,575,000	5,506,630	52,081,630
2046-47	13,465,000	3,713,546	17,178,546
2047-48	14,040,000	3,137,495	17,177,495
2048-49	5,345,000	2,535,881	7,880,881
2049-50	5,530,000	2,354,712	7,884,712
2050-51	5,725,000	2,159,925	7,884,925
2051-52	5,935,000	1,950,338	7,885,338
2052-53	6,155,000	1,732,790	7,887,790
2053-54	6,380,000	1,506,973	7,886,973
2054-55	6,610,000	1,272,671	7,882,671
2055-56	6,855,000	1,029,667	7,884,667
2056-57	7,110,000	777,438	7,887,438
2057-58	7,370,000	515,551	7,885,551
2058-59	3,895,000	243,790	4,138,790
2059-60	4,010,000	123,668	4,133,668
TOTAL	**$2,230,296,426**	**$825,492,341**	**$3,055,788,767**

[1] This table only includes the City's General Obligation Bonds and does not include any of the overlapping debt as shown in Table A-33.

[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 assessed value.

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

Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds

Certain GO 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 ("1992 Proposition A") which authorized the issuance of up to $350.0 million in GO bonds to support San Francisco's Seismic Safety Loan Program ("SSLP"), which provides loans for the seismic strengthening of privately-owned unreinforced masonry affordable housing, market-rate residential, commercial and institutional buildings. Between 1994 and 2015, the City issued $89.3 million of bonds under the original 1992 Proposition A authorization. In November 2016, voters approved Proposition C ("2016 Proposition C"), which amended the 1992 Proposition A authorization (together, the "1992A/2016A Propositions") to broaden the scope of the remaining $260.7 million authorization by adding the eligibility to finance the acquisition, improvement, and rehabilitation to convert at-risk multi-unit residential buildings to affordable housing, as well as the needed seismic, fire, health, and safety upgrades and other major rehabilitation for habitability, and related costs. In 2019 and 2020, the City issued $175.0 million of bonds across two series under the 1992A/2016A Propositions. Currently $85.7 million remains authorized and unissued.

In November 2018, voters approved Proposition A ("2018 Embarcadero Seawall Improvement Proposition"), authorizing the issuance of up to $425.0 million in general obligation bonds for repair and improvement projects along the City's Embarcadero and Seawall to protect the waterfront, BART and Muni, buildings, historic piers, and roads from earthquakes, flooding, and sea level rise. In 2020 and 2023, the City issued the first two series of bonds in the principal amount of $88.7 million, leaving $336.3 million authorized and unissued.

In November 2019, voters approved Proposition A ("2019 Affordable Housing Proposition"), which authorized the issuance of up to $600.0 million in general obligation bonds to finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of affordable housing for certain vulnerable San Francisco residents; to assist in the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of existing affordable housing to prevent the displacement of residents; to repair and reconstruct distressed and dilapidated public housing developments and their underlying infrastructure; to assist the City's middle-income residents or workers in obtaining affordable rental or home ownership opportunities including down payment assistance and support for new construction of affordable housing for SFUSD and City College of San Francisco employees; and to pay related costs. In 2021 and 2023, the City issued the first two series of bonds in the principal amount of $425.4 million, leaving $174.6 million authorized and unissued.

In March 2020, voters approved Proposition B ("2020 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Proposition") which authorized the issuance of up to $628.5 million in general obligation bonds to aid fire, earthquake and emergency response by improving, constructing, and/or replacing: deteriorating cisterns, pipes, tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for fires and disasters; neighborhood fire and police stations and supporting facilities; the City's 911 Call Center; and other disaster response and public safety facilities, and to pay related costs. In 2021, the City closed the first four series of bonds with a total principal amount of $167.8 million, leaving $460.7 million authorized and unissued.

In November 2020, voters approved Proposition A ("2020 Health and Recovery Bond"), which authorized the issuance of up to $487.5 million in general obligation bonds to fund permanent investments in transitional supportive housing facilities, shelters, and/or facilities that serve individuals experiencing homelessness, mental health challenges, or substance use; improve the safety and quality of parks; and

improve the safety and condition of streets and other public rights of way. In 2021 and 2023, the City issued the first three series of bonds in an aggregate principal amount of $287.3 million, leaving approximately $200.2 million authorized and unissued.

In March 2024, voters approved Proposition A ("2024 Affordable Housing Proposition"), which authorized the issuance of up to $300.0 million in general obligation bonds to construct, develop, acquire, and/or rehabilitate housing, including workforce housing and senior housing, that will be affordable to households ranging from extremely low-income to moderate-income households. No series have yet been issued under the 2024 Affordable Housing Proposition authorization.

