

File No. 130424

Committee Item No. 20

Board Item No. 39

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Committee

Date: 07/24/2013

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: July 30, 2013

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Victor Young

Date July 19, 2013

Completed by: Victor Young

Date 7/25/13

1 [Approval of Official Statement for Certificates of Participation - Port Facilities Project]

2
3 **Resolution providing for the sale of certificates of participation (Certificates)**
4 **evidencing undivided, proportionate interests in the right to receive certain rental**
5 **payments to be made by the City under a Project Lease to finance capital projects at**
6 **the Port of San Francisco; providing for the sale of the Certificates by competitive sale;**
7 **approving the form and publication of an Official Notice of Sale and a Notice of**
8 **Intention to Sell the Certificates; approving the form of a Preliminary Official Statement**
9 **and the form and execution of an Official Statement relating to the sale of the**
10 **Certificates; approving the form of a Continuing Disclosure Certificate; granting**
11 **general authority to City officials to take necessary actions in connection with the**
12 **execution, sale and delivery of the Certificates; approving modifications to documents;**
13 **and ratifying previous actions taken in connection therewith.**

14
15 WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 152-12 (the "Authorizing Resolution") adopted by the
16 Board of Supervisors (the "Board of Supervisors") of the City and County of San Francisco
17 (the "City") on May 1, 2012 and signed by the Mayor of the City on May 8, 2012, it was
18 determined to authorize the execution and delivery of the Certificates in an amount not to
19 ~~exceed \$45,000,000 and, in connection therewith, the form of a Property Lease, a Project~~
20 ~~Lease and a Trust Agreement to be entered into by the City; and~~

21 WHEREAS, The Resolution authorized the execution and delivery of the Certificates to
22 partially finance the costs of various improvements to Port facilities, including: (i) Pier 27,
23 located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, which is planned to be used as a
24 cruise terminal and special events facilities, together with related and subordinate facilities (in
25 addition to a plaza/park at the front of the terminal), (ii) a shoreside power facility to be

1 installed at Pier 70, located along 20th Street, San Francisco 94117, including the removal of
2 seven PCB containing transformers, (iii) Piers 30 and 32, located along The Embarcadero,
3 San Francisco 94105, which facility is planned to be used as a team base for the 34th
4 America's Cup, a secondary cruise terminal and other vessel birth, public parking, and a
5 facility for special events, together with related and subordinate facilities, (iv) Pier 19, 23 and
6 29, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, including handrail, apron and
7 storm water improvements, and (v) various capital improvements to these and other Piers
8 located along The Embarcadero (collectively, the "Project"); and

9 WHEREAS, The Project is located wholly within the City; and

10 WHEREAS, The interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates may qualify for
11 tax exemption under Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the
12 "Code") only if the Certificates are approved in accordance with Section 147(f) of the Code;
13 and

14 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of the City (the "Board") is the elected legislative
15 body of the City and is one of the applicable elected representatives required to approve the
16 issue within the meaning of Section 147(f) of the Code; and

17 WHEREAS, On April 11, 2012 and April 15, 2013, the City caused notices to appear in
18 the San Francisco Chronicle, which is a newspaper of general circulation in the City, stating
19 ~~that a public hearing with respect to the issuance of the Certificates and the Project would be~~
20 held by the City's Office of Public Finance on April 25, 2012 and April 30, 2013, respectively;
21 and

22 WHEREAS, The Office of Public Finance held the respective public hearings described
23 above on April 25, 2012, and April 30, 2013, and an opportunity was provided for persons to
24 comment on the issuance of the Certificates and the plan of financing for the Project, and the
25

1 Office of Public Finance has forwarded to this Board any written comments received on or
2 prior to the date of such hearings; and

3 WHEREAS, That it is the purpose and intent of this Board that this Resolution
4 constitute approval of the issuance of the Certificates by the applicable elected representative
5 of the governmental unit having jurisdiction over the area in which the Project is located for
6 the purposes of and in accordance with Section 147(f) of the Code; and

7 WHEREAS, In connection with the execution and delivery of the Certificates, the City
8 will enter into a Property Lease and a Project Lease, each under such terms and conditions
9 as described in the Authorizing Resolution and herein; and

10 WHEREAS, In connection with the sale of the Certificates, the City will cause to be
11 prepared and distributed a Notice of Intention to Sell, a Notice of Sale, a Preliminary Official
12 Statement and an Official Statement relating to the Certificates and the form of such
13 documents are on file with the Clerk of this Board of Supervisors; and

14 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and
15 County of San Francisco, as follows:

16 Section 1. Recitals. All of the recitals herein are true and correct.

17 Section 2. Conditions Precedent. All conditions, things and acts required by law to
18 exist, to happen and to be performed precedent to and in the sale, execution and delivery of
19 ~~the Certificates exist, have happened and have been performed in due time, form and manner~~

20 in accordance with applicable law, and the City is authorized pursuant to its Charter and
21 applicable law to execute and deliver the Certificates and related documents in the manner
22 and form established in the Authorizing Resolution. The documents presented to this Board
23 and on file with the Clerk of the Board or her designee (the "Clerk") are contained in File No.
24 120380.

1 Section 3. Sale of the Certificates; Use of Proceeds. This Board hereby approves the
2 execution, delivery and sale of the Certificates in accordance with the terms of the Trust
3 Agreement referred to in Section 5 of the Authorizing Resolution, as the same is finally
4 executed and delivered. The proceeds of the Certificates shall be used to fund costs of the
5 Project and for other purposes described in the Authorizing Resolution, which purposes the
6 Board hereby determines include (i) reimbursing the City for payment of such costs of the
7 Project and (ii) repaying the principal amount of commercial paper issued by the City the
8 proceeds of which were used by the City to pay a portion of such costs, including the costs of
9 issuance, fees, accrued interest and other costs of the City related to the principal amount of
10 commercial paper so used.

11 The Director of Public Finance of the City or her designee (collective, the "Director of
12 Public Finance") is authorized to approve the terms of the Certificates, subject to the
13 parameters established in the Authorizing Resolution. The approval of the Certificates shall
14 also be approval by the applicable elected representative of the issuance of the Certificates
15 pursuant to Section 147(f) of the Code.

16 Section 4. Sale and Award of Certificates by Competitive Sale. The Director of Public
17 Finance, on behalf of the Controller, is hereby authorized and directed to receive bids for the
18 purchase of the Certificates, and the Controller is hereby authorized and directed to award the
19 Certificates to the bidder whose bid represents the lowest true interest cost to the City, all in
20 accordance with the procedures described in the Notice of Sale (as defined herein).

21 Section 5. Approval of Form of Official Notice of Sale. The form of an Official Notice of
22 Sale relating to the Certificates (the "Official Notice of Sale"), as presented to this Board, a
23 copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board, is hereby approved. The Director of Public
24 Finance is hereby authorized to approve the distribution of an Official Notice of Sale for the
25 Certificates, with such changes, additions modifications or deletions as the Director of Public

1 Finance may approve upon consultation with the City Attorney; such approval to be
2 conclusively evidenced by the distribution of the Official Notice of Sale to potential purchasers
3 of the Certificates.

4 Section 6. Approval of Notice of Intention to Sell relating to the Certificates. The form
5 of a notice of intention to sell relating to the Certificates (the "Notice of Intention to Sell"), as
6 presented to this Board, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board, is hereby
7 approved. The Director of Public Finance is hereby authorized to approve the publication of
8 the Notice of Intention to Sell relating to the Certificates, with such changes, additions,
9 modifications or deletions as the Director of Public Finance may approve upon consultation
10 with the City Attorney; such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the publication of the
11 Notice of Intention to Sell relating to the Certificates.

12 Section 7. Approval of the Official Statement in Preliminary and Final Form. The form
13 of an official statement relating to the Certificates (the "Official Statement"), as presented to
14 this Board, a copy of which is on file in preliminary form with the Clerk, is hereby approved.
15 The Director of Public Finance is hereby authorized to approve the distribution of the
16 preliminary Official Statement (the "Preliminary Official Statement") in substantially said form,
17 with such changes, additions, modifications or deletions as the Director of Public Finance may
18 approve upon consultation with the City Attorney; such approval to be conclusively evidenced
19 by the distribution of the Preliminary Official Statement to potential purchasers of the

20 Certificates. The Controller of the City or his designee (collectively, the "Controller") is hereby
21 authorized to cause the distribution of the Preliminary Official Statement, deemed final for
22 purposes of Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and to
23 sign a certificate to that effect. The Controller is hereby further authorized and directed to sign
24 the Official Statement in final form. The Co-Financial Advisors retained by the City in
25 connection with the Certificates are hereby authorized and directed to cause to be printed and

1 mailed, or distributed electronically, to prospective bidders copies of the Preliminary Official
2 Statement and the final Official Statement.

3 Section 8. Approval of the Form of Continuing Disclosure Certificate. The form of a
4 Continuing Disclosure Certificate of the City, as presented to this Board, a copy of which is on
5 file with the Clerk of the Board, is hereby approved. The Controller is hereby authorized to
6 execute the Continuing Disclosure Certificate, with such changes, additions, modifications or
7 deletions as the Controller may approve upon consultation with the City Attorney; such
8 approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery of the Continuing
9 Disclosure Certificate.

10 Section 9. General Authority. The Mayor, the City Attorney, the Controller, the City
11 Administrator, the Director of Public Finance, the Clerk of the Board and other officers of the
12 City and their duly authorized deputies and agents are hereby authorized and directed, jointly
13 and severally, to take such actions and to execute and deliver such certificates, agreements,
14 requests or other documents as they may deem necessary or desirable to facilitate the
15 execution and delivery of the Certificates and otherwise to carry out the provisions of this
16 Resolution.

17 Section 10. Ratification of Prior Actions. All actions heretofore taken by officials,
18 employees and agents of the City with respect to the sale and issuance of the Bonds are
19 hereby approved, confirmed and ratified.

20 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
21 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

22
23 By:

24 MARK D. BLAKE
25 Deputy City Attorney

n:\financ\as2013\1300182\00845428.doc

Mayor Lee,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

Nadia Sesay
Director
Office of Public Finance

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
FROM: Nadia Sesay, Director of Public Finance
SUBJECT: Resolution Approving the Form and Authorizing the Distribution of the Official Statement Among Other Matters in Connection with the Upcoming Sale of the City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Port Facilities Project)
DATE: May 7, 2013

Federal securities laws impose on the City the obligation to ensure that its offering documents are accurate and complete in all material respects. This obligation applies to the individual members of the governing bodies approving the disclosure documents as well as City staff charged with preparing the documents.

We are attaching the revised Official Statement for your approval prior to its publication. We would like to respectfully request consideration of the resolution at the May 15, 2013 Budget and Finance Committee meeting.

Background

In Resolution No. 152-12 (the "Resolution"), the Board of Supervisors (the "Board") approved the execution and delivery of certificates of participation (the "Certificates") to partially finance the costs of various improvements to Port facilities (collectively, the "Project"): (i) Pier 27, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, which is planned to be used as a cruise terminal and special events facilities, together with related and subordinate facilities (in addition to a plaza/park at the front of the terminal), (ii) a shoreside power facility to be installed at Pier 70, located along 20th Street, San Francisco 94117, including the removal of seven PCB containing transformers, (iii) Piers 30 and 32, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94105, which facility is planned to be used as a team base for the 34th America's Cup, a secondary cruise terminal and other vessel birth, public parking, and a facility for special events, together with related and subordinate facilities, (iv) Pier 19, 23 and 29, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, including handrail, apron and storm water improvements,

and (v) various capital improvements to these and other Piers located along The Embarcadero. The City anticipates issuing its Certificates to refund commercial paper in June 2013.

Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA): Before the Certificates may be issued on a tax-exempt basis, federal tax law requires that the governing body of the jurisdiction in which the Project is located approve the financing after providing the opportunity for a duly-noticed public hearing. To facilitate the tax exemption of interest on one or more series of the Certificates, the City is required to conduct a duly noticed public hearing and approve the financing. The Office of Public Finance originally held such hearing on Wednesday, April 25, 2012, notice of which was published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on April 11, 2012. In order to refresh the public hearing, the Office of Public Finance held a more recent hearing on April 30, 2013, notice of which was published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on April 15, 2013. No comments from the public were heard or received from the TEFRA public hearings.

Official Statement

The Board last approved the distribution of official statements and Appendix A on April 2, 2013 in adopting Resolutions No. 93-13 in connection with the issuance of the City's Certificates of Participation (Moscone Improvement Project) Series 2013A. The Resolution approves the form and authorizes the distribution of a preliminary official statement relating to the issuance of the Certificates and the form of Appendix A (the "Appendix A" and together with the preliminary and final official statement, the "Official Statement"). The information contained in the Appendix A was updated as of March 5, 2013 and was prepared by City staff for inclusion in the Official Statement.

Additional Information

For further explanation and discussion of the legal obligations of members of boards and commissions approving disclosure documents, please contact the City's Attorney's Office on this subject.

The Resolution is expected to be introduced at the Board of Supervisors meeting on Tuesday, May 7, 2013. The related financing documents—including the Notice of Intention to Sell, Official Notice of Sale, Official Statement and Continuing Disclosure Certificate, and related documents—will also be submitted.

~~*Official Notice of Sale and Notice of Intention to Sell:*~~ The Notice of Intention to Sell provides legal notice to prospective bidders of the City's intention to sell the Certificates. Such Notice of Intention to Sell will be published once in "The Bond Buyer" or another financial publication generally circulated throughout the State of California.

The Official Notice of Sale for the Certificates announces the date and time of the competitive bond sale, including the terms relating to the Certificates; the terms of sale, form of bids, and delivery of bids; and closing procedures and documents.

The Official Bid Form attached to the Official Notice of Sale is the form of the official bid for the purchase of the Certificates. Pursuant to the Resolution, the Controller is authorized to award

the Certificates to the bidder whose bid represents the lowest true interest cost to the City in accordance with the procedures described in the Official Notice of Sale.

Continuing Disclosure Certificate: The City covenants to provide certain financial information and operating data relating to the City (the "Annual Report") not later than 270 days after the end of the fiscal year and to provide notices of the occurrence of certain enumerated events.

The Continuing Disclosure Certificate describes the nature of the information to be contained in the Annual Report or the notices of enumerated events. These covenants have been made in order to assist initial purchasers of the Certificates in complying with the Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12(b)(5).

Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated. Please contact me at 554-5956 if you have any questions. Thank you.

Cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Elaine Forbes, Port Commission
Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Mark Blake, Deputy City Attorney

The City reserves the right to modify or amend this Official Notice of Sale in any respect; *provided*, that any such modification or amendment will be communicated to potential bidders through Parity not later than [1:00] p.m. (California time) on the business day preceding the date for receiving bids. Failure of any potential bidder to receive notice of any modification or amendment will not affect the sufficiency of any such notice or the legality of the sale. See "TERMS OF SALE—Right to Modify or Amend."

This Official Notice of Sale will be submitted to the Parity bid delivery system. In the event the summary of the terms of sale of the Certificates posted by Parity conflicts with this Official Notice of Sale in any respect, the terms of this Official Notice of Sale shall control, unless a notice of an amendment is given as described herein.

TERMS RELATING TO THE CERTIFICATES

IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING THE CERTIFICATES AND THE CITY IS PRESENTED IN THE PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT (THE "PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT") WHICH EACH BIDDER MUST REVIEW, AND WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE REVIEWED, PRIOR TO BIDDING FOR THE CERTIFICATES. THIS OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE GOVERNS ONLY THE TERMS OF SALE, BIDDING, AWARD AND CLOSING PROCEDURES FOR THE CERTIFICATES. THE DESCRIPTION OF THE CERTIFICATES CONTAINED IN THIS OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE IS QUALIFIED IN ALL RESPECTS BY THE DESCRIPTION CONTAINED IN THE PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

Interest Rates. The interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates shall be payable on ___ 1 and ___ 1 of each year, beginning on ___ 1, 201__ (each an "Interest Payment Date"). Interest shall be calculated on the basis of a 360-day year comprised of twelve 30-day months, from the date of delivery of the Certificates.

Bidders may specify any number of separate rates, and the same rate or rates may be repeated as often as desired, provided:

- (i) each interest rate specified in any bid must be a multiple of one-eighth or one-twentieth of one percent (___ or ___ of 1%) per annum;
- (ii) the maximum interest rate bid for any maturity shall not exceed ___ (___ %) per annum;
- (iii) no Certificate shall bear a zero rate of interest;
- (iv) each Certificate shall bear interest from its dated date to its stated maturity date at the single rate of interest specified in the bid; and
- (v) all Certificates maturing at any one time shall bear the same rate of interest.

Premium Bids; Discount Bids. Bids may include a net discount from or a net premium on the par value of the Certificates; provided that the following conditions are met:

- (i) the amount of total net discount (inclusive of original issue discount) with respect to the Certificates may not exceed ___ (___ %) of the aggregate principal amount of the Certificates; and
- (ii) the amount of total net premium with respect to the Certificates may not exceed ___ (___ %) of the aggregate principal amount of the Certificates.

Principal Payments. The Certificates shall be serial and/or term Certificates, as specified by each bidder and principal shall be payable on ____ 1 of each year, beginning on ____ 1, 201_ as shown below; provided that no term Certificate shall require sinking fund payments prior to ____ 1, 201_ . For any term certificates specified, the principal amount for a given year may be allocated only to a single term certificate and must be part of an uninterrupted annual sequence from the first sinking account installment prepayment to the term certificate maturity. Subject to adjustment as herein provided, the aggregate principal amount of the serial maturity or sinking account installment prepayment for the Certificates in each year is as follows:

Certificate Payment Date (____ 1)*	<u>Principal Amount*</u>
--	--------------------------

Total	\$[Amount]
-------	------------

* Preliminary, subject to change. Maturity schedule may be adjusted prior to pricing. Certificate Payment Dates for the Certificates are subject to the creation of term certificates by the bidder, as set forth in herein.

Adjustment of Principal Payments. The principal amounts, set forth in this Official Notice of Sale reflect certain estimates of the City with respect to the likely interest rates of the winning bid. **The City reserves the right to change the principal payment schedule set forth above after the determination of the winning bidder, by adjusting one or more of the principal payments of the Certificates in increments of \$5,000, in an aggregate amount not to exceed the greater of 10% of such principal amount or \$__000, as determined in the sole discretion of the City; provided however, that the Certificates will be executed and delivered in an aggregate par amount of not-to-exceed \$_____.** Any such adjustment of principal payments on the Certificates shall be based on the schedule of principal payments provided by the City to be used as the basis of bids for the Certificates. Any such adjustment will not change the average per Certificate dollar amount of underwriter's discount. In the event of any such adjustment, no rebidding or recalculation of the

bids submitted will be required or permitted and no successful bid may be withdrawn. THE BIDDER AWARDED THE CERTIFICATES BY THE CITY (THE "PURCHASER") WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO WITHDRAW ITS BID, CHANGE THE INTEREST RATES IN ITS BID OR THE REOFFERING PRICES IN ITS REOFFERING PRICE CERTIFICATE AS A RESULT OF ANY CHANGES MADE TO THE PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE CERTIFICATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE.

Prepayment. (a) Optional Prepayment. The principal component evidenced by the Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or after ____ 1, 201__, is subject to optional prepayment prior to the respective Certificate Payment Dates in whole or in part on any date on or after ____ 1, 201__, at the option of the City, in the event the City exercises its option under the Project Lease to prepay the principal component of the Base Rental payments at a prepayment price equal to 100% of the principal component to be prepaid, plus accrued interest to the date fixed for prepayment, without premium.

(b) Special Mandatory Prepayment. The principal component of the Base Rental payments evidenced by the Certificates is subject to special mandatory prepayment prior to the respective Certificate Payment Dates in whole or in part on any date, at the Prepayment Price (plus accrued interest to the prepayment date), without premium, from any amounts deposited in the Base Rental Fund pursuant to the Trust Agreement following an event of damage, destruction or condemnation of the Leased Property or any portion thereof or loss of the use or possession of the Leased Property or any portion thereof due to a title defect.

(c) Mandatory Sinking Account Installment Prepayment. The principal component of the Base Rental payments evidenced by the Certificates is further subject to prepayment prior to the respective stated Certificate Payment Dates on ____ 1 of each year for which a sinking account installment prepayment is specified by the bidder, by lot in the principal component to be prepaid plus accrued interest to the prepayment date, without premium, but only in amounts equal to, and in accordance with, the scheduled prepaid components of the Base Rental evidenced by the Certificates to be prepaid.

[Municipal Bond Insurance at Bidder's Option]. The City has provided information to [Name of Insurer] in order to pre-qualify the Certificates for municipal bond insurance. However, bids shall not be conditioned upon the issuance of any such policy or the ratings of such insurer upon delivery of the Certificates. The City makes no representation as to whether the Certificates will qualify for municipal bond insurance. Payment of any insurance premium and satisfaction of any conditions to the issuance of a municipal bond insurance policy and payment of any additional rating agency fees shall be the sole responsibility of the bidder. *In particular, the City will neither amend nor supplement the ordinance or agreements relating to the Certificates in any way, nor will it agree to enter into any additional agreements with respect to the provision of any such policy.* The Purchaser must provide the City with the municipal bond insurance commitment, including the amount of the policy premium, as well as information with respect to the municipal bond insurance policy and the insurance provider for inclusion in the final Official Statement within two (2) business days following the award of the Certificates by the City. The City will require a certificate from the insurance provider substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A on or prior to the date of delivery of the Certificates, as well as an opinion of counsel of the insurance provider regarding the enforceability of the municipal bond insurance policy and a tax certificate, each in form reasonably satisfactory to the City and Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation and Lofton & Jennings (collectively, "Co-Special Counsel"). **THE PURCHASER SHALL PAY ALL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ANY CITY DECISION TO AMEND, SUPPLEMENT, REPRINT AND/OR "STICKER" THE OFFICIAL STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CERTIFICATE INSURANCE. FAILURE OF THE INSURANCE PROVIDER TO ISSUE ITS POLICY OR ANY OTHER INFORMATION OR EVENTS OCCURRING OR BECOMING KNOWN RELATING TO SUCH INSURANCE PROVIDER OR THE POLICY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO A RATINGS DOWNGRADE, SHALL NOT CONSTITUTE CAUSE FOR A FAILURE**

OR REFUSAL BY THE PURCHASER TO ACCEPT DELIVERY OF OR PAY FOR THE CERTIFICATES.]

Legal Opinion and Tax Matters. Upon delivery of the Certificates, Co-Special Counsel, Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation and Lofton & Jennings, will deliver an approving opinion concerning interest with respect to the Certificates. See "TAX MATTERS" in the Preliminary Official Statement. A complete copy of the proposed form of opinion of Co-Special Counsel is set forth in Appendix __ to the Preliminary Official Statement. See "TAX MATTERS" in the Preliminary Official Statement.

Tax-Exempt Status: In the opinion of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, and Lofton & Jennings, San Francisco, California, Co-Special Counsel, based upon an analysis of existing statutes, regulations, rulings and court decisions, and assuming, among other matters, compliance with certain covenants, interest evidenced by the Certificates is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes under Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and is exempt from State of California personal income taxes. [Interest evidenced by the Certificates is not a specific preference item for purposes of federal individual and corporate alternative minimum taxes, although Co-Special Counsel observes that interest evidenced by the Certificates is included in adjusted current earnings in calculating federal corporate alternative minimum taxable income.] Co-Special Counsel express no opinion regarding other tax consequences relating to the ownership or disposition of, or the accrual or receipt of interest evidenced by, the Certificates. See "TAX MATTERS" in the Preliminary Official Statement.

In the event that prior to the delivery of the Certificates the income received by any private holder from obligations of the same type and character as the Certificates shall be declared to be taxable (either at the time of such declaration or at any future date) under any federal income tax law, either by the terms of such law or by ruling of a federal income tax authority or official which is followed by the Internal Revenue Service, or by decision of any federal court, the successful bidder may, at its option, prior to the tender of the Certificates by the Corporation, be relieved of its obligation to purchase the Certificates and in such case the Good Faith Deposit accompanying its bid will be returned. For purposes of the preceding sentence, interest will be treated as excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes whether or not it is includable as an item of tax preference for calculating alternative minimum taxes or is otherwise includable for the purpose of calculating certain other tax liabilities.

TERMS OF SALE

Form of Bids; Delivery of Bids. Each bid for the Certificates must be: (1) for not less than all of the Certificates hereby offered for sale, (2) unconditional, and (3) (i) submitted on the Official Bid Form attached hereto as Exhibit B and signed by the bidder, or (ii) submitted via Parity, along with a facsimile transmission by the winning bidder, after the verbal award, of the completed and signed Official Bid Form conforming to the Parity bid, with any adjustments made by the City pursuant hereto, by not later than [10:30] a.m. California time on the sale date. Electronic bids must conform with the procedures established by Parity. Sealed bids must be enclosed in a sealed envelope, delivered to the City at the address set forth on the cover and clearly marked "Bid for the Certificates" or words of similar import, as hereinafter described and received by [8:30] a.m. California time, at the offices of the Office of Public Finance, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 336, San Francisco, California 94102; phone: (415) 554-5956. No bid submitted to the City is subject to withdrawal or modification by the bidder.

All bids will be deemed to incorporate all of the terms of this Official Notice of Sale. If the sale of the Certificates is canceled or postponed, all bids shall be rejected. No bid submitted to the City is subject to withdrawal or modification by the bidder. No bid will be accepted after the time for receiving bids. The City retains absolute discretion to determine whether any bid is timely, legible and complete and conforms to this Official Notice of Sale. The City takes no responsibility for informing any bidder prior to the time for receiving bids that its bid is incomplete, illegible or

nonconforming with this Official Notice of Sale or has not been received. Although faxed confirmation is acceptable, no faxed-bids will be accepted.

Solely as an accommodation to bidders, electronic bids will be received exclusively through Parity in accordance with this Official Notice of Sale. For further information about Parity, potential bidders may contact Parity, phone: (212) 849-5021.

Warnings Regarding Electronic Bids. Bids for the Certificates may be submitted electronically via Parity. The City will attempt to accommodate bids submitted electronically via Parity. However, the City does not endorse or encourage the use of such electronic bidding service. None of the City, the City Attorney, the Co-Financial Advisors or Co-Special Counsel assumes any responsibility for any error contained in any bid submitted electronically or for failure of any bid to be transmitted, received or opened by the time for receiving bids, and each bidder expressly assumes the risk of, any incomplete, illegible, untimely or nonconforming bid submitted by electronic transmission by such bidder, including without limitation, by reason of garbled transmissions, mechanical failure, engaged telecommunications lines, or any other cause arising from submission by electronic transmission. The time for receiving bids will be determined by the City at the place of bid opening, and the City will not be required to accept the time kept by Parity.

If a bidder submits an electronic bid for the Certificates through Parity, such bidder thereby agrees to the following terms and conditions: (1) if any provision in this Official Notice of Sale with respect to the Certificates conflicts with information or terms provided or required by Parity, this Official Notice of Sale, including any amendments or modifications issued through Parity, will control; (2) each bidder will be solely responsible for making necessary arrangements to access Parity for purposes of submitting its bid in a timely manner and in compliance with the requirements of this Official Notice of Sale; (3) the City will not have any duty or obligation to provide or assure access to Parity to any bidder, and the City will not be responsible for proper operation of, or have any liability for, any delays, interruptions or damages caused by use of Parity or any incomplete, inaccurate or untimely bid submitted by any bidder through Parity; (4) the City is permitting use of Parity as a communication mechanism, and not as an agent of the City, to facilitate the submission of electronic bids for the Certificates; Parity is acting as an independent contractor, and is not acting for or on behalf of the City; (5) the City is not responsible for ensuring or verifying bidder compliance with any procedures established by Parity; (6) the City may regard the electronic transmission of a bid through Parity (including information regarding the purchase price for the Certificates or the interest rates for any maturity of the Certificates) as though the information were submitted on the Official Bid Form and executed on the bidder's behalf by a duly authorized signatory; (7) if the bidder's bid is accepted by the City, the signed, completed and conforming Official Bid Form submitted by the bidder by facsimile transmission after the verbal award, this Official Notice of Sale and the information that is transmitted electronically through Parity will form a contract, and the bidder will be bound by the terms of such contract; and (8) information provided by Parity to bidders will form no part of any bid or of any contract between the Purchaser and the City unless that information is included in this Official Notice of Sale or the Official Bid Form.

Basis of Award. The City reserves the right to reject all the bids or postpone the bids if the City determines the desired savings have not been achieved, or for any other reason. Unless all bids are rejected, the Certificates will be awarded to the responsible bidder who submits a conforming bid that represents the lowest true interest cost ("TIC") to the City. The TIC will be that nominal interest rate which, when compounded semiannually and applied to discount all payments of principal and interest payable on the Certificates to the dated date of the Certificates, results in an amount equal to the principal amount of such Certificates plus the amount of any net premium bid. For the purpose of calculating the TIC, mandatory sinking fund payments for any Term Certificates specified by each bidder will be treated as Certificates maturing on the dates of such mandatory sinking fund payments. In the event that two or

more bidders offer bids for the Certificates at the same lowest TIC, the City will determine by lot which bidder will be awarded the Certificates. Bid evaluations or rankings made by Parity are not binding on the City.

Estimate of TIC. Each bidder is requested, but not required, to supply an estimate of the TIC based upon its bid, which will be considered as informative only and not binding on either the bidder or the City.

Multiple Bids. In the event multiple bids are received from a single bidder by any means or combination thereof, the City shall accept the bid representing the lowest TIC to the City, and each bidder agrees by submitting any bid to be bound by the bid representing the lowest TIC to the City.

Good Faith Deposit. To secure the City from any loss resulting from the failure of the apparent winning bidder to comply with the terms of its bid, a good faith deposit in the amount of \$_____ (the "Good Faith Deposit") must be provided. The Good Faith Deposit may be provided concurrently with the bid [and must be received no later than ninety (90) minutes from the time the apparent winning bidder is identified].

The Good Faith Deposit may be submitted in the form of a (i) cashier's check, drawn on a bank or trust company transacting business in the State of California and payable to the order of the City, (ii) wire transfer (as described below), or (iii) a financial surety bond issued by an insurer licensed to do business in the State of California and acceptable to the City, followed by a wire transfer. The Certificates will not be officially awarded to a bidder who has not submitted a Good Faith Deposit by one of the methods herein described.