Refunding General Obligation Bonds

The Board of Supervisors has adopted and the Mayor has approved three different resolutions (the "Refunding Resolutions") authorizing the issuance of approximately $3.8 billion in aggregate of general obligation refunding bonds in one or more series. Resolution No. 272-04 (approved in May 2004) authorized the issuance of $800.0 million to refund all or a portion of the City's outstanding General Obligation Bonds. Resolution No. 448-11 (approved in November 2011) authorized the issuance of approximately $1.5 billion for the purpose of refunding certain outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City. Resolution No. 097-20 (approved in March 2020) authorized the issuance of approximately $1.5 billion for the purpose of refunding certain outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City. The refunding bonds outstanding as of October 15, 2024, under the Refunding Resolutions, are shown in Table A-29 below.

TABLE A-29

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Refunding Bonds
As of October 15, 2024

Series Name	Date Issued	Principal Amount Issued	Amount Outstanding
2020-R1	May 2020	$195,250,000	$140,415,000 [1]
2021-R1	May 2021	91,230,000	67,545,000 [2]
2021-R2	September 2021	86,905,000	25,205,000 [3]
2022-R1	May 2022	327,300,000	277,445,000 [4]
2024-R1	May 2024	340,615,000	340,615,000 [5]

1 Series 2008-R1 Bonds were refunded by the 2020-R1 Bonds in May 2020.

2 Series 2013A, 2013B, and 2013C Bonds were refunded by the 2021-R1 Bonds in May 2021.

3 Series 2011-R1 Bonds, which refunded the 2004-R1 Bonds, were refunded by the 2021-R2 Bonds in September 2021.

4 Series 2012D, 2012E, 2014A, 2014C, and 2014D Bonds were refunded by the 2022-R1 Bonds in May 2022.

5 Series 2015B, 2017A, 2018A, 2018B, 2018C, 2018E, and 2015-R1 Bonds--which refunded the 2006-R1, 2006-R2, and 2008-R3 Bonds, were refunded by the 2024-R1 Bonds in May 2024.

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

Table A-30 on the following page lists for each of the City's voter-authorized general obligation bond programs, the amounts 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 15, 2024, the City had authorized and unissued general obligation bond authority of approximately $1.6 billion.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-30

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds
As of October 15, 2024 [1] [2]

Bond Authorization Name	Election Date	Authorized Amount	Series	Bonds Issued	Bonds Outstanding	Authorized & Unissued
Seismic Safety Loan Program	11/3/92	$350,000,000	1994A	$35,000,000	$0	
			2007A	$30,315,450	$10,346,426	[2]
			2015A	$24,000,000	-	
Reauthorization to Repurpose for Affordable Housing	11/8/16		2019A	$72,420,000	$67,710,000	
			2020C	$102,580,000	$91,915,000	$85,684,550
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks	2/5/08	$185,000,000	2008B	$42,520,000	-	
			2010B	$24,785,000	-	
			2010D	$35,645,000	$21,090,000	
			2012B	$73,355,000	-	
			2016A	$8,695,000	$5,325,000	-
San Francisco General Hospital & Trauma Center	11/4/08	$887,400,000	2009A	$131,650,000	-	
Earthquake Safety			2010A	$120,890,000	-	
			2010C	$173,805,000	$102,840,000	
			2012D	$251,100,000	-	
			2014A	$209,955,000	-	-
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	6/8/10	$412,300,000	2010E	$79,520,000	-	
			2012A	$183,330,000	-	
			2012E	$38,265,000	-	
			2013B	$31,020,000	-	
			2014C	$54,950,000	-	
			2016C	$25,215,000	$15,995,000	-
Road Repaving & Street Safety	11/8/11	$248,000,000	2012C	$74,295,000	-	
			2013C	$129,560,000	-	
			2016E	$44,145,000	$28,005,000	-
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks	11/6/12	$195,000,000	2013A	$71,970,000	-	
			2016B	$43,220,000	$17,285,000	
			2018A	$76,710,000	-	
			2019B	$3,100,000	-	-
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	6/3/14	$400,000,000	2014D	$100,670,000	-	
			2016D	$109,595,000	$53,965,000	
			2018C	$189,735,000	-	-
Transportation and Road Improvement	11/4/14	$500,000,000	2015B	$67,005,000	-	
			2018B	$174,445,000	-	
			2020B	$135,765,000	$95,430,000	
			2021C-1	$104,785,000	$81,070,000	
			2021C-2	$18,000,000	-	-
Affordable Housing Bond	11/3/15	$310,000,000	2016F	$75,130,000	$36,230,000	
			2018D	$142,145,000	$81,420,000	
			2019C	$92,725,000	$20,680,000	-
Public Health and Safety Bond	6/7/16	$350,000,000	2017A	$173,120,000	-	
			2018E	$49,955,000	-	
			2020D-1	$111,925,000	$75,385,000	
			2020D-2	$15,000,000	-	-
Embarcadero Seawall Earthquake Safety	11/6/18	$425,000,000	2020A	$49,675,000	-	
			2023B	$39,020,000	-	$336,305,000
Affordable Housing Bond	11/5/19	$600,000,000	2021A	$254,585,000	$162,425,000	
			2023C	$170,780,000	$104,160,000	$174,635,000
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	3/3/20	$628,500,000	2021B-1	$69,215,000	$62,665,000	
			2021B-2	$11,500,000	-	
			2021E-1	$74,090,000	$57,975,000	
			2021E-2	$13,000,000	-	$460,695,000
Health and Recovery Bond	11/4/20	$487,500,000	2021D-1	$194,255,000	$160,130,000	
			2021D-2	$64,250,000	-	
			2023A	$28,785,000	$27,025,000	$200,210,000
Affordable Housing Bond	3/5/24	$300,000,000	-	-	-	$300,000,000
SUBTOTAL		$6,278,700,000		$4,721,170,450	$1,379,071,426	$1,557,529,550