If the apparent winning bidder on the Certificates is determined to be a bidder which has submitted a financial surety bond and not a Good Faith Deposit, the Co-Financial Advisors will request the apparent winning bidder to immediately wire the Good Faith Deposit to the Trustee (as described below), and provide the Federal wire reference number of such Good Faith Deposit to the Co-Financial Advisors, within ninety (90) minutes of such request by the Co-Financial Advisors. The wire transfer is to be made to _____, for credit to the City, Account No. _____, with notice thereof to Angela Whittaker, telephone: (415) 554 6643, fax: (415) 554 4864.

No interest will be paid upon the Good Faith Deposit made by any bidder. If a Good Faith Deposit is submitted by an unsuccessful bidder, it will be returned promptly after the award of the Certificates or the rejection of all bids. The Good Faith Deposit of the Purchaser will, immediately upon acceptance of its bid, become the property of the City, and if in the form of a cashier's check, will be cashed. The Good Faith Deposit will be held and invested for the exclusive benefit of the City. The Good Faith Deposit, without interest thereon, will be credited against the purchase price of the Certificates purchased by the Purchaser at the time of delivery thereof.

If the purchase price is not paid in full upon execution and delivery of the Certificates, the City shall retain the Good Faith Deposit and the Purchaser will have no right in or to the Certificates or to the recovery of its Good Faith Deposit, or to any allowance or credit by reason of such deposit, unless it shall appear that the Certificates would not be validly delivered if delivered to the Purchaser in the form and manner proposed, except pursuant to a right of cancellation. See "CLOSING PROCEDURES AND DOCUMENTS – Right of Cancellation." [In the event of nonpayment for the Certificates by the Purchaser, the City reserves any and all rights granted by law to recover the full purchase price of the Certificates and, in addition, any damages suffered by the City.][The Good Faith Deposit of the successful bidder will be retained by the City as liquidated damages should such bidder fail to pay the purchase price in full upon tender of the Certificates. Such retention shall constitute a full release and discharge of all claims by the City against the successful bidder. The City's actual damages may be higher or lower than the amount of such Good Faith Deposit. Such amount represents a good faith

estimate of the City's actual damages. Each bidder waives the right to claim that actual damages arising from such default are less than such amount.]

Reoffering Prices and Certificate. The successful bidder for the Certificates must actually reoffer all of the Certificates to the general public (excluding bond houses, brokers or similar persons or organizations acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers).

As soon as is practicable, but not later than one hour after the award of the Certificates, the successful bidder shall provide to the City the initial offering prices at which it has offered all of the Certificates of each maturity to the general public (excluding bond houses, brokers, or similar persons acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers), in a bona fide public offering. Prior to delivery of the Certificates, the successful bidder shall provide a reoffering price certificate, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C, to the City, Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, 650 California Street, San Francisco, CA, 94108; Attention: Stephen Melikina, Esq., fax (415) 391-5784, Esq.; e-mail: smelikina@joneshall.com and Lofton & Jennings, 225 Bush Street, 16th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94104; fax: (415) 772-1909; Attention: William M. Lofton, Esq.; e-mail: blofton@loftonjennings.com. In addition, at the request of Co-Special Counsel, the successful bidder will provide information regarding its sales of the Certificates. For the purposes of this paragraph, sales of the Certificates to the other securities brokers or dealers will not be considered sales to the general public.

Right of Rejection and Waiver of Irregularity. The City reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion (a) to reject any bid for any reason; (b) to reject all bids for any reason; or (c) to waive any irregularity or informality in any bid which does not materially affect such bid or change the ranking of the bids.

Right to Modify or Amend. The City reserves the right to modify or amend this Official Notice of Sale in any respect; *provided*, that any such modification or amendment will be communicated to potential bidders through Parity not later than [1:00] p.m. (California time) on the business day preceding the date for receiving bids. Failure of any potential bidder to receive notice of any modification or amendment will not affect the sufficiency of any such notice or the legality of the sale.

Postponement or Cancellation of Sale. The City may postpone or cancel the sale of the Certificates at or prior to the time for receiving bids. Notice of such postponement or cancellation shall be given through Parity as soon as practicable following such postponement or cancellation. If the sale is postponed, notice of a new sale date and time will be given through Parity not later than [1:00] p.m. (California time) on the business day preceding the new date that bids are to be received. Failure of any potential bidder to receive notice of postponement or cancellation will not affect the sufficiency of any such notice.

Prompt Award. The Controller will take official action awarding the Certificates or rejecting all bids not later than thirty (30) hours after the time for receipt of bids, unless such time period is waived by the Purchaser.

Equal Opportunity. Pursuant to the spirit and intent of the City's Local Business Enterprise ("LBE") Ordinance, Chapter 14B of the Administrative Code of the City, the City strongly encourages the inclusion of Local Business Enterprises certified by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission in prospective bidding syndicates. A list of certified LBEs may be obtained from the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, 25 Van Ness Avenue, 8th Floor, San Francisco, California; phone: (415) 252-2500.

CLOSING PROCEDURES AND DOCUMENTS

Delivery and Payment. Delivery of the Certificates will be made through the facilities of DTC in New York, New York, and is presently expected to take place on or about _____, 2013.

Payment for the Certificates (including any premium) must be made at the time of delivery in immediately available funds to the Treasurer of the City. Any expense for making payment in immediately available funds shall be borne by the Purchaser. The City will deliver to the Purchaser, dated as of the delivery date, the legal opinions described in APPENDIX _ – “PROPOSED FORM OF OPINIONS OF CO-SPECIAL COUNSEL” to the Official Statement.

Qualification for Sale. The City will furnish such information and take such action not inconsistent with law as the Purchaser may request and the City may deem necessary or appropriate to qualify the Certificates for offer and sale under the Blue Sky or other securities laws and regulations of such states and other jurisdictions of the United States of America as may be designated by the Purchaser; *provided*, that the City will not execute a general or special consent to service of process or qualify to do business in connection with such qualification or determination in any jurisdiction. By submitting its bid for the Certificates, the Purchaser assumes all responsibility for qualifying the Certificates for offer and sale under the Blue Sky or other securities laws and regulations of the states and jurisdictions in which the Purchaser offers or sells the Certificates, including the payment of fees for such qualification. Under no circumstances may the Certificates be sold or offered for sale or any solicitation of an offer to buy the Certificates be made in any jurisdiction in which such sale, offer or solicitation would be unlawful under the securities laws of the jurisdiction.

No Litigation. The City will deliver a certificate stating that no litigation is pending with service of process having been accomplished, or, to the knowledge of the officer of the City executing such certificate, threatened, concerning the validity of the Certificates, the corporate existence of the City, or the title to their respective offices of the officers of the City who will execute the Certificates or concerning the validity of the Project Lease, Property Lease and the Trust Agreement.

Right of Cancellation. The Purchaser will have the right, at its option, to cancel this contract if the City fails to execute the Certificates and tender the same for delivery within 30 days from the sale date, and in such event the Purchaser will be entitled only to the return of the Good Faith Deposit, without interest thereon.

CUSIP Numbers. It is anticipated that CUSIP numbers will be printed on the Certificates, but neither the failure to print such numbers on any Certificate nor any error with respect thereto will constitute cause for a failure or refusal by the Purchaser to accept delivery of and pay for the Certificates in accordance with the terms of this contract. The Purchaser, at its sole cost, will obtain separate CUSIP numbers for each maturity of the Certificates. CUSIP data is provided by Standard and Poor's, CUSIP Service Bureau, a division of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. CUSIP numbers will be provided for convenience of reference only. The City will take no responsibility for the accuracy of such numbers.

California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission Fee. Pursuant to Section 8856 of the California Government Code, the Purchaser must pay to the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission within 60 days from the sale date the statutory fee for the Certificates purchased.

Official Statement. In accordance with Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Rule 15c2-12”), the City deems such Preliminary Official Statement final as of its date, except for the omission of certain information permitted by Rule 15c2-12. The contact information for the Co-Financial Advisors is set forth on the first page of this Official Notice of Sale. Within seven business days after the date of award of the Certificates, the Purchaser will be furnished with a reasonable number of copies (not to exceed 200) of the final Official Statement, without charge, for distribution in connection with the resale of the Certificates. The Purchaser must notify the City in writing within two days of the sale of the Certificates if the Purchaser requires additional copies of the Official Statement to comply with applicable regulations. The cost for such additional copies will be paid by the Purchaser requesting such copies.

By submitting a bid for the Certificates, the Purchaser agrees: (1) to disseminate to all members of the underwriting syndicate, if any, copies of the final Official Statement, including any supplements, (2) to promptly file a copy of the final Official Statement, including any supplements, with a nationally recognized municipal securities information repository, as defined in Rule 15c2-12, and (3) to take any and all other actions necessary to comply with applicable SEC and Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board rules governing the offering, sale and delivery of the Certificates to the Purchaser, including without limitation, the delivery of a final Official Statement to each investor who purchases Certificates.

The form and content of the final Official Statement is within the sole discretion of the City. The Purchaser's name will not appear on the cover of the Official Statement.

Certificate Regarding Official Statement. At the time of delivery of the Certificates, the Purchaser will receive a certificate, signed by an authorized representative of the City, confirming to the Purchaser that, to the best of the knowledge of such authorized representative, the Official Statement (except for information regarding DTC and its book-entry system and reoffering information, as to which no view will be expressed), as of the date of sale of the Certificates and as of the date of delivery thereof did not and does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made therein, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

Continuing Disclosure. In order to assist bidders in complying with Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) ("Rule 15c2-12(b)(5)"), the City will undertake, pursuant to a Continuing Disclosure Certificate, to provide certain annual financial information and notices of the occurrence of certain events, if material. A description of this undertaking is set forth in the Preliminary Official Statement and will also be set forth in the final Official Statement. The City has not failed, in the prior five years, to comply in all material respects with any previous undertakings with regard to Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) to provide annual reports or notices of material events.

Dated: _____, 2013

CERTIFICATE OF INSURER

The undersigned, the duly authorized and acting _____ of _____ (the "Insurer"), hereby certifies on behalf of the Insurer as follows:

1. The statements contained in the Official Statement dated _____, 201__ (the "Official Statement"), relating to the \$_____ aggregate principal amount of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Port Facilities Project), Series 2013__ under the caption "Certificate Insurance," insofar as such statements constitute descriptions or summaries of the Insurer or the municipal bond insurance policy (the "Policy") of the Insurer covering the Certificates, accurately reflect and fairly present the information set forth therein, and do not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements therein, in light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading; and

2. The Form of Insurance Policy set forth in APPENDIX __ of the Official Statement is a true and complete copy of the form of Policy.

NAME OF INSURER:

By: _____

Title: _____

BID TIME: [8:30] a.m. (California time)

OFFICIAL BID FORM FOR THE PURCHASE OF
\$[Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
2013 (Port Facilities Project)
SERIES 2013

Controller
City and County of San Francisco
c/o Office of Public Finance
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 336
San Francisco, California 94102
Confirm Number: (415) 554-6643

BIDDING FIRM'S NAME:

Subject to the provisions and in accordance with the terms of the Official Notice of Sale dated _____, 2013, which is incorporated herein and made a part of this proposal, we have reviewed the Preliminary Official Statement relating to the above-referenced Certificates (the "Certificates") and hereby offer to purchase all of the \$[Amount]* aggregate principal component of the Base Rental payments evidenced by the Certificates dated the date of the delivery on the following terms, including the submission of the required Good Faith Deposit in the amount of \$_____ (previously submitted or to be submitted within ninety (90) minutes from receipt of notice that we are the apparent winner) in the form of (check one): _____ cashier's check, _____ wire transfer, or _____ surety bond/wire transfer; and to pay therefor the price of \$_____, which is equal to the aggregate principal component of the Base Rental payments evidenced by the Certificates plus/less a net premium/discount of \$_____ (such amount being the "Purchase Price"). The principal component of the Base Rental payments evidenced by the Certificates shall be payable and will be subject to mandatory sinking fund prepayment commencing no earlier than _____, 20__ (if term certificates are specified below) in the amounts and years, and shall evidence interest at the rates per annum (in multiples of __ or __ of __%; not to exceed __%), as set forth in the schedule below.

(Check one)

Certificate Payment Date (____)*	Principal Amount*	Serial Payment	Mandatory Sinking Fund Prepayment ⁽¹⁾	Interest Rate
---	----------------------	-------------------	---	------------------

Total \$[Amount]

(1) Circle the final payment date of the principal component evidenced by each term Certificate specified. No term Certificate shall require mandatory sinking fund prepayments prior to _____, 20__.

Authorized Signatory
Title: _____
Phone Number: _____
Fax Number: _____

TIC (optional and not binding): _____

THE BIDDER EXPRESSLY ASSUMES THE RISK OF ANY INCOMPLETE, ILLEGIBLE, UNTIMELY OR OTHERWISE NONCONFORMING BID. THE CITY RETAINS ABSOLUTE DISCRETION TO DETERMINE WHETHER ANY BID IS TIMELY, LEGIBLE, COMPLETE AND CONFORMING. NO BID SUBMITTED WILL BE CONSIDERED TIMELY UNLESS, BY THE TIME FOR RECEIVING BIDS, THE ENTIRE BID FORM HAS BEEN RECEIVED BY DELIVERY METHOD PROVIDED IN THE NOTICE OF SALE.

* Subject to adjustment following award in accordance with the Official Notice of Sale.

REOFFERING PRICE CERTIFICATE

(TO BE DELIVERED BY THE PURCHASER AS DESCRIBED UNDER "REOFFERING PRICE CERTIFICATE" IN THE OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE)

This certificate is being delivered by _____, the purchaser (the "Purchaser") in connection with the issuance of the City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation, Series 2013__ (Port Facilities Project) (the "Certificates"). The Purchaser hereby certifies and represents that:

A. Issue Price.

1. On the date of the Certificates' [sale][award] (the "Sale Date"), all Certificates of all maturities have been the subject of an initial offering to the public (excluding bond houses, brokers, or similar persons or organizations acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers) at prices not higher than, or, in the case of obligations sold on a yield basis, at yields not lower than, those set forth in Schedule A attached hereto.

2. On the Sale Date, to the best of our knowledge based on our records, the first price or yield at which at least ten percent (10%) of each maturity of the Certificates [*if less than ten percent of some maturities of the Certificates has been sold to the public, add:* , except the Certificates maturing in the year[s] []], was sold to the public (excluding such bond houses, brokers or similar persons or organizations acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers) was not greater than the respective price, or was not lower than the respective yield, shown in the Official Statement. [Less than ten percent of the Certificates maturing in the year[s] [] were sold to the public following a bona fide public offering at the prices or yields shown in the Official Statement.]

3. On the Sale Date, based on our assessment of the then prevailing market conditions, we had no reason to believe that any of the Certificates would be initially sold to the public (excluding such bond houses, brokers or similar persons or organizations acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers) at prices greater than the prices, or yields lower than the yields, shown in the Official Statement.

4. The prices and yields of the Certificates, maturity-by-maturity, shown in the Official Statement, represented our best judgment of the fair market value of the Certificates.

[B. Qualified Guarantee.

The present value of the premium paid in respect of the policy issued by [] insuring the scheduled principal and interest payments on the Certificates [if not all maturities are insured add: maturing in the years [] through []] is less than the present value of the interest savings resulting from obtaining the policy. Present value, for this purpose, is computed by using the yield on the Certificates as the discount rate after taking into account the insurance premium. Based on our experience, the insurance premium represents a reasonable charge for the transfer of credit risk.]

C. Compensation.

All compensation received for underwriting services (which includes certain expenses) in connection with the sale and delivery of the Certificates is being paid on the date hereof in the form of a purchase discount in the amount of \$ _____, and no part of such compensation includes any

payment for any property or services other than underwriting services relating to sale and delivery of the Certificates.

We understand that the representations contained herein will be relied upon by the City and County of San Francisco in connection with the execution and delivery of the Certificates in making certain of the representations contained in the Tax Certificate, and we further understand that Co-Special Counsel to the issuer may rely upon this certificate, among other things, in providing an opinion with respect to the exclusion from gross income of the of the portion of each payment due under the Project Lease designated as and comprising interest with respect to the Certificates, pursuant to Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. Capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Tax Certificate relating to the Certificates to which this certificate is attached as an exhibit.

Dated: _____, 201_

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

Certificates

<u>Certificate Payment Date (____ 1)</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Reoffering Price or Yield</u>
	\$ _____	_____ %	_____ %
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

* Principal components evidenced by the Certificates were priced to call on _____, 20__ at 100% of par.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SELL

§ _____*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
(Port Facilities Project)
SERIES 2013 _____

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") intends to offer for public sale on

_____, at _____ a.m. (California time)*

by sealed bids at the Office of Public Finance, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 336, San Francisco, California 94102, and by electronic bids through Ipreo LLC's BiDCOMP™/PARITY® System ("Parity"), \$ _____* aggregate principal amount of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Port Facilities Project), Series 2013 _____ (the "Certificates").

The City reserves the right to postpone or cancel the sale of the Certificates or change the terms thereof upon notice given through Parity. If the sale is postponed, bids will be received at the hour and place set forth above on any weekday during the period from _____ through _____, as the City may determine. In the event of a postponement of the sale of the Certificates, notice of the new date and time for receipt of bids (and any change in the terms of the sale of the Certificates) shall be given through Parity, as soon as practicable but no later than [1:00] p.m. California time on the date preceding the original or new date for receiving bids.

Further information regarding the proposed sale of the Certificates, including copies of the Preliminary Official Statement and the Official Notice of Sale relating to the Certificates are available electronically at the News Services or may be obtained from either of the City's Co-Financial Advisors: Public Financial Management, Inc., 50 California Street, Suite 2300, San Francisco, California 94111, Attention: Robert Gamble, Telephone: (415) 982-5544, Fax: (415) 982-4513, email: gambler@pfm.com and Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co., LLC, Attention: Vincent McCarley, 155 Sansome Street, Mezzanine A, San Francisco, California 90404, Telephone: (415) 4392-5505, Fax: (415) 392-5276, e-mail: VMcCarley@bmcbbc.com. On or about _____, the Preliminary Official Statement and Official Notice of Sale will be posted electronically at Ipreo Prospectus www.i-dealprospectus.com. Failure of any bidder to receive such notice shall not affect the legality of the sale.

Dated: _____, 2013

* Preliminary, subject to change.

PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT DATED _____, 2013

NEW ISSUE – BOOK-ENTRY ONLY

RATINGS: Moody's: _____
S&P: _____
Fitch: _____
(See "RATINGS" herein)

In the opinion of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, and Lofton & Jennings, San Francisco, California, Co-Special Counsel to the City, subject, however to certain qualifications described herein, under existing law, the portion of lease payments designated as and comprising interest and received by the owners of the Certificates is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes, except, with respect to the 2013B Certificates, during any period while a 2013B Certificate is held by a "substantial user" of the facilities financed by the 2013B Certificates or by a "related person" within the meaning of Section 147(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. With respect to the 2013A Certificates, such interest is not an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals and corporations, although for the purpose of computing the alternative minimum tax imposed on certain corporations, such interest is taken into account in determining certain income and earnings. With respect to the 2013B Certificates, however, such interest is an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals and corporations. Interest with respect to the Taxable 2013C Certificates is not excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes. In the further opinion of Co-Special Counsel, interest with respect to the Certificates is exempt from California personal income taxes. See "TAX MATTERS" herein.

[\$Par Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION



\$ _____ *
SERIES 2013A
(Port Facilities Project)
(Non-AMT)

\$ _____ *
SERIES 2013B
(Port Facilities Project)
(AMT)

\$ _____ *
TAXABLE SERIES 2013C
(Port Facilities Project)

evidencing proportionate interests of the Owners thereof in a Project Lease,
including the right to receive Base Rental payments to be made by the
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Dated: Date of Delivery

Due: [September] 1, as shown on the inside cover

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

The City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Series 2013A (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013A Certificates"), the City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Series 2013B (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013B Certificates"), and the City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Taxable Series 2013C (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013C Certificates," and together with the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates, the "Certificates") will be sold to provide funds: (i) for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, equipping and improvement and rehabilitation of certain facilities (as described herein, the "Project"), to be operated by the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Commission"), (ii) to fund the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund established under the Trust Agreement (as defined hereafter), and (iii) pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates. See "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS."

The Certificates are executed and delivered pursuant to a Trust Agreement, dated as of _____ 1, 2013 (the "Trust Agreement"), between the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") and [Name of Trustee], as trustee (the "Trustee"), and in accordance with the Charter of the City. See "THE CERTIFICATES – Authority for Execution and Delivery." The Certificates evidence the principal and interest components of the Base Rental payable by the City pursuant to a Project Lease dated as of _____ 1, 2013 (the "Project Lease"), by and between the Trustee, as lessor, and the City, as lessee. The City has covenanted in the Project Lease to take such action as may be necessary to include and maintain all Base Rental and Additional Rental payments in its annual budget, and to make necessary annual appropriations therefor. See "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Covenant to Budget." The obligation of the City to pay Base Rental is in consideration for the use and occupancy of the land and facilities subject to the Project Lease (as further described herein, the "Leased Property"), and such obligation may be abated in whole or in part if there is substantial interference with the City's use and occupancy of the Leased Property. See "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Abatement of Base Rental Payments" and "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement."

The Certificates will be delivered in fully registered form and registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC"). Individual purchases of the Certificates will be made in book entry form only, in the principal amount of \$5,000 and integral multiples thereof. Principal and interest with respect to the Certificates will be paid by the Trustee to DTC, which will in turn remit such payments to the participants in DTC for subsequent disbursement to the beneficial owners of the Certificates. See "THE CERTIFICATES – Form and Registration." Interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates is payable on [March] 1 and [September] 1 of each year, commencing [September 1, 2013]. Principal will be paid as shown on the inside cover hereof. See "THE CERTIFICATES – Payment of Principal and Interest."

The Certificates are subject to prepayment prior to their scheduled payment of principal as described herein. See "THE CERTIFICATES – Prepayment of the Certificates."

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CITY TO MAKE BASE RENTAL PAYMENTS UNDER THE PROJECT LEASE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN OBLIGATION TO LEVY OR PLEDGE, OR FOR WHICH THE CITY HAS LEVIED OR PLEDGED, ANY FORM OF TAXATION. NEITHER THE CERTIFICATES NOR THE OBLIGATION OF THE CITY TO MAKE BASE RENTAL OR ADDITIONAL RENTAL PAYMENTS CONSTITUTES AN INDEBTEDNESS OF THE CITY, THE STATE OR ANY OF ITS POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS WITHIN THE MEANING OF ANY CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY DEBT LIMITATION OR RESTRICTION. THE CITY WILL BE OBLIGATED TO MAKE BASE

* Preliminary, subject to change.

Preliminary Official Statement and the information contained herein are subject to completion or amendment without notice. Under no circumstances shall this Preliminary Official Statement constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of these securities, in any jurisdiction in which such offer, solicitation, or sale would be unlawful prior to registration or qualification under the securities laws of such jurisdiction.

PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT DATED _____, 2013

RENTAL PAYMENTS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF THE PROJECT LEASE AND NEITHER THE CITY NOR ANY OF ITS OFFICERS WILL INCUR ANY LIABILITY OR ANY OTHER OBLIGATION WITH RESPECT TO THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF THE CERTIFICATES. SEE "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS."

CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE

(See inside cover)

The Certificates are offered when, as and if executed and received by the initial purchasers, subject to the approval of the validity of the Project Lease by Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California, and Lofton & Jennings, San Francisco, California, Co-Special Counsel, and certain other conditions. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by the City Attorney and by Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California, Disclosure Counsel. It is expected that the Certificates in book-entry form will be available for delivery through DTC on or about _____, 2013.

Dated: _____, 2013.

This Preliminary Official Statement and the information contained herein are subject to completion or amendment without notice. Under no circumstances shall this Preliminary Official Statement constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of these securities, in any jurisdiction in which such offer, solicitation, or sale would be unlawful prior to registration or qualification under the securities laws of such jurisdiction.

CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE

(Base CUSIP Number: 79765D¹)

\$ _____ *					\$ _____ *				
2013A Certificates					2013B Certificates				
Certificate Payment Date (Sept.1.)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Yield	CUSIP Suffix ¹	Certificate Payment Date (Sept.1.)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Yield	CUSIP Suffix ¹

\$ _____ *					
2013C Certificates					
Certificate Payment Date (Sept.1.)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Yield	CUSIP Suffix ¹	

¹ CUSIP is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, managed by Standard and Poor's Financial Services LLC on behalf of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP numbers are provided for convenience of reference only. Neither the City nor the initial purchaser take any responsibility for the accuracy of such numbers.

* Preliminary, subject to change.

No dealer, broker, salesperson or other person has been authorized by the City to give any information or to make any representation other than those contained herein and, if given or made, such other information or representation must not be relied upon as having been authorized by the City. This Official Statement does not constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of the Certificates, by any person in any jurisdiction in which it is unlawful for such person to make such an offer, solicitation or sale.

The information set forth herein other than that provided by the City, although obtained from sources which are believed to be reliable, is not guaranteed as to accuracy or completeness. The information and expressions of opinion herein are subject to change without notice and neither delivery of this Official Statement nor any sale made hereunder shall, under any circumstances, create any implication that there has been no change in the affairs of the City since the date hereof.

The City maintains a website. The information presented on such website is *not* incorporated by reference as part of this Official Statement and should not be relied upon in making investment decisions with respect to the Certificates. Various other websites referred to in this Official Statement are also not incorporated herein by such references.

This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract with the initial purchaser of the Certificates. Statements contained in this Official Statement which involve estimates, forecasts or matters of opinion, whether or not expressly so described herein, are intended solely as such and are not to be construed as representations of facts.

The execution and sale of the Certificates have not been registered under the Securities Act of 1933 in reliance upon the exemption provided thereunder by Section 3(a)2 for the issuance and sale of municipal securities.

IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFERING OF THE CERTIFICATES, THE INITIAL PURCHASERS MAY OVERALLOT OR EFFECT TRANSACTIONS WHICH STABILIZE OR MAINTAIN THE MARKET PRICE OF THE CERTIFICATES AT LEVELS ABOVE THAT WHICH MIGHT OTHERWISE PREVAIL IN THE OPEN MARKET. SUCH STABILIZING, IF COMMENCED, MAY BE DISCONTINUED AT ANY TIME.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MAYOR

Edwin M. Lee

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

David Chiu, *Board President, District 3*

Eric Mar, *District 1*
Mark Farrell, *District 2*
Katy Tang, *District 4*
London Breed, *District 5*
Jane Kim, *District 6*

Norman Yee, *District 7*
Scott Wiener, *District 8*
David Campos, *District 9*
Malia Cohen, *District 10*
John Avalos, *District 11*

CITY ATTORNEY

Dennis J. Herrera

CITY TREASURER

José Cisneros

OTHER CITY AND COUNTY OFFICIALS

Naomi M. Kelly, *City Administrator*
Benjamin Rosenfield, *Controller*

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Co-Special Counsel

Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation
San Francisco, California

Lofton & Jennings
San Francisco, California

Co-Financial Advisor

Public Financial Management, Inc.
San Francisco, California

Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co. LLC
San Francisco, California

Disclosure Counsel

Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP
San Francisco, California

Trustee

[Name of Trustee]
_____, *California*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.....	2
[RECENT DEVELOPMENTS].....	2
THE CERTIFICATES.....	3
Authority for Execution and Delivery	3
Payment of Principal and Interest.....	4
Form and Registration	4
Prepayment of the Certificates.....	4
THE PROJECT AND THE LEASED PROPERTY.....	7
ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS	8
CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE.....	9
SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES	10
Source of Payment.....	10
Covenant to Budget	10
Limited Obligation.....	10
Base Rental Payments; Additional Rental	11
Abatement of Base Rental Payments	11
Reserve Fund	12
Replacement, Maintenance and Repairs	13
Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property	13
Eminent Domain.....	14
Addition, Release and Substitution of Leased Property.....	15
Additional Certificates.....	15
CERTAIN RISK FACTORS	15
Rental Payments Not a Debt of the City.....	15
Additional Obligations.....	16
Abatement.....	16
Reserve Fund	17
Limited Recourse on Default; No Reletting of the Leased Property	17
Enforcement of Remedies.....	17
No Acceleration on Default	18
Release and Substitution of the Leased Property.....	18
Seismic Risks.....	18
Risk Management and Insurance	19
State Law Limitations on Appropriations.....	19
Changes in Law	19
Bankruptcy.....	19
State of California Financial Condition	20
U.S. Government Finances	20
Taxability Risk.....	21
Other	22
TAX MATTERS	22
OTHER LEGAL MATTERS	23
PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED IN THE OFFERING.....	24
CONTINUING DISCLOSURE.....	24

ABSENCE OF LITIGATION	25
RATINGS	25
SALE OF THE CERTIFICATES	25
MISCELLANEOUS	26

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	— CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO – ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES	A-1
APPENDIX B	— COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012	B-1
APPENDIX C	— SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS	C-1
APPENDIX D	— FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE	D-1
APPENDIX E	— DTC AND THE BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM	E-1
APPENDIX F	— PROPOSED FORM OF CO-SPECIAL COUNSEL OPINION	F-1
APPENDIX G	— CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER – INVESTMENT POLICY	G-1



OFFICIAL STATEMENT

\$[Par Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

\$ _____*
SERIES 2013A
(Port Facilities Project)
(Non-AMT)

\$ _____*
SERIES 2013B
(Port Facilities Project)
(AMT)

\$ _____*
TAXABLE SERIES 2013C
(Port Facilities Project)

evidencing proportionate interests of the Owners thereof in a Project Lease,
including the right to receive Base Rental payments to be made by the
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INTRODUCTION

This Official Statement, including the cover page and the appendices hereto, is provided to furnish information in connection with the offering by the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") of its City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Series 2013A (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013A Certificates"), its City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Series 2013B (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013B Certificates"), and its City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Taxable Series 2013C (Port Facilities Project) (the "2013C Certificates," and together with the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates, the "Certificates"). Any capitalized term not defined herein will have the meaning given to such term in APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – Definitions." The references to any legal documents, instruments and the Certificates in this Official Statement do not purport to be comprehensive or definitive, and reference is made to each such document for complete details of all terms and conditions.

This Introduction is designed to give an overview of the transactions and serve as a guide to the contents of this Official Statement.