General Obligation Refunding Bonds	Dated Issued	Bonds Issued	Bonds Outstanding
Series 2020-R1	5/7/20	$195,250,000	$140,415,000
Series 2021-R1	5/6/21	$91,230,000	$67,545,000
Series 2021-R2	9/16/21	$86,905,000	$25,205,000
Series 2022-R1	5/18/22	$327,300,000	$277,445,000
Series 2024-R1	5/22/24	$340,615,000	$340,615,000
SUBTOTAL		$1,041,300,000	$851,225,000

TOTALS	**$6,278,700,000**	**$5,762,470,450**	**$2,230,296,426**	**$1,557,529,550**

[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.

[2] Of the $35,000,000 authorized by the Board of Supervisors in February 2007, $30,315,450 has been drawn upon to date pursuant to the Credit Agreement described under "General Obligation Bonds ."

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

General Fund Lease 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 financings 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-31 sets forth the aggregate annual lease payment obligations supported by the City's General Fund with respect to outstanding long-term lease revenue bonds and certificates of participation as of October 15, 2024.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-31

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Debt Service on Lease Revenue Bonds and Certificates of Participation
As of October 15, 2024 [1] [2]

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest [3]	Annual Payment Obligation
2024-25[4]	79,118,037	66,580,814	145,698,852
2025-26	78,468,229	64,147,414	142,615,643
2026-27	79,118,731	60,202,410	139,321,142
2027-28	74,655,000	56,325,250	130,980,250
2028-29	78,180,000	52,599,220	130,779,220
2029-30	81,700,000	48,828,216	130,528,216
2030-31	75,220,000	45,209,989	120,429,989
2031-32	68,735,000	42,109,403	110,844,403
2032-33	70,285,000	39,246,804	109,531,804
2033-34	73,220,000	36,153,022	109,373,022
2034-35	66,975,000	33,138,934	100,113,934
2035-36	67,730,000	30,041,180	97,771,180
2036-37	68,430,000	26,878,545	95,308,545
2037-38	71,420,000	23,686,358	95,106,358
2038-39	74,560,000	20,347,590	94,907,590
2039-40	77,860,000	16,843,428	94,703,428
2040-41	81,315,000	13,165,237	94,480,237
2041-42	68,645,000	9,316,361	77,961,361
2042-43	34,365,000	6,398,656	40,763,656
2043-44	34,010,000	4,758,706	38,768,706
2044-45	20,115,000	3,573,000	23,688,000
2045-46	13,695,000	2,768,400	16,463,400
2046-47	14,245,000	2,220,600	16,465,600
2047-48	13,220,000	1,650,800	14,870,800
2048-49	13,750,000	1,122,000	14,872,000
2049-50	14,300,000	572,000	14,872,000
TOTAL [5]	**$1,493,334,998**	**$707,884,338**	**$2,201,219,336**

[1] Includes privately placed lease purchase financings and excludes the 833 Bryant lease and commercial paper.

[2] Actual payment dates are used to project outstanding payment obligations.

[3] Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

[4] Includes payments made to date in current fiscal year.

[5] 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 6.0%. These bonds are in variable rate mode.

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

Voter-Approved Lease Revenue Bonds

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 F, which authorizes the City to lease finance (without limitation as to maximum aggregate principal 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 additional bonds at this time.

In 1990, voters approved Proposition C ("1990 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. 1990 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 July 1, 2023, the total authorized and unissued amount for such financings was $100 million. There is no current plan to issue additional bonds at this time.

In 1994, voters approved Proposition B ("1994 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 1994 Proposition B lease revenue bonds, respectively, leaving $14.1 million in remaining authorization. There is no current plan to issue additional series of bonds under 1994 Proposition B.

In 2000, voters approved Proposition C ("2000 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"). 2000 Proposition C also authorized the issuance of lease revenue bonds or other forms of indebtedness payable from the Open Space Fund. In August 2018 the City issued refunding lease revenue bonds to refund Series 2006 and 2007 Open Space Fund lease revenue bonds.

In 2007, voters approved Proposition D, which amended the Charter and renewed the Library Preservation Fund. Proposition D continued the two and one-half cent per $100.0 in assessed valuation property tax set-aside and established a minimum level of City appropriations, moneys that are maintained in the Library Preservation Fund. Proposition D also authorized the issuance of revenue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness. In August 2018 the City issued refunding lease revenue bonds to refund Series 2009A Branch Library Improvement Project lease revenue bonds.

Table A-32 below lists the City's outstanding certificates of participation, lease purchase financings, and voter-authorized lease revenue bonds.

TABLE A-32

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Outstanding Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds[1]
As of October 15, 2024 [1] [2]

Issue Name	Final Maturity	Original Par	Outstanding Principal
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION			
Series 2009D - Taxable BABs (525 Golden Gate Avenue)	2041	129,550,000	124,975,000
Series 2013B - Non-AMT (Port Facilities Project)	2038	4,830,000	4,830,000
Series 2013C - AMT (Port Facilities Project)	2043	32,870,000	19,195,000
Series 2016A (War Memorial Veterans Building)	2032	16,125,000	8,775,000
Series 2017A - Taxable (Hope SF)	2047	28,320,000	23,935,000
Series 2017B (Moscone Convention Center Expansion Project)	2042	412,355,000	345,655,000
Series 2019A (49 South Van Ness Project)	2050	247,810,000	236,815,000
Refunding Series 2019-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2035	116,460,000	76,745,000
Refunding Series 2020-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2033	70,640,000	53,255,000
Series 2020 (Animal Care & Control Project)	2041	47,075,000	42,330,000
Series 2021A (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2041	76,020,000	70,730,000
Series 2023A - Taxable (Affordable Housing and Community Facilities Projects)	2043	103,410,000	100,670,000
Series 2023B (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2043	80,040,000	77,595,000
Refunding Series 2024-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2033	214,585,000	214,585,000
SUBTOTAL CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION		**$1,580,090,000**	**$1,400,090,000**
LEASE PURCHASE FINANCINGS			
2010 Lease Purchase Financing (SFGH Emergency Backup Generators)	2025	$22,549,489	$3,320,763
2016 Lease Purchase Financing (Public Safety Radio Replacement Project)	2026	34,184,136	9,089,235
SUBTOTAL LEASE PURCHASE FINANCINGS		**$56,733,625**	**$12,409,998**
FINANCE CORPORATION LEASE REVENUE BONDS			
Refunding Series 2008-1 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) - Variable	2030	$72,670,000	$21,500,000
Refunding Series 2008-2 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) - Variable	2030	72,670,000	$21,500,000
Refunding Series 2018A (Open Space Fund - Various Park Projects)	2029	34,950,000	16,115,000
Refunding Series 2018B (Branch Library Improvement Program)	2028	13,355,000	6,030,000
SUBTOTAL LEASE REVENUE BONDS		**$193,645,000**	**$65,145,000**
TOTAL		**$1,830,468,625**	**$1,477,644,998**

[1] Excludes commercial paper and California HFA Revenue Bonds (San Francisco Supportive Housing - 833 Bryant Apartments) ($26,485,000)

[2] Actual payment dates are used to project outstanding payment obligations.

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

Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Certificates of Participation

Certain issuances below have been authorized as supplements to a lease ("Master Lease"), which currently supports the City's outstanding Certificates of Participation ("COPs"), Series 2019-R1, Series 2020-R1, Series 2021A, Series 2023A, Series 2023B, and Series 2024-R1, by and between the City and a third-party trustee, currently U.S. Bank National Association. Properties leased pursuant to the Master Lease currently include the City-owned Laguna Honda Hospital campus located at 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard, San Francisco; the San Bruno Jail Complex located at 1 Moreland Drive, San Bruno; and One South Van Ness Property located at 1 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco.

Treasure Island Improvement Project: In October of 2013, the Board authorized, and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $13.5 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation to finance the cost of additions and improvements to the utility infrastructure at Treasure Island. At this time there is not an expected timeline for the issuance of these certificates.

Housing Trust Fund Project: In April 2016, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $95.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Affordable Housing Projects) authorized under the Master Lease to provide funds to assist in the development, acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing projects. The City has issued commercial paper to finance these projects and is paying down its commercial paper balance rather than issuing long-term certificates at this time.