Overview of the Transaction: The City, exercising its Charter powers to convey and lease property for City purposes, will convey certain real property to [Name of Trustee] (the "Trustee") under that certain Property Lease, dated as of ____ 1, 2013 (the "Property Lease"), by and between the City as lessor and the Trustee as lessee, in exchange for the proceeds of the sale of the Certificates and other consideration. The Trustee will lease the Leased Property (as defined herein) back to the City for the City's use under that certain Project Lease, dated as of ____ 1, 2013 (the "Project Lease"), by and between the Trustee as lessor and the City as lessee. The City will be obligated under the Project Lease to pay Base Rental payments and other payments to the Trustee each year during the term of the Project Lease (subject to certain conditions under which obligation to pay Base Rental may be abated as discussed herein). Each payment of Base Rental consists of principal and interest components, and when received by the Trustee in each rental period, is deposited in trust for payment of the Certificates. The Trustee creates the "certificates of participation" in the Project Lease, representing proportional interests in the principal and interest components of Base Rental it receives from the City. The Trustee will apply Base Rental it receives to pay principal and interest with respect to each Certificate when due according to the Trust Agreement, which governs the security and terms of payment of the Certificates. The money received from sale of the Certificates will be applied by the Trustee (i) for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, equipping and improvement and rehabilitation of certain facilities (as described herein, the "Project"), to be operated by the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Commission"), (ii) to fund the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund established under the Trust Agreement, and (iii) pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates. See "THE PROJECT AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" and "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS" herein.

Guide to this Official Statement: The Leased Property is described herein in the section "THE PROJECT AND THE LEASED PROPERTY." The application of the proceeds of sale of the Certificates is described in the sections "THE PROJECT AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" and "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS." The terms of the

* Preliminary, subject to change.

Certificates and repayment thereof and security for the Certificates are described in the sections "THE CERTIFICATES," "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES," and other sections in the front portion of this Official Statement. Current information about the City, its finances and governance, are provided in APPENDIX A. The City's most recent comprehensive annual financial report appears in APPENDIX B. A summary of the Property Lease, the Project Lease, the Trust Agreement, and other basic legal documents are provided in APPENDIX C.

This Official Statement speaks only as of its date, and the information contained herein is subject to change. Except as required by the Continuing Disclosure Certificate to be executed by the City, the City has no obligation to update the information in this Official Statement. See "CONTINUING DISCLOSURE" and APPENDIX D: "FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE" herein.

Quotations from and summaries and explanations of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Project Lease, the Property Lease, the resolutions providing for the execution and delivery of the Certificates, provisions of the constitution and statutes of the State of California (the "State"), the City's charter and ordinances, and other documents described herein, do not purport to be complete, and reference is made to said laws and documents for the complete provisions thereof. Copies of those documents and information concerning the Certificates are available from the City through the Office of Public Finance, City Hall Room 336, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4682. Reference is made herein to various other documents, reports, websites, etc., which were either prepared by parties other than the City, or were not prepared, reviewed and approved by the City with a view towards making an offering of public securities, and such materials are therefore not incorporated herein by such references nor deemed a part of this Official Statement.

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

The City is the economic and cultural center of the San Francisco Bay Area and northern California. The corporate limits of the City encompass over 93 square miles, of which 49 square miles are land, with the balance consisting of tidelands and a portion of the San Francisco Bay (the "Bay"). The City is located at the northern tip of the San Francisco Peninsula, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the Bay and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to the east, the entrance to the Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge to the north, and San Mateo County to the south. Silicon Valley is about a 40-minute drive to the south, and the wine country is about an hour's drive to the north. The City's most recently completed and adopted Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (the "CAFR") for fiscal year 2011-12 estimated the City's fiscal year 2011-12 population at 820,466.

The San Francisco Bay Area consists of the nine counties contiguous to the Bay: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma Counties (collectively, the "Bay Area"). The economy of the Bay Area includes a wide range of industries, supplying local needs as well as the needs of national and international markets. Major business sectors in the Bay Area include retail, entertainment and the arts, conventions and tourism, service businesses, banking, professional and financial services, corporate headquarters, international and wholesale trade, multimedia and advertising, biotechnology and higher education.

The City is a major convention and tourist destination. According to the San Francisco Travel Association, a nonprofit membership organization, during the calendar year 2011, approximately 16.35 million people visited the City and spent an estimated \$8.46 billion during their stay. The City is also a leading center for financial activity in the State and is the headquarters of the Twelfth Federal Reserve District, the Eleventh District Federal Home Loan Bank, and the San Francisco regional Office of Thrift Supervision.

The City benefits from a highly skilled, educated and professional labor force. The CAFR estimates that per-capita personal income of the City for fiscal year 2011-12 was \$74,040. The San Francisco Unified School District operates 71 elementary and K-8 school sites, 13 middle schools, 17 senior high schools (including two continuation schools and an independent study school), and 36 state-funded preschool sites, and sponsors 9 independent charter schools. Higher education institutions located in the City include the University of San Francisco, California State University – San Francisco, University of California – San Francisco (a medical school and health science campus), the University of California Hastings College of the Law, the University of the Pacific's School of Dentistry, Golden Gate University, City College of San Francisco (a public community college), the Art Institute of California – San Francisco, the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, the California Culinary Academy, and the Academy of Art University.

San Francisco International Airport ("SFO"), located 14 miles south of downtown San Francisco in an unincorporated area of San Mateo County and owned and operated by the City, is the principal commercial service airport for the Bay Area and one of the nation's principal gateways for Pacific traffic. In fiscal year 2011-12, SFO serviced approximately 43.1 million passengers and handled 385,113 metric tons of cargo. The City is also served by the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (electric rail commuter service linking the City with the East Bay and the San Francisco Peninsula, including SFO), Caltrain (a conventional commuter rail line linking the City with the San Francisco Peninsula), and bus and ferry services between the City and residential areas to the north, east and south of the City. San Francisco Municipal Railway, operated by the City, provides bus and streetcar service within the City. The Port of San Francisco (the "Port"), which administers 7.5 miles of Bay waterfront held in "public trust" by the Port on behalf of the people of the State, promotes a balance of maritime-related commerce, fishing, recreational, industrial and commercial activities and natural resource protection.

The City is governed by a Board of Supervisors elected from eleven districts to serve four-year terms, and a Mayor who serves as chief executive officer, elected citywide to a four-year term. Edwin M. Lee is the 43rd and current Mayor of the City, having been elected by the voters of the City in November 2011. The City's fiscal year 2012-13 adopted budget includes \$7.35 billion of expenditures and reserves, of which \$3.49 billion was allocated to the General Fund of the City and \$3.86 billion was allocated to all other funds, including enterprise fund departments, such as SFO, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The CAFR estimates that the City employed 28,073 full-time-equivalent employees at the end of fiscal year 2011-12. According to the Controller of the City (the "Controller"), fiscal year 2012-13 total net assessed valuation of taxable property in the City is approximately \$165.04 billion.

More detailed information about the City's governance, organization and finances may be found in APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES" and in APPENDIX B: "COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012."

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The information contained in APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES" was prepared by the City for inclusion in official statements relating to bonds of the City and updated as of March __, 2013. The following information supplements and amends the information set forth in such Appendix as of the date of this Official Statement:

[To be updated, if necessary.]

THE CERTIFICATES

Authority for Execution and Delivery

The Certificates will be executed and delivered pursuant to a Trust Agreement, dated as of ____ 1, 2013 (the "Trust Agreement"), by and between the City and the Trustee. Each Certificate represents a proportionate interest in the right of the Trustee to receive Base Rental payments (comprising principal and interest components) payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease. The City is obligated under the Project Lease to pay the Base Rental in consideration for its use and occupancy of the land and facilities subject to the Project Lease (the "Leased Property"). The Leased Property will be originally conveyed to the Trustee pursuant to the Property Lease.

The Trust Agreement, the Property Lease, and the Project Lease were approved by the Board of Supervisors of the City by its Resolution No. ____, adopted on ____, 2013, and signed by the Mayor on ____, 2013 (the "Resolution"). The Resolution authorized the execution and delivery of up to \$__ million in aggregate principal amount of the Certificates under the Trust Agreement and the payment of a maximum annual Base Rental payment under the Project Lease. Under Section 9.108 of the Charter of the City, the City is authorized to enter into lease-financing agreements with a public agency or nonprofit corporation only with the assent of the majority of the voters voting upon a proposition for the purpose. The lease-financing arrangements with the Trustee for the Certificates do not fall under this provision, since the Trustee is neither a public agency nor a nonprofit corporation.

Payment of Principal and Interest

The principal evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be payable on [September] 1 of each year shown on the inside cover hereof, or upon prepayment prior thereto, and will evidence and represent the sum of the portions of the Base Rental Payments designated as principal components coming due on each [September] 1. Payment of the principal and premium, if any, of the Certificates upon prepayment or upon the Certificate Payment Date will be made upon presentation and surrender of such Certificates at the Principal Office of the Trustee. Principal and premium will be payable in lawful money of the United States of America.

Interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be payable on [March] 1 and [September] 1 of each year, commencing on [September 1, 2013] (each, an "Interest Payment Date") and continuing to and including their Certificate Payment Dates or on prepayment prior thereto, and will evidence and represent the sum of the portions of the Base Rental designated as interest components coming due on such dates in each year. Interest with respect to the Certificates will be calculated on the basis of a 360-day year composed of twelve 30-day months. Interest evidenced and represented by each Certificate will accrue from the Interest Payment Date next preceding the date of execution and delivery thereof, unless (i) it is executed after a Regular Record Date and before the close of business on the immediately following Interest Payment Date, in which event interest represented thereby will be payable from such Interest Payment Date; or (ii) it is executed prior to the close of business on the first Regular Record Date, in which event interest represented thereby will be payable from the date of delivery; provided, however, that if at the time of execution of any Certificate interest thereon is in default, such interest will be payable from the Interest Payment Date to which interest has previously been paid or made available for payment or, if no interest has been paid or made available for payment, from the date of delivery.

Interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be payable in lawful money of the United States of America. Payments of interest represented by the Certificates will be made on each Interest Payment Date by check of the Trustee sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, or by wire transfer to any Owner of \$1,000,000 or more of Certificates to the account in the United States of America specified by such Owner in a written request delivered to the Trustee on or prior to the Regular Record Date for such Interest Payment Date, to the Owner thereof on the Regular Record Date.

Form and Registration

The Certificates will be executed and delivered in the aggregate principal amount shown on the cover hereof.

The Certificates will be delivered in fully registered form, without coupons, dated their date of delivery, and registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC"), who will act as securities depository for the Certificates. Individual purchases of the Certificates will be made in book-entry form only in the principal amount of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof. Principal, premium, if any, and interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be paid by the Trustee to DTC which will in turn remit such amounts to the DTC participants for subsequent disbursement to the beneficial owners of the Certificates. Beneficial owners of the Certificates will not receive physical certificates representing their interests in the Certificates. For further information concerning the Book-Entry Only System, see APPENDIX E: "DTC AND THE BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM."

Prepayment of the Certificates

Optional Prepayment

The 2013A Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or after [September] 1, 20__, are subject to optional prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates in whole or in part on any date on or after [September] 1, 20__ at a prepayment price equal to the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for prepayment, [without premium].

The 2013B Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or after [September] 1, 20__, are subject to optional prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates in whole or in part on any date on or after [September] 1, 20__ at a prepayment price equal to the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for prepayment, [without premium].

The 2013C Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or after [September] 1, 20__, are subject to optional prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates in whole or in part on any date on or after [September] 1, 20__ at a prepayment price equal to the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for prepayment, [without premium].

Mandatory Sinking Account Installment Prepayment

The 2013A Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date of [September] 1, 20__, are subject to sinking account installment prepayment prior to their Certificate Payment Date in part, by lot, on each [September] 1, beginning [September] 1, 20__, in the amounts set forth below, from scheduled payments of the principal component of Base Rental payments, at the principal amount of the 2013A Certificates to be prepaid, plus accrued interest to the prepayment date, without premium:

Prepayment Date ([September] 1)	Sinking Account Installment Amount
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

The 2013B Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date of [September] 1, 20__, are subject to sinking account installment prepayment prior to their Certificate Payment Date in part, by lot, on each [September] 1, beginning [September] 1, 20__, in the amounts set forth below, from scheduled payments of the principal component of Base Rental payments, at the principal amount of 2013B Certificates to be prepaid, plus accrued interest to the prepayment date, without premium:

Prepayment Date ([September] 1)	Sinking Account Installment Amount
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

The 2013C Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date of [September] 1, 20__, are subject to sinking account installment prepayment prior to their Certificate Payment Date in part, by lot, on each [September] 1, beginning [September] 1, 20__, in the amounts set forth below, from scheduled payments of the principal component of Base Rental payments, at the principal amount of 2013B Certificates to be prepaid, plus accrued interest to the prepayment date, without premium:

Prepayment Date
([September] 1)

Sinking Account
Installment Amount

Special Mandatory Prepayment

The Certificates are subject to mandatory prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates, as a whole or in part on any date, at a Prepayment Price equal to the principal amount thereof plus accrued but unpaid interest to the prepayment date, without premium, from amounts deposited in the Prepayment Account of the Base Rental Fund following an event of damage, destruction or condemnation of the Leased Property or any portion thereof or upon loss of the use or possession of the Leased Property or any portion thereof due to a title defect.

Selection of Certificates for Prepayment

Whenever provision is made in the Trust Agreement for the prepayment of Certificates (other than from Sinking Account Installments) and less than all of the Outstanding Certificates are to be prepaid, the City will direct the principal amount of each Series of the Certificates to be prepaid from among the Certificates scheduled to be paid on various Certificate Payment Dates. Among the Certificates scheduled to be paid on a particular Certificate Payment Date, the Trustee will select Certificates for prepayment by lot in any manner which the Trustee in its sole discretion deems fair and appropriate; provided, however, that the portion of any Certificate to be prepaid will be in Authorized Denominations and all Certificates to remain Outstanding after any prepayment in part will be in Authorized Denominations.

Notice of Prepayment

Notice of prepayment will be given to the respective Owners of Certificates designated for prepayment by Electronic Notice or first-class mail, postage prepaid, at least 30 but not more than 45 days before any prepayment date, at their addresses appearing on the registration books maintained by the Trustee; provided, however, that so long as the DTC book-entry system is used for any Certificates, notice with respect thereto will be given solely to DTC, as nominee of the registered Owner, in accordance with its operational requirements. Notice will also be given as required by the Continuing Disclosure Certificate. See "CONTINUING DISCLOSURE" herein.

Each notice of prepayment will specify: (i) the Certificates or designated portions thereof (in the case of prepayment of the Certificates in part but not in whole) which are to be prepaid, (ii) the date of prepayment, (iii) the place or places where the prepayment will be made, including the name and address of the Trustee, (iv) the prepayment price, (v) the CUSIP numbers (if any) assigned to the Certificates to be prepaid, (vi) the Certificate numbers of the Certificates to be prepaid in whole or in part and, in the case of any Certificate to be prepaid in part only, the amount of such Certificate to be prepaid, and (vii) the original delivery date and stated Certificate Payment Date of each Certificate to be prepaid in whole or in part. Each notice will further state that on the specified date there will become due and payable with respect to each Certificate or portion thereof being prepaid the prepayment price, together with interest represented thereby accrued but unpaid to the prepayment date, and that from and after such date, if sufficient funds are available for prepayment, interest with respect thereto will cease to accrue and be payable. Neither the failure to receive any notice nor any defect therein will affect the proceedings for such prepayment.

Effect of Prepayment

If, on the designated prepayment date, money for the prepayment of all of the Certificates to be prepaid, together with accrued interest to such prepayment date, is held by the Trustee so as to be available for the prepayment on the scheduled prepayment date, and if a prepayment notice has been given as described above, then from and after such prepayment date, no additional interest will become due with respect to the Certificates to be prepaid, and such Certificate or portion thereof will no longer be deemed Outstanding under the provisions of the Trust Agreement; however, all money held by or on behalf of the Trustee for the prepayment of such Certificates will be held in trust for the account of the Owners thereof.

If the City acquires any Certificate by purchase or otherwise, such Certificate will no longer be deemed Outstanding and will be surrendered to the Trustee for cancellation.

Conditional Notice; Cancellation of Optional Prepayment

The City may provide a conditional notice of prepayment and such notice will specify its conditional status.

If the Certificates are subject to optional prepayment, and the Trustee does not have on deposit moneys sufficient to prepay the principal, plus the applicable premium, if any, represented by the Certificates proposed to be prepaid on the date fixed for prepayment, and interest with respect thereto, the prepayment will be canceled, and in such case, the City, the Trustee and the Owners will be restored to their former positions and rights under the Trust Agreement, and the City will continue to pay the Base Rental payments as if no such notice were given. Such a cancellation of an optional prepayment at the election of the City will not constitute a default under the Trust Agreement, and the Trustee and the City will have no liability from such cancellation. In the event of such cancellation, the Trustee will send notice of such cancellation to the Owners in the same manner as the related notice of prepayment. Neither the failure to receive such cancellation notice nor any defect therein will affect the sufficiency of such cancellation.

In the event the City gives notice to the Trustee of its intention to exercise its prepayment option, but fails to deposit with the Trustee on or prior to the prepayment date an amount equal to the prepayment price, or fails to satisfy any condition to a conditional notice, the City will continue to pay the Base Rental payments as if no such notice were given.

Purchase of Certificates

Unless expressly provided in the Trust Agreement, money held in the Base Rental Fund may be used to reimburse the City for the purchase of Certificates that would otherwise be subject to prepayments from such moneys upon the delivery of such Certificates to the Trustee for cancellation at least ten days prior to the date on which the Trustee is required to select Certificates for prepayment. The purchase price of any Certificates purchased by the City will not exceed the applicable prepayment price of the Certificates that would be prepaid but for the operation of this paragraph. Any such purchase must be completed prior to the time notice would otherwise be required to be given to prepay the related Certificates. All Certificates so purchased will be surrendered to the Trustee for cancellation and applied as a credit against the obligation to prepay such Certificates from such moneys.

THE PROJECT AND THE LEASED PROPERTY

The proceeds from sale of the Certificates will be applied by the Trustee (i) for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, equipping and improvement and rehabilitation of the Project, to be operated by the Commission, (ii) to fund the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund established under the Trust Agreement, and (iii) pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates.

A portion of the proceeds of the Certificates will be used to finance the costs of various facilities and improvements owned, operated and/or managed by the Commission, including without limitation the design, demolition, construction, reconstruction, expansion, improvement, equipping, renewal, restoration and/or replacement of the following facilities (collectively, the "Project"): (i) Pier 27, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, which is planned to be used as a cruise terminal and special events facilities, together with related and subordinate facilities (in addition to a plaza/park at the front of the terminal), (ii) a shoreside power facility to be installed at Pier 70, located along 20th Street, San Francisco 94117, including the removal of seven PCB containing transformers, (iii) Piers 30 and 32, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94105, which facility is planned to be used as a team base for the 34th America's Cup, a secondary cruise terminal and other vessel birth, public parking, and a facility for special events, together with related and subordinate facilities, (iv) Pier 19, 23 and 29, located along The Embarcadero, San Francisco 94111, including handrail, apron and storm water improvements, and (v) various capital improvements to these and other Piers located along The Embarcadero.

The Leased Property consists generally of Pier 27 and a portion of the campus of the Laguna Honda Hospital, and the facilities and structures related thereto and the real property on which such facilities are located. Upon final completion of the Cruise Ship Terminal located at Pier 27, the Project Lease provides that the City has the absolute right to make Pier 27 the only Leased Property subject to the Property Lease and the Project Lease, and to release from the Property Lease and the Project

Lease the portion of Laguna Honda Hospital initially included as Leased Property. The Leased Property may be amended, released or substituted from time to time, as provided under the Project Lease. See "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Addition, Release and Substitution of Leased Property" and "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Release and Substitution of the Leased Property."

A portion of the Leased Property consisting of Pier 27 is considered part of the "Port Area," which consists of all real and personal property owned, controlled or operated by the Commission, or over which the Commission has management, supervision or control, or is deemed by the Commission to be a benefit to the Port Area.

ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

Following is a table of estimated sources and uses of funds:

<u>Sources of Funds:</u>	<u>2013A</u>	<u>2013B</u>	<u>2013C</u>
Certificate Par Amount			
Original Issue Premium			
Total Sources			
<u>Uses of Funds:</u>			
Deposit into the Project Account			
2013 Reserve Accounts			
Purchaser's Discount			
Costs of Delivery ⁽¹⁾			
Total Uses			

⁽¹⁾ Includes amounts for legal fees, Trustee's fees and expenses, financial advisory fees, rating agency fees, printing costs and other delivery costs.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank.]

CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The Trust Agreement requires that Base Rental payments payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease be deposited in the Base Rental Fund maintained by the Trustee. Pursuant to the Trust Agreement, the Trustee will apply amounts in the Base Rental Fund as necessary to make principal and interest payments with respect to the Certificates as the same will become due and payable, as shown in the following table.

Payment Date	<u>2013A Certificates</u>			<u>2013B Certificates</u>			<u>2013C Certificates</u>			Fiscal Year Total ⁽¹⁾
	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	Total Principal and Interest	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	Total Principal and Interest	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	Total Principal and Interest	
<hr/>										
Total ⁽¹⁾										

⁽¹⁾ Totals may not add due to independent rounding.

SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES

Source of Payment

The Certificates will evidence and represent proportionate interests in the Base Rental payments required to be made by the City to the Trustee under the Project Lease so long as the City has use and occupancy of the Leased Property. The Project Lease terminates on [September] 1, 20__, or upon early payment of all of the Certificates in accordance with the Trust Agreement, unless extended upon the event of abatement. See "- Abatement of Base Rental Payments" below.

Pursuant to the Trust Agreement, the City will grant to the Trustee, for the benefit of the Owners, a first and exclusive lien on, and security interest in, all amounts on hand from time to time in the funds and accounts established under the Trust Agreement (excluding the Rebate Fund), including: (i) all Base Rental payments received by the Trustee from the City; (ii) the proceeds of any insurance (including the proceeds of any self-insurance and any liquidated damages received in respect of the Leased Property), and eminent domain award not required to be used for repair or replacement of the Project or the Leased Property; (iii) proceeds of rental interruption insurance policies with respect to the Leased Property; (iv) all amounts on hand from time to time in the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and the Base Rental Fund established under the Trust Agreement, including amounts transferred to the Base Rental Fund from other funds and accounts, as provided in the Trust Agreement (including proceeds of the Certificates no longer needed to complete the Project or to pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates); and (v) any additional property subjected to the lien of the Trust Agreement by the City or anyone on its behalf. The City will pay to the Trustee the Base Rental payments to the extent required under the Project Lease, which Base Rental payments are designed to be sufficient, in both time and amount, to pay, when due, the annual principal and interest represented by the Certificates.

Covenant to Budget

The City will covenant in the Project Lease to take such action as may be necessary to include all Rental Payments as a separate line item in its annual budget and to make the necessary annual appropriations for such Rental Payments. The Project Lease provides that such covenants on the part of the City are deemed and construed to be ministerial duties imposed by law and by the Charter, and it is the duty of each and every public official of the City to take such action and do such things as are required by law and by the Charter in the performance of the official duty of such officials to enable the City to carry out and perform the covenants and agreements in the Project Lease agreed to be carried out and performed by the City.

If the City defaults on its covenant in the Project Lease to include all rental payments in the applicable annual budget and such default continues for 60 days or more, the Trustee may retain the Project Lease and hold the City liable for all Rental Payments on an annual basis.

~~The obligation of the City to make Rental Payments is an obligation payable from any legally available funds of the City. For a discussion of the budget and finances of the City, see APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES - CITY BUDGET" and APPENDIX B: "COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012." For a discussion of the City's investment policy regarding pooled cash, see APPENDIX G: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER - INVESTMENT POLICY."~~

Limited Obligation

The obligation of the City to make Base Rental or Additional Rental payments under the Project Lease does not constitute an obligation for which the City is obligated to levy or pledge any form of taxation or for which the City has levied or pledged, any form of taxation. Neither the Certificates nor the obligation of the City to make Base Rental or Additional Rental payments constitutes an indebtedness of the City, the

State or any of its political subdivisions within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory debt limitation or restriction. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Rental Payments Not a Debt of the City."

Base Rental Payments; Additional Rental

Base Rental Payments. The City has covenanted in the Project Lease that, so long as the City has the full use and occupancy of the Leased Property, it will make Base Rental payments to the Trustee from any legally available funds of the City. The Trustee is required by the Trust Agreement to deposit in the Base Rental Fund all Base Rental payments and certain other amounts received and required to be deposited therein, including investment earnings. The total Rental Payment due in any fiscal year will not be in excess of the total fair rental value of the Leased Property for such fiscal year.

The Base Rental payments will be payable by the City on or before the fourth Business Day immediately preceding each Interest Payment Date, provided that any such payment will be for that portion of the applicable period that the City has use and occupancy of all or a portion of the Leased Property. In the event that during any such period the City does not have use and occupancy of all or a portion of the Leased Property due to material damage to, destruction of or condemnation of the Leased Property, or defects in the title to the Leased Property, Base Rental payments are subject to abatement. See "– Abatement of Base Rental Payments" and "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement." The obligation of the City to make Base Rental payments is payable solely from annual appropriations of the City from any legally available funds of the City and the City has covenanted in the Project Lease to take such action as may be necessary to include all Base Rental and Additional Rental due under the Project Lease in its annual budget and to make necessary annual appropriations for all such Base Rental and Additional Rental, subject to the abatement provisions under the Project Lease. See "– Covenant to Budget" above.

Additional Rental and the Working Capital Fund. Additional Rental payments due from the City to the Trustee include, among other things, amounts sufficient to pay any taxes and insurance premiums, and to pay all fees, costs and expenses of the Trustee in connection with the Trust Agreement, deposits required to be made to the Rebate Fund, if any, and all other fees, costs and expenses of the Trustee incurred from time to time in administering the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement. The City is also responsible for repair and maintenance of the Leased Property during the term of the Project Lease. The City may, at its option, pay all or a portion of Additional Rental to the Trustee for deposit in the Working Capital Fund established under the Trust Agreement. Pursuant to the Trust Agreement, the Trustee will keep the Working Capital Fund separate and apart from all funds and moneys held by the Trustee. The Working Capital Fund is not pledged to the payment of the Certificates.

Abatement of Base Rental Payments

The Trustee will collect and receive all of the Base Rental payments, and all payments of Base Rental received by the Trustee under the Project Lease will be deposited into the Base Rental Fund. The City's obligation to make Rental Payments in the amount and on the terms and conditions specified in the Project Lease is absolute and unconditional without any right of set-off or counterclaim, subject only to the provisions of the Project Lease regarding rental abatement. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement."

The City's obligation under the Project Lease to make Rental Payments will be abated during any period in which there is substantial interference with the right to the use and occupancy of the Leased Property or any portion thereof by the City, by reason of material damage, destruction or condemnation of the Leased Property or any portion thereof, or due to defects in title to the Leased Property or any portion thereof, except to the extent of (i) available amounts held by the Trustee in the Base Rental Fund or in the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account or the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund, (ii) amounts, if any, received in respect of rental interruption insurance, and (iii) amounts, if any, otherwise legally available to the City for Rental Payments or to the Trustee for payments in respect of the Certificates. The amount of annual rental abatement will be such that the resulting Rental Payments in any Project Lease Year during which such interference continues do not exceed the annual fair rental value of the portions of the Leased Property with respect to which there has not been substantial interference. Abatement of Base Rental payments will commence with such damage, destruction or condemnation and end when use and occupancy or possession is restored. In the event of abatement, the term of the Project Lease

may be extended until all amounts due under the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement are fully paid, but in no event later than [September] 1, 20___. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement."

In order to mitigate the risk that an abatement event will cause a disruption in payment of Base Rental, the Project Lease requires the City to maintain rental interruption insurance in an amount not less than the aggregate Base Rental payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease for a period of at least 24 months. See "-- Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property" below. During any period of abatement with respect to all or any part of the Leased Property, the Trustee is required to use the proceeds of the rental interruption insurance to make payments of principal and interest represented by the Certificates. The City is also required by the Project Lease to use insurance proceeds to replace or repair Leased Property destroyed or damaged to the extent that there is substantial interference with the City's use and occupancy, or to prepay Certificates such that resulting Rental Payments are sufficient to pay all amounts due under the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement with respect to the Certificates remaining Outstanding. See "--Replacement, Maintenance and Repairs" below. In lieu of abatement of Rental Payments, the City in its sole discretion may elect, but is not obligated, to substitute property for the damaged, condemned or destroyed Leased Property, or portion thereof, pursuant to the substitution provisions of the Project Lease. See "-- Addition, Release and Substitution of Leased Property" below. In addition, the Trust Agreement establishes a 2013A Reserve Account, a 2013B Reserve Account and a 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and requires the Trustee to use any moneys on deposit in the Reserve Fund to make payments of principal and interest represented by the Certificates. See "-- Reserve Fund" below.

Reserve Fund

The Trust Agreement establishes a Reserve Fund that will be held by the Trustee, and within the Reserve Fund, there is created a 2013A Reserve Account, a 2013B Reserve Account and a 2013C Reserve Account to be held with the Trustee. The 2013A Reserve Account will only be available to support payments with respect to the 2013A Certificates and any additional certificates identified in a supplement to the Trust Agreement pursuant to which Additional Certificates are executed and delivered. The 2013B Reserve Account will only be available to support payments with respect to the 2013B Certificates and any additional certificates identified in a supplement to the Trust Agreement pursuant to which Additional Certificates are executed and delivered. The 2013C Reserve Account will only be available to support payments with respect to the 2013C Certificates and any additional certificates identified in a supplement to the Trust Agreement pursuant to which Additional Certificates are executed and delivered. Amounts on deposit in the 2013A Reserve Account may not be used to pay debt service with respect to the 2013B Certificates or the 2013C Certificates, amounts on deposit in the 2013B Reserve Account may not be used to pay debt service with respect to the 2013A Certificates or the 2013C Certificates, and amounts on deposit in the 2013C Reserve Account may not be used to pay debt service with respect to the 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates. Simultaneously with the delivery of the Certificates, the City will cause to be deposited into the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund established under the Trust Agreement a portion of the proceeds of the 2013A Certificates, the 2013B Certificates and the 2013C Certificates, respectively, which amounts will be at least equal to the Reserve Requirement. The Reserve Requirement with respect to the Certificates, as of any date of calculation, is equal to the least of [(1) an amount equal to the maximum annual payments of principal and interest with respect to the 2013A Certificates, the 2013B Certificates or the 2013C Certificates, as applicable, (2) 125% of average annual payments of principal and interest with respect to the 2013A Certificates, the 2013B Certificates or the 2013C Certificates, as applicable, or (3) 10% of the initial principal amount represented by the 2013A Certificates, the 2013B Certificates or the 2013C Certificates, as applicable]. As of the date of delivery of the Certificates, the Reserve Requirement is \$ _____.