Hall of Justice Relocation Projects: In October 2019, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $62.0 million principal amount of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Multiple Capital Projects) authorized under the Master Lease to finance or refinance tenant improvements involving the construction, acquisition, improvement, renovation, and retrofitting of City-owned properties as needed for the Hall of Justice Improvement Project enabling staff and offices to be consolidated in acquired City-owned properties. The City funded $4.6 million in project fund and related financing costs related to this authorization for the 444 Sixth Street acquisition as part of the Certificates of Participation, Series 2021A issuance. The City expects to issue the remainder of the long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25 or later.

HOPE SF Project: In December 2019, the Board authorized, and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $83.6 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease to finance or refinance certain capital improvements, including but not limited to certain properties generally known as Hunters View, Sunnydale, and Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments. The City anticipates issuing the first long-term COPs under this authorization in fiscal year 2024-25.

Department of Public Health Facilities Improvements: In November 2020, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $157.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance projects for the Department of Public Health ("DPH"), including but not limited to certain projects generally known as the Homeless Services Center, Laguna Honda Hospital Wings Reuse Project, AITC Immunization and Travel Clinic Relocation, and San Francisco General Hospital Chiller and Cooling Tower Replacement Project. The City anticipates issuing the long-term COPs as the Series 2024A COPs.

Critical Repairs and Recovery Stimulus (FY2022): In July 2021, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $67.5 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance and refinance certain capital improvements generally consisting of critical repairs, renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities and works utilized by various City departments and local economic stimulus projects. The City funded $31.9 million in project fund and related financing costs for this authorization as part of the Certificates of Participation Series 2023B issuance. The City expects to issue the remainder of the long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25 or later.

Critical Repairs, Recovery Stimulus and Street Repaving Projects (FY2023): In July 2022, the Board authorized and in August 2022 the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $140.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance and refinance certain capital improvements generally consisting of (a) street repaving and reconstruction, (b) critical repairs, including renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities and works utilized by various City departments and (c) local economic stimulus projects. The City funded $48.4 million in project fund and related financing costs for this authorization as part of the Certificates of Participation Series 2023B issuance. The City expects to issue the remainder of the long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25 or later.

Affordable Housing and Community Development Projects: In May 2023 the Board authorized and in June 2023 the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $146.8 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance and refinance certain capital improvement, affordable housing and community facility development projects. The City funded $102.0 million in project funds for this authorization as part of the Certificates of Participation, Series 2023A issuance. The City expects to issue the remainder of the long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25 or later.

Critical Repairs and Street Repaving Projects (FY2024): In September 2023 the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $77.2 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance and refinance certain capital improvements generally consisting of critical repairs, renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities, streets, and works utilized by various City departments. The City expects to issue its first series of long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25.

Critical Repairs and Street Repaving Projects (FY2025): In September 2024 the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $61.4 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation authorized under the Master Lease, to finance and refinance certain capital improvements generally consisting of critical repairs, renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities, streets, and works utilized by various City departments. The City expects to issue its first series of long-term COPs in fiscal year 2025-26.

Treasure Island Stage 2 Certificates of Participation. In May 2024, legislation amending the Development Agreement and Disposition and Development Agreement for the Treasure Island development project was approved by the Board of Supervisors. This amendment includes a proposal for the City to issue Certificates of Participation to fund $115 million in infrastructure improvements related to Stage 2 of the Treasure Island development project. If the COP authorizing legislation is approved, the City would expect to issue its first series of long-term COPs in fiscal year 2024-25.

Commercial Paper Program

In March 2009, the Board of Supervisors authorized and the Mayor approved 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 "Original CP Program"). In July of 2013, the Board of Supervisors authorized, and the Mayor approved an additional $100.0 million of Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation, Series 3 and 3-T and Series 4 and 4-T (the "Second CP Program" and together with the Original CP Program, the "City CP Program") that increased the total authorization of the City CP Program to $250.0 million.

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. Projects are eligible to access the CP Program once the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor have approved the project and the long-term, permanent financing for the project.

The Series 1 and 1-T and Series 2 and 2-T CP notes are secured by a $150 million revolving credit agreement with Wells Fargo, which expires in March 2026.

The Series 3 and 3-T and 4 and 4-T are secured by a $100 million revolving letter of credit issued by Bank of the West, which expires in April 2026.

As of October 1, 2024, the outstanding principal amount of CP Notes is $51.2 million. The interest rate for the $41.4 million outstanding tax-exempt CP Notes is 3.01%. The interest rate for the $9.8 million outstanding taxable CP Notes is 4.75%. The projects with Board of Supervisors authorized and unissued Certificates of Participation currently utilizing the CP Program includes HOPE SF, DPH Facilities Improvements, Critical Repairs & Recovery Stimulus, and Hall of Justice Relocation Project - Tenant Improvements. Additionally, there is a short-term financing for Police Vehicle acquisition utilizing the City's CP Program and is expected to be paid down over time. The following is a summary of the outstanding liability by project associated with the CP Notes outstanding.

Project	CP Notes Liability as of 10/1/2024
HOPE SF	$3,645,796
DPH Facilities Improvements	35,627,386
Critical Repairs & Recovery Stimulus	9,444,245
Police Vehicle Acquisition	1,780,852
HOJ Relocation – Tenant Improvements	716,721
TOTAL	**$51,215,000**

Overlapping Debt

Table A-33 shows bonded debt and long-term obligations as of October 15, 2024, sold in the public capital markets, except for those financings otherwise noted in the table, 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-33

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations
As of October 15, 2024

2024-25 Assessed Valuation (includes unitary utility valuation):	$351,900,093,338 [1]
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	
San Francisco City and County	$2,230,296,426
San Francisco Unified School District	932,935,000
San Francisco Community College District	642,020,000
TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	$3,805,251,426
LEASE OBLIGATIONS BONDS	
San Francisco City and County	$1,477,644,998
TOTAL LEASE OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	$1,477,644,998 [2]
TOTAL COMBINED DIRECT DEBT	$5,282,896,424
OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT	
Bay Area Rapid Transit District General Obligation Bond (33.728%)	$793,683,107
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 6	114,415,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 7	27,160,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2009-1, Improvement Areas 1 and 2	2,050,422
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 Transbay Transit Center	562,820,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 Treasure Island, Improvement Areas 1 and 2	99,140,000
San Francisco Special Tax District No. 2020-1 Mission Rock Facilities	150,825,000
City of San Francisco Assessment District No. 95-1	145,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2004-1 Seismic Safety Improvements	7,805,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2006-1 San Francisco Rincon Hill	4,275,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2006-2 San Francisco Mint Plaza	2,495,000
TOTAL OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT	$1,764,813,529
OVERLAPPING TAX INCREMENT DEBT:	
Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency	$745,206,913
Transbay Joint Powers Authority	222,965,000
TOTAL OVERLAPPING INCREMENT DEBT	$968,171,913
OVERLAPPING TAX INCREMENT REVENUE DEBT:	
San Francisco Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District No. 1	$37,420,000
TOTAL OVERLAPPING INCREMENT DEBT	$37,420,000
TOTAL DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING BONDED DEBT	$8,053,301,866 [3]
Ratios to 2024-25 Assessed Valuation ($351,900,093,338)	**Actual Ratio**
Direct General Obligation Bonded Debt ($3,805,251,426)	1.08% [4]
Combined Direct Debt ($5,282,896,424)	1.50%
Total Direct and Overlapping Bonded Debt	2.29%
Ratio to 2024-25 Redevelopment Incremental Valuation ($45,832,885,271)	
Total Overlapping Tax Increment Debt	2.11%

[1] Includes $578,762,800 homeowner's exemption for FY24-25.

[2] Excludes 833 Bryant lease.

[3] Excludes tax and revenue anticipation notes, enterprise revenue bonds and airport improvement corporation bonds, as well as the issue to be sold.

[4] 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. The City's general obligation debt as a percentage of FY24-25 AV is 0.63%.

Source: California Municipal Statistics Inc., City and County of San Francisco

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 were authorized and approved in accordance with all applicable constitutional limitations. A summary of the currently effective limitations is set forth below.

Article XIIIA of the California Constitution

Article XIIIA 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 XIIIA 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 XIIIA) 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 XIIIA 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 XIIIA 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 XIIIA.

Article XIIIB of the California Constitution

Article XIIIB was enacted by California voters as an initiative constitutional amendment in November 1979. Article XIIIB 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 XIIIB includes a requirement that if an entity's average revenues over two consecutive years exceed the amount permitted to be spent, the excess would have to be returned by revising tax or fee schedules over the following two years. With voter approval, the appropriations limit can be raised for up to four years.

Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution

Proposition 218, an initiative constitutional amendment, approved by the voters of the State in 1996, added Articles XIIIC and XIIID 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 XIIIC 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 XIIIC 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 XIIIC addresses the initiative power in matters of local taxes, assessments, fees, and charges. Pursuant to Article XIIIC, 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 XIIIC. No assurance can be given that the voters of the City will not approve initiatives that repeal, reduce, or prohibit the imposition or increase of local taxes, assessments, fees or charges. See "GENERAL FUND REVENUES — 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 XIIID contains several provisions making it generally more difficult for local agencies, such as the City, to levy and maintain "assessments" (as defined in Article XIIID) 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.

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 increases 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 "THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY" 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 of the State approved Proposition 26 ("Proposition 26"), revising certain provisions of Articles XIIIA and XIIIC 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 was repealed as of November 2011 absent the re-adoption by the requisite two-thirds vote.

Proposition 26 amends Article XIIIC 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 and parking violations; (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. See "LEGAL MATTERS AND RISK MANAGEMENT – Initiative Measure Qualified for November 2024 Ballot – Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act."