The Reserve Fund is required to be maintained by the Trustee until the Base Rental is paid in full pursuant to the Project Lease or until there are no longer any Certificates Outstanding; provided, however, that the final Base Rental payment may, at the City's option, be paid from the Reserve Fund.

A Credit Facility in the amount of the Reserve Requirement may be substituted by the City at any time for all or a portion of the funds held by the Trustee in the Reserve Fund, provided that (i) such substitution will not result in the reduction or withdrawal of any ratings by any Rating Agency with respect to the Certificates at the time of such substitution (and the City will notify each Rating Agency prior to making any such substitution), and (ii) the Trustee will receive an opinion of Independent Counsel stating that such substitution will not, by itself, adversely affect the exclusion from gross income for federal income tax purposes of interest components of the Base Rental

evidenced and represented by the Certificates. If the Credit Facility is a surety bond or insurance policy, such Credit Facility will be for the term of the Certificates. Amounts on deposit in the Reserve Fund for which a Credit Facility has been substituted will be transferred as directed in writing by a City Representative.

If on any Interest Payment Date the amounts on deposit in the Base Rental Fund are less than the principal and interest payments due with respect to the Certificates on such date, the Trustee will transfer from the Reserve Fund for credit to the Base Rental Fund an amount sufficient to make up such deficiency (provided that if the amounts on deposit in a Reserve Account within the Reserve Fund are restricted to a series of Certificates, then such amounts will only be available for such series of Certificates). In the event of any such transfer, the Trustee will immediately provide written notice to the City of the amount and the date of such transfer.

Any moneys in the Reserve Fund in excess of the Reserve Requirement on each [March] 1 and [September] 1, commencing [September 1, 2013], and at such other time or times as directed by the City, will be transferred to the Base Rental Fund and applied to the payment of the principal of and interest with respect to the Certificates on the next succeeding Interest Payment Date, or transferred to such other fund as the City may designate. The Reserve Fund may secure Additional Certificates on a parity basis or, alternatively, a separate account in the Reserve Fund may be established for one or more series of Additional Certificates.

Replacement, Maintenance and Repairs

The Project Lease requires the City, at its own expense and as determined and specified by the Director of Real Estate of the City, to maintain or cause to be maintained the Leased Property in good order, condition and repair during the term of the Project Lease. The Trust Agreement requires that if the Leased Property or any portion thereof is damaged or destroyed or taken by eminent domain, the City must elect to either prepay the Certificates or replace or repair the affected portion of the Leased Property in accordance with the Project Lease, provided however that the City's obligation to repair or replace any portion of the Leased Property pursuant to the Project Lease will be subject to the availability of proceeds of insurance or condemnation for such purpose. Under the Project Lease, the City must replace any portion of the Leased Property that is destroyed or damaged or taken by eminent domain, to such an extent that there is substantial interference with its right to the use and occupancy of the Leased Property or any portion thereof that would result in an abatement of Rental Payments or any portion thereof pursuant to the Project Lease; provided, however, that the City is not required to repair or replace any such portion of the Leased Property if there is applied to the prepayment of Outstanding Certificates insurance or condemnation proceeds or other legally available funds are sufficient to prepay: (i) all of the Certificates Outstanding and to pay all other amounts due under the Project Lease and under the Trust Agreement or (ii) any portion of the Certificates such that the resulting Rental Payments payable in any Project Lease Year following such partial prepayment are sufficient to pay in the then current and any future Project Lease Year the principal and interest evidenced and represented by all Certificates to remain Outstanding and all other amounts due under the Project Lease and under the Trust Agreement to the extent they are due and payable in such Project Lease Year.

Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, in the event any proceeds of insurance or condemnation relate to Leased Property that is within the Port Area, either (i) such proceeds will be applied to the cost of repair or replacement of such Leased Property or the affected portion thereof, (ii) the City will, subject to the limitations set forth under that certain Indenture of Trust, dated as of February 1, 2010, by and between the Commission and the trustee thereunder (as amended or supplemented from time to time, the "Port Indenture"), acquire and/or construct a new facility that will be substituted as the Leased Property pursuant to the Project Lease, or (iii) the City will otherwise substitute another site and facility as the Leased Property under the Project Lease. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – THE PROJECT LEASE."

Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property

The Project Lease requires the City to maintain or cause to be maintained throughout the term of the Project Lease: (i) general liability insurance against damages occasioned by construction of improvements to or operation of the Leased Property with minimum coverage limits of \$5,000,000 combined single limit for bodily and personal injury and property damage per occurrence, which general liability insurance may be maintained as part of or in conjunction with any other liability insurance coverage maintained or caused by the City to be maintained;

(ii) all risk property insurance on all structures constituting any part of the Leased Property in an amount equal to the Outstanding principal amount of Certificates, with such insurance covering, as nearly as practicable, loss or damage by fire, lightning, explosion, windstorm, hail, riot, civil commotion, vandalism, malicious mischief, aircraft, vehicle damage, smoke and such other hazards as are normally covered by such insurance (excluding earthquakes and flood), including a replacement cost endorsement; (iii) boiler and machinery insurance, comprehensive form, insuring against accidents to pressure vessels and mechanical and electrical equipment, with a property damage limit not less than \$5,000,000 per accident; and (iv) rental interruption insurance in an amount not less than the aggregate Base Rental payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease for a period of 24 months (such amount may be adjusted to reflect the actual scheduled Base Rental payments due under the Project Lease for the next succeeding 24 months) to insure against loss of rental income from the Leased Property caused by perils covered by the insurance described in (ii) above. All policies of insurance required under the Project Lease may provide for a deductible amount that is commercially reasonable as determined by the City Risk Manager.

The Project Lease further requires the City to maintain earthquake insurance in an amount equal to the Outstanding principal amount of the Certificates (to the extent commercially available, in the judgment of the City's Risk Manager); provided that no such earthquake insurance is required if the Risk Manager files a written recommendation annually with the Trustee that such insurance is not obtainable in reasonable amounts at reasonable costs on the open market from reputable insurance companies. Based upon current market conditions and the recommendations of the Risk Manager of the City, the City has determined not to obtain earthquake insurance as of the date of this Official Statement.

The City is also required under the Project Lease to deliver to the Trustee, on the date of execution and delivery of the Certificates, evidence of the commitment of a title insurance company to issue a policy of title insurance (with no survey required), in an amount at least equal to the initial aggregate principal amount of the Certificates, showing a leasehold interest in the Leased Property in the name of the Trustee, and naming the insured parties as the City and the Trustee, for the benefit of the Owners of the Certificates, and to deliver such policy to the Trustee promptly after the execution and delivery of the Certificates.

The City may self-insure against any of the risks required to be insured against in the Project Lease, except for self-insurance for rental interruption insurance and title insurance. Except for all risk property insurance on the Leased Property, the City expects to self-insure for all other hazards for which the Project Lease permits self-insurance. *[Please confirm.]*

Eminent Domain

If all of the Leased Property, or so much thereof as to render the remainder of the Leased Property unusable for the City's purposes under the Project Lease, is taken under the power of eminent domain: (i) the City may, at its option, replace the Leased Property or (ii) the Project Lease will terminate and the proceeds of any condemnation award will be paid to the Trustee for application to the prepayment of Certificates. If less than a substantial portion of the Leased Property is taken under the power of eminent domain, and the remainder is useable for the City's purposes, the Project Lease will continue in full force and effect as to the remaining portions of the Leased Property, subject only to its rental abatement provisions. Any condemnation award will be paid to the Trustee for application to the replacement of the portion of the Leased Property taken or to the partial prepayment of Certificates.

Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, in the event any proceeds of insurance or condemnation relate to Leased Property that is within the Port Area, either (i) such proceeds will be applied to the cost of repair or replacement of such Leased Property or the affected portion thereof, (ii) the City will, subject to the limitations set forth under the Port Indenture, acquire and/or construct a new facility that will be substituted as the Leased Property pursuant to the Project Lease, or (iii) the City will otherwise substitute another site and facility as the Leased Property under the Project Lease. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – TRUST AGREEMENT – Eminent Domain" and "– THE PROJECT LEASE – Eminent Domain."

Addition, Release and Substitution of Leased Property

If no Project Lease Event of Default has occurred and is continuing, the Project Lease may be modified or amended at any time, and the Trustee may consent thereto without the consent of the Owners, if such amendment is to modify or amend the description of the Leased Property or to release from the Project Lease any portion of the Leased Property, or to add other property and improvements to the Leased Property or substitute other property and improvements for the Leased Property, upon satisfaction of the conditions to such amendment and substitution in the Project Lease.

Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the Project Lease provides that upon final completion of the Cruise Ship Terminal located at Pier 27, the City has the absolute right to make Pier 27 the only Leased Property subject to the Property Lease and the Project Lease, and to release from the Property Lease and the Project Lease the portion of Laguna Honda Hospital initially included as Leased Property. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – THE PROJECT LEASE – Addition, Release and Substitution."

Additional Certificates

The Trust Agreement and the Project Lease may be amended from time to time to authorize one or more series of Additional Certificates secured by Base Rental payments under the Project Lease on a parity with the Outstanding Certificates, provided that, among other requirements, the Base Rental payable under the amended Project Lease is sufficient to pay all principal of and interest with respect to the Outstanding Certificates and such Additional Certificates, and that the amended Base Rental is not in excess of the fair rental value of the Leased Premises.

CERTAIN RISK FACTORS

The following risk factors should be considered by potential investors, along with all other information in this Official Statement, in evaluating the risks inherent in the purchase of the Certificates. The following discussion is not meant to be a comprehensive or definitive list of the risks associated with an investment in the Certificates. The order in which this information is presented does not necessarily reflect the relative importance of the various issues. Any one or more of the risk factors discussed below, among others, could lead to a decrease in the market value and/or in the liquidity of the Certificates. There can be no assurance that other risk factors not discussed herein will not become material in the future.

Rental Payments Not a Debt of the City

The obligation of the City to make Base Rental or Additional Rental payments does not constitute an obligation of the City to levy or pledge any form of taxation or for which the City has levied or pledged any form of taxation. The obligation of the City to make Base Rental or Additional Rental payments does not constitute an indebtedness of the City, the State or any of its political subdivisions within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory debt limitation or restriction.

The Certificates represent and are payable solely from Base Rental payments made by the City pursuant to the Project Lease and amounts held in the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and the Base Rental Fund established pursuant to the Trust Agreement, subject to the provisions of the Trust Agreement permitting the application of such amounts for the purposes and on the terms and conditions set forth therein. The City will be obligated to make Rental Payments subject to the terms of the Project Lease, and neither the City nor any of its officers will incur any liability or any other obligation with respect to the delivery of the Certificates.

Additional Obligations

Subject to certain City Charter restrictions, the City may incur other obligations, which may constitute additional charges against its revenues, without the consent of the Owners of the Certificates. There are no restrictions in the Trust Agreement against the City incurring additional lease and other obligations payable from the City's General Fund. To the extent that the City incurs additional obligations, the funds available to make payments of Base Rental may be decreased. The City is currently liable on other obligations payable from its general revenues. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Capital Financing and Bonds – Overlapping Debt," "– Tax Supported Debt Service," and "– Lease Payments and Other Long-Term Obligations." See also APPENDIX B: "COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012."

Abatement

The obligation of the City under the Project Lease to make Base Rental payments is in consideration for the use and right of occupancy of the Leased Property.

In the case of abatement relating to the Leased Property, the amount of annual rental abatement would be such that the resulting Rental Payments in any Project Lease Year during which such interference continues do not exceed the annual fair rental value of the portions of the Leased Property with respect to which there has not been substantial interference, as evidenced by a certificate of a City Representative. Such abatement would continue for the period commencing with the date of such damage, destruction, condemnation or discovery of such title defect and ending with the restoration of the Leased Property or portion thereof to tenantable condition or correction of the title defect; and the term of the Project Lease will be extended by the period during which the rental is abated under the Project Lease, except that such extension will in no event extend beyond [September 1, 20__]. Reserve Fund moneys and the proceeds of rental interruption insurance may be used by the Trustee to make payments with respect to the Certificates in the event Base Rental payments received by the Trustee are insufficient to pay principal or interest represented by the Certificates as such amounts become due. See "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property." and "SECURITY AND SOURCES OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Replacement, Maintenance and Repairs" for additional provisions governing damage to the Leased Property.

In addition, even if such amounts are sufficient to make such payments, moneys remaining in the Reserve Fund after such payments may be less than the Reserve Fund Requirement. The City is not required by the Project Lease or the Trust Agreement, and cannot be compelled, to replenish the Reserve Fund to the Reserve Fund Requirement.

It is not possible to predict the circumstances under which such an abatement of Base Rental payments may occur. In addition, there is no statute, case or other law specifying how such an abatement of rental should be measured. For example, it is not clear whether fair rental value is established as of commencement of the Project Lease or at the time of the abatement. If the latter, it may be that the value of the Leased Property is substantially higher or lower than its value at the time of execution and delivery of the Certificates. Abatement, therefore, could have an uncertain and material adverse effect on the security for and payment of the Certificates.

If damage, destruction, condemnation or title defect with respect to the Leased Property or any portion thereof results in abatement of Base Rental payments and the resulting Base Rental payments, together with moneys in the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and any available insurance proceeds, are insufficient to make all payments with respect to the Certificates during the period that the Leased Property, or portion thereof, is being restored, then all or a portion of such payments may not be made and no remedy is available to the Trustee or the Owners under the Project Lease or Trust Agreement for nonpayment under such circumstances. Failure to pay principal of, premium, if any, or interest with respect to the Certificates as a result of abatement of the City's obligation to make Rental Payments under the Project Lease is not an event of default under the Trust Agreement or the Project Lease.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement specifying the extent of abatement in the event of the City's failure to have use and possession of the Leased Property, such provisions may be superseded by operation of law, and, in such event, the resulting Base Rental payments of the City may not be sufficient to pay all of that portion of the remaining principal and interest with respect to the Certificates.

Reserve Fund

At the time of delivery of the Certificates, proceeds of the 2013A Certificates in the amount of \$ _____ will be deposited in the 2013A Reserve Account, proceeds of the 2013B Certificates in the amount of \$ _____ will be deposited in the 2013B Reserve Account, and proceeds of the 2013C Certificates in the amount of \$ _____ will be deposited in the 2013C Reserve Account. In the event of abatement or default, the amounts on deposit in the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund may be significantly less than the amount of Base Rental due at the time of abatement or default.

Limited Recourse on Default; No Reletting of the Leased Property

The Project Lease and the Trust Agreement provide that, if there is a default by the City, the Trustee may enforce all of its rights and remedies under the Project Lease, including the right to recover Base Rental payments as they become due under the Project Lease by pursuant any remedy available in law or in equity, other than by terminating the Project Lease or re-entering and reletting the Leased Property, or except as expressly provided in the Project Lease. The City is not required by the Project Lease or the Trust Agreement, and cannot be compelled, to replenish the 2013A Reserve Account, the 2013B Reserve Account and the 2013C Reserve Account to the Reserve Fund Requirement. In addition, the Project Lease provides that no remedies may be exercised so as to cause the interest with respect to the Certificates to be includable in gross income for federal income tax purposes or subject to State personal income taxes. The enforcement of any remedies provided for in the Project Lease and in the Trust Agreement could prove to be both expensive and time consuming.