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 statue 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.

LEGAL MATTERS AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Pending Litigation

There are a number of lawsuits and claims routinely pending against the City. 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 its General Fund lease obligations or other debt obligations, nor have an adverse impact on City finances.

Ongoing Investigations

Public Works Investigation. In January 2020, the City's former Director of Public Works, Mohammad Nuru, was criminally charged with public corruption, including honest services wire fraud, and lying to Federal Bureau of Investigation ("**FBI**") agents. In February 2020, then-City Attorney Dennis Herrera and Controller Ben Rosenfield announced the initiation of a joint investigation stemming from the federal criminal charges against Mr. Nuru. The City Attorney's Office focused on holding public officials and City vendors accountable. The Controller undertook a public integrity review of contracts, purchase orders, and grants to the City.

Mr. Nuru resigned from employment with the City in January 2021. In January 2022, Mr. Nuru pled guilty to taking bribes from contractors, developers, and entities he regulated, including bribes from Walter Wong, a San Francisco construction company executive and permit expediting consultant, who ran or

controlled multiple entities doing business with the City. In August 2022, the district court judge sentenced Mr. Nuru to 84 months in prison.

Mr. Wong was criminally charged in June 2020 with conspiring with City officials and laundering money. As part of the criminal investigation into Mr. Nuru and Mr. Wong, the SFPUC received a federal, criminal, grand jury subpoena in June 2020 for the production of documents, communications, contracts and records, including the complete personnel file of the SFPUC's former General Manager, Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.

In November 2020, Mr. Kelly was charged in a criminal complaint with one count of honest services wire fraud. The complaint alleged that Mr. Kelly also engaged in a long-running bribery scheme and corrupt partnership with Mr. Wong. The complaint further alleged that as part of the scheme, Mr. Wong provided items of value to Mr. Kelly in exchange for official acts by Mr. Kelly that benefited or attempted to benefit Mr. Wong's business ventures. According to the criminal complaint against Mr. Kelly, Mr. Wong bribed Mr. Kelly with thousands of dollars in airfare, meals, jewelry, and travel expenses, as well as by making improvements to Mr. Kelly's home.

Mr. Wong pled guilty in July 2020 and continues to cooperate with the ongoing federal criminal investigation. Mr. Wong has not been sentenced. Mr. Wong settled civilly with the City in May 2021. As part of his civil settlement, he and his companies agreed to pay the City more than $300,000 in ethics fines and more than $1 million in restitution. The total restitution amount to the City includes $73,000 that he received through the SFPUC when Mr. Kelly was General Manager.

Mr. Kelly resigned from employment with the City, effective November 30, 2020. Michael Carlin, former-Deputy General Manager of the SFPUC, then served as the Acting General Manager of the SFPUC through October 31, 2021. Mr. Herrera began serving as General Manager of the SFPUC on November 1, 2021.

Since Mr. Nuru's arrest in January 2020, the Controller's Office, in consultation with the City Attorney, has issued 11 public integrity reviews, all of which can be found on the Controller's website. Ten of the 11 reports focus primarily on City departments other than the SFPUC. The Controller's Office's December 9, 2021, Public Integrity Audit looked specifically at the SFPUC's Social Impact Partnership Program and made seven recommendations to strengthen internal controls and oversight. The SFPUC concurred with all seven of those recommendations, and as of December 2022, five of the seven recommendations had been implemented and two were in progress.

In October 2021, a criminal grand jury returned an indictment against Mr. Kelly and Victor Makras, a San Francisco real estate broker and property developer. Mr. Makras formerly served on a number of City boards and commissions, including the Port Commission, Police Commission, Public Utilities Commission, and Retirement Board. In addition to the original charges against Mr. Kelly of conspiracy with Mr. Wong, the indictment added charges of bank fraud and bank fraud conspiracy related to a $1.3 million loan Mr. Kelly obtained from Quicken Loans.

Mr. Makras' case was severed from Mr. Kelly's, and in August 2022, a jury convicted Mr. Makras of bank fraud for his role in making false statements to a bank in support of the loan to Mr. Kelly. In December 2022, Mr. Makras was sentenced to three years of probation and fined $15,200. In July 2023, a jury convicted Mr. Kelly of wire fraud and bank fraud, and Mr. Kelly was sentenced to four years in prison and fined $10,000. The FBI investigation is ongoing, and the City can give no assurance when the FBI will complete its investigation.

Community Challenge Grant Program Investigation. On August 29, 2023, the San Francisco District Attorney charged Lanita Henriquez, who served as the director of the San Francisco Community Challenge Grant Program under the Office of the San Francisco City Administrator, and Rudolph Dwayne Jones, a former City official who occasionally served as a prime contractor and a subcontractor to the SFPUC, with counts of misappropriation of public monies, bribery, and financial conflict of interest in a government contract. It is alleged that Ms. Henriquez and Mr. Jones misappropriated public money between 2016 and 2020, that Mr. Jones wrote Ms. Henriquez multiple checks in 2017 and 2018 totaling $25,000, while Ms. Henriquez directed government grant contracts exceeding $1.4 million to entities controlled by Mr. Jones, in which entities Ms. Henriquez also had a financial stake, between 2016 and 2020.

The San Francisco District Attorney has not alleged any impropriety in connection with the sole grant program Ms. Henriquez administered for the SFPUC and the SFPUC has confirmed that there are no active direct contracts between the SFPUC and Mr. Jones or his affiliated entities. The SFPUC has, however, identified four subcontracts between Mr. Jones or his affiliated entities and other SFPUC prime contractors that were effective on the date that Mr. Jones was charged, and directed each of the four prime contractors retaining Mr. Jones and/or any entities affiliated with Mr. Jones, to terminate or cancel any subcontract, service order, or other contractual arrangement such parties.

The FBI investigation is ongoing, and the City can give no assurance when the FBI will complete its investigation. The San Francisco District Attorney's Office Public Integrity Task Force has also independently investigated certain of the matters described here, and the City can give no assurance when this task force will complete its investigation.

Recology Settlement. On March 4, 2021, the City Attorney announced an approximately $100 million settlement with Recology San Francisco ("Recology"), the contractor handling the City's waste and recycling collection. The settlement arose from overcharges that were uncovered as part of the continuing public integrity investigation tied to Mr. Nuru and others. As part of the Settlement, Recology was required to lower commercial and residential rates starting April 1, 2021 and make a $7 million settlement payment to the City under the California Unfair Competition Law and the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code. In addition, Recology will be enjoined for four years from making any gift to any City employee or any contribution to a nonprofit at the behest of a City employee. The comprehensive settlement agreement with Recology was approved by the Board of Supervisors. The bribery and corruption public integrity investigation related to the Nuru matter is ongoing.

On May 16, 2022, the Controller's Office released a public integrity assessment report on the review of rate-setting and rate reporting processes, and profits earned by Recology that were over and above allowed profit margins. The report found that Recology netted profits of $23.4 million over and above the allowed profit margin set in the 2017 Rate Application. Even after taking into account the 2021, $101 million settlement in restitution, penalties, and interest to ratepayers affected by the erroneous calculation of revenues in the rate application, Recology consistently exceeded their allowable operating profits.

On June 7, 2022, the voters of San Francisco passed Proposition F, a ballot measure that allows the City to oversee Recology more closely, including certain changes to the composition of the Refuse Rate Board. The changes are intended to provide more oversight with respect to monitoring rates to residential and commercial customers.

In addition to the ongoing joint investigation by the City Attorney's Office and the Controller's Office into City contracting policies and procedures, the City's Board of Supervisors has conducted a series of public hearings before its Government Audit and Oversight Committee to examine issues raised by the federal complaints. That committee also considered the Controller's periodic reports. The City can give no assurance regarding when the City's investigation will be completed or what the outcome will be. The criminal investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Attorney's office is ongoing.

Risk Retention Program

Citywide risk management is coordinated by the Risk Management Division of the City Administrator's Office. With certain exceptions, it is the general policy of the City to first evaluate self-insurance and not purchase commercial liability insurance for the risks of losses to which it is exposed. The City believes 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 decision to obtain commercial insurance depends on various factors. For property insurance, these factors include 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 limits. The majority of the City's commercial insurance coverage is purchased for enterprise fund departments and other similar revenue-generating departments (i.e. the Airport, MTA, SFPUC, 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. In recent years, the City has purchased Cyber Liability insurance for departments and certain enterprise fund departments providing critical City services and/or managing high volumes of confidential/personal data.

Through coordination between 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 ACFR. The appropriations are sized based on actuarially determined anticipated claim payments and the projected timing of disbursement.

The City is self-insured for the financial risk and liability to provide workers' compensation benefits to its employees. The administration of workers' compensation claims and disbursement of all benefit payments is managed by the Workers' Compensation Division of the City's Department of Human Resources and its contracted third-party claims administrator. Estimates of future workers' compensation costs are based on the following criteria: (i) the frequency and severity of historical claim filings; (ii) average claim losses by expense category; (iii) gross payroll and workforce composition; (iv) benefit cost inflation, including increases to the statewide average weekly wage, and medical cost growth; and (v)

regulatory developments that impact benefit cost and delivery. The Workers' Compensation Division determines and allocates workers' compensation costs to departments based upon actual claim benefit expenditures and an allocated share of overhead expenses for self-insurance administration. The City continues to develop and implement programs to lower or mitigate workers' compensation costs.