The Project Lease provides that any remedies on default will be exercised by the Trustee. Upon the occurrence and continuance of the City's failure to deposit with the Trustee any Base Rental and/or Additional Rental payments when due, or if the City breaches any other terms, covenants or conditions contained in the Project Lease, the Property Lease or in the Trust Agreement (and does not remedy such breach with all reasonable dispatch within 60 days after notice thereof or, if such breach cannot be remedied within such 60-day period, the City fails to take corrective action within such 60-day period and diligently pursue the same to completion), the Trustee may proceed (and, upon written request of the Owners of not less than a majority in aggregate principal amount of Certificates then outstanding, will proceed), without any further notice, to enforce all of its rights and remedies under the Project Lease, including the right to recover Base Rental payments as they become due by pursuing any remedy available in law or in equity, other than by terminating the Project Lease or re-entering and reletting the Leased Property, or except as expressly provided in the Project Lease. The Project Lease does not allow the remedy of re-entering and reletting of the Leased Property.

Enforcement of Remedies

The enforcement of any remedies provided in the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement could prove both expensive and time consuming. The rights and remedies provided in the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement may be limited by and are subject to the limitations on legal remedies against cities and counties in the State, including State constitutional limits on expenditures, and limitations on the enforcement of judgments against funds needed to serve the public welfare and interest; by federal bankruptcy laws, as now or hereafter enacted; applicable bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium, or similar laws relating to or affecting the enforcement of creditors' rights generally, now or hereafter in effect; equity principles which may limit the specific enforcement under State law of certain remedies; the exercise by the United States of America of the powers delegated to it by the Constitution; the reasonable and necessary exercise, in certain exceptional situations, of the police powers inherent in the sovereignty of the State and its governmental bodies in the interest of serving a significant and legitimate public purpose, and the limitations on remedies against municipal corporations in the State. Bankruptcy proceedings, or the exercise of powers by the federal or State government, if initiated, could subject the Owners of

the Certificates to judicial discretion and interpretation of their rights in bankruptcy or otherwise, and consequently may entail risks of delay, limitation, or modification of their rights.

The legal opinions to be delivered concurrently with the delivery of the Certificates will be qualified, as to the enforceability of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Project Lease, the Property Lease and other related documents, by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium, arrangement, fraudulent conveyance and other laws relating to or affecting creditors' rights, to the application of equitable principles, to the exercise of judicial discretion in appropriate cases, and to the limitations on legal remedies against charter cities and counties and non-profit public benefit corporations in the State. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Bankruptcy" herein.

No Acceleration on Default

In the event of a default, there is no remedy of acceleration of the total Base Rental payments for the term of the Project Lease. Any suit for money damages would be subject to the legal limitations on remedies against cities and counties in the State, including a limitation on enforcement of judgments against funds needed to serve the public welfare and interest.

Release and Substitution of the Leased Property

The Project Lease permits the release of portions of the Leased Property or the substitution of other real property for all or a portion of the Leased Property. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – The Project Lease – Addition, Release and Substitution." Although the Project Lease requires that the substitute property have an annual fair rental value upon becoming part of the Leased Property equal to the maximum annual amount of the Base Rental payments remaining due with respect to the Leased Property being replaced, it does not require that such substitute property have an annual fair rental value equal to the total annual fair rental value at the time of replacement of the Leased Property or portion thereof being replaced. In addition, such replacement property could be located anywhere within (or outside) the City's boundaries. Therefore, release or substitution of all or a portion of the Leased Property could have an adverse effect on the security for the Certificates. Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the Project Lease provides that upon final completion of the Cruise Ship Terminal located at Pier 27, the City has the absolute right to make Pier 27 the only Leased Property subject to the Property Lease and the Project Lease, and to release from the Property Lease and the Project Lease the portion of Laguna Honda Hospital initially included as Leased Property.

Seismic Risks

The City and the Leased Property are located in a seismically active region. Active earthquake faults underlie both the City and the surrounding Bay Area, including the San Andreas Fault, which passes about three miles to the southeast of the City's border, and the Hayward Fault, which runs under Oakland, Berkeley and other cities on the east side of San Francisco Bay, about 10 miles away. Significant recent seismic events include the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, centered about 60 miles south of the City, which registered 6.9 on the Richter scale of earthquake intensity. That earthquake caused fires, building collapses, and structural damage to buildings and highways in the City and environs. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the only east-west vehicle access into the City, was closed for a month for repairs, and several highways in the City were permanently closed and eventually removed.

In April 2008, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (a collaborative effort of the U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.), the California Geological Society, and the Southern California Earthquake Center) reported that there is a 63% chance that one or more quakes of about magnitude 6.7 or larger will occur in the Bay Area before the year 2038. Such earthquakes may be very destructive. For example, the U.S.G.S. predicts a magnitude 7 earthquake occurring today on the Hayward Fault would likely cause hundreds of deaths and almost \$100 billion of damage. In addition to the potential damage to City-owned buildings and facilities, including the Leased Property (on which the City does not generally carry earthquake insurance), due to the importance of San Francisco as a tourist destination and regional hub of commercial, retail and entertainment activity, a major earthquake anywhere in the Bay Area may cause significant temporary and possibly longer-term harm to the City's economy, tax receipts, and residential and business real property values.

The Leased Property is located near the geographic center of the City and is therefore in a seismically active region. The obligation of the City to make payments of Base Rental may be abated if the Leased Property or any improvements thereon are damaged or destroyed by natural hazard such as earthquake or flood. The City is not obligated under the Project Lease to maintain earthquake insurance on the Leased Property so long as the City's Risk Manager determines that such insurance is not obtainable in reasonable amounts at reasonable costs on the open market from reputable insurance companies, and the City does not expect to obtain earthquake insurance.

Risk Management and Insurance

The Project Lease obligates the City to maintain and keep in force various forms of insurance, subject to deductibles, on the Leased Property for repair or replacement in the event of damage or destruction to the Leased Property. The City is also required to maintain rental interruption insurance in an amount equal to but not less than 24 months Base Rental payments. The Project Lease allows the City to insure against any or all risks, except rental interruption and title defects, through an alternative risk management program such as self-insurance. The City makes no representation as to the ability of any insurer to fulfill its obligations under any insurance policy provided for in the Project Lease and no assurance can be given as to the adequacy of any such insurance to fund necessary repair or replacement or to pay principal of and interest with respect to the Certificates when due.

The City employs a full-time Risk Manager, as well as safety and loss control professionals, for the prevention and mitigation of property, liability and employee claims for injury or damage. For information concerning the self insurance and risk management programs of the City see APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT – Risk Retention Program."

State Law Limitations on Appropriations

Article XIII B of the State Constitution limits the amount that local governments can appropriate annually. The ability of the City to make Base Rental payments may be affected if the City should exceed its appropriations limit. The City does not anticipate exceeding its appropriations limit in the foreseeable future. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES – Article XIII B of the California Constitution."

Changes in Law

The City cannot provide any assurance that the State Legislature or the City's Board of Supervisors will not enact legislation that will result in a reduction of the City's General Fund revenues and therefore a reduction of the funds legally available to the City to make Base Rental payments. See, for example, Appendix A: "City and County of San Francisco Organization and Finances – CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES – Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution" herein. See also Appendix A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT – Risk Retention Program."

The General Fund of the City, which is the source of payment of the principal and interest evidenced by the Certificates, may also be adversely affected by actions taken (or not taken) by voters. Under the State Constitution, the voters of the State have the ability to initiate legislation and require a public vote on legislation passed by the State Legislature through the powers of initiative and referendum, respectively. Under the City's Charter, the voters of the City can restrict or revise the powers of the City through the approval of a Charter amendment. The City is unable to predict whether any such initiatives might be submitted to or approved by the voters, the nature of such initiatives, or their potential impact on the City.

Bankruptcy

In addition to the limitations on remedies contained in the Trust Agreement and the Project Lease, the rights and remedies in the Trust Agreement and the Project Lease may be limited and are subject to the provisions of

federal bankruptcy laws, as now or hereafter enacted, and to other laws or equitable principles that may affect the enforcement of creditors' rights.

The City is authorized under California law to file for bankruptcy protection under Chapter 9 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (Title 11, United States Code) (the "Bankruptcy Code"), which governs the bankruptcy proceedings for public agencies such as the City. Third parties, however, cannot bring involuntary bankruptcy proceedings against the City. If the City were to file a petition under Chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Certificate Owners and the Trustee could be prohibited from or delayed in taking steps to enforce their rights under the Trust Agreement and the Project Lease and from taking steps to collect amounts due from the City under the Project Lease. In any event, the mere filing by the City for bankruptcy protection likely would have a material adverse effect on the marketability and market price of the Certificates.

The Trust Agreement will state that the Trustee has entered into such agreement in its capacity as trustee and not in its individual corporate capacity. Were the Trustee to fail or become insolvent, federal regulatory authorities such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States would have broad authority respecting the assets and liabilities of the Trustee. No opinion will be delivered in connection with the delivery of the Certificates to the effect that the Leased Property or payments by the City under the Project Lease do not constitute property of the Trustee or that the Trust Agreement or the Certificates do not constitute obligations of the Trustee. Were the Trustee to fail or become insolvent, the Project Lease, the Trust Agreement and/or the Certificates could be determined to be assets and/or liabilities of the Trustee. In such event, the holders of the Certificates could suffer a significant delay in payment and/or a loss of some portion or all of their investment.

State of California Financial Condition

The State has for a number of years experienced, and continues to experience, significant financial and budgetary stress. The City receives a significant portion of its funding from the State. The City's fiscal year 2012-13 Adopted Budget projects that approximately 14.0% of the City's General Fund revenues will come from State sources.

On January 10, 2013, the Governor released his 2013-14 Proposed Budget (the "2013-14 Proposed Budget"). The 2013-14 Proposed Budget projects improvement in the State's finances, due to the economic recovery, prior budgetary restraint, and the approval of Proposition 30, which temporarily increases the maximum marginal personal income tax rates for individuals, heads of households and joint filers above 9.3 percent by creating three additional tax brackets of 10.3 percent, 11.3 percent and 12.3 percent.

For fiscal year 2012-13, the administration estimates that General Fund revenues will be \$95.4 billion and expenditures will be \$93 billion, resulting in a \$2.4 billion operating surplus. This \$2.4 billion surplus is expected to erase the \$2.2 billion deficit remaining after fiscal year 2011-12 and leave the General Fund with a small reserve as it enters fiscal year 2013-14. The 2013-14 Proposed Budget projects fiscal year 2013-14 General Fund revenues and transfers of \$98.5 billion and total expenditures of \$97.7 billion, producing an \$851 million operating surplus. The 2013-14 Proposed Budget also estimates that the General Fund will end fiscal year 2013-14 with a \$1 billion reserve. The 2013-14 Proposed Budget is projected to be balanced by a small margin and cautions that the occurrence of certain events, including among other things, shifts of costs to the State from the federal government, the uncertainty of the economic recovery in the State and the country, actions taken by the federal government and the judicial system and rising health care costs pose risks to the State's budget performance.

Features of the 2013-14 Proposed Budget which may affect the City include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("ACA") provides states with the option to expand Medi-Cal coverage to certain adults with incomes up to 138 percent of the federal poverty level who are not currently eligible. The 2013-14 Proposed Budget suggests two alternatives for this optional expansion: (i) the State would administer an expanded version of its current Medi-Cal Program, or (ii) counties would administer the expansion. Under the second approach, counties would

have operational and fiscal responsibility for implementing the expansion. Operational responsibilities include some functions performed by the State and Medi-Cal managed care plans to administer the program, such as establishing networks of providers, setting payment rates to providers, and processing claims billed by providers. The ACA also includes provisions that will likely result in additional enrollment among the currently eligible Medi-Cal population;

- The 2013-14 Proposed Budget assumes General Fund savings from the dissolution of redevelopment agencies of \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 2013-14. These amounts are approximately \$1.6 billion lower than the assumption used in the 2012-13 State Budget Act. In those areas that contained redevelopment agencies, it is estimated that over the current year and budget year, approximately \$1.6 billion will be distributed back to counties, \$1.2 billion will be distributed back to cities, and \$400 million will be distributed back to special districts; and
- The 2013-14 Proposed Budget provides \$9 billion for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation in fiscal year 2013-14, representing an increase of \$33 million above the fiscal year 2012-13 level. The 2013-14 Proposed Budget assumes a decrease in the average inmate and parolee population due to the realignment of responsibility for housing and supervising various lower-level adult offenders from the State to the counties. Despite the projected decrease in population, the inmate population is expected to exceed a federal court-imposed cap on prison population by approximately 7,000 inmates at the end of fiscal year 2012-13. Any plan to reduce the inmate population further would have budgetary impacts, although the exact amount would depend on specific changes included in the plan.

The City cannot predict the extent of the budgetary problems the State will encounter in this or in any future fiscal years, and, it is not clear what measures would be taken by the State to balance its budget, as required by law. Accordingly, the City cannot predict the final outcome of future State budget negotiations, the impact that such budgets will have on its finances and operations or what actions will be taken in the future by the State Legislature and Governor to deal with changing State revenues and expenditures. Current and future State budgets will be affected by national and State economic conditions and other factors over which the City has no control. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – CITY BUDGET – Adopted Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget" and "– Impact of State Budget on City Budget."

U.S. Government 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. On March 1, 2013 automatic spending cuts to federal defense and other discretionary spending (referred to as "sequestration") went into effect and will continue for nine years unless further action is taken by Congress. At this time, the only certain reduction to City revenue due to sequestration is the loss of \$2.0 million in Medicare revenue. The City cannot predict the ultimate outcome of federal budget deliberations. For more information on the potential impact of sequestration on the City's finances and operations, see APPENDIX A – "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – CITY BUDGET – Impact of Federal Budget Tax Increases and Expenditure Reductions on Local Finances." See also APPENDIX A – "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" and "– INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS."

Taxability Risk

As discussed herein under the caption "TAX MATTERS," interest with respect to the Certificates could become includable in gross income for purposes of federal income taxation retroactive to the date the Certificates were executed and delivered as a result of future acts or omissions of the City in violation of its covenants contained in the Trust Agreement or the Project Lease. There is no provision in the Certificates, the Trust Agreement or the Project Lease for special prepayment or acceleration or for the payment of additional interest should such an event

of taxability occur, and the Certificates would remain outstanding until maturity or until redeemed under one of the other redemption provisions contained in the Trust Agreement.

In addition, Congress has considered in the past, is currently considering and may consider in the future, legislative proposals, including some that carry retroactive effective dates, that, if enacted, would alter or eliminate the exclusion from gross income for federal income tax purposes of interest on municipal bonds, such as the Certificates. Prospective purchasers of the Certificates should consult their own tax advisors regarding any pending or proposed federal tax legislation. The City can provide no assurance that federal tax law will not change while the Certificates are outstanding or that any such changes will not adversely affect the exclusion of interest with respect to the Certificates from gross income for federal income tax purposes. If the exclusion of interest with respect to the Certificates from gross income for federal income tax purposes were amended or eliminated, it is likely that the market price for the Certificates would be adversely impacted.

Other

There may be other risk factors inherent in ownership of the Certificates in addition to those described in this section.

TAX MATTERS

In the opinion of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation and Lofton & Jennings, Co-Special Counsel to the City, subject, however to the qualifications set forth below, under existing law, the portion of lease payments designated as and comprising interest and received by the owners of the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes, except, with respect to the 2013B Certificates, during any period while a 2013B Certificate is held by a "substantial user" of the facilities financed by the 2013B Certificates or by a "related person" within the meaning of Section 147(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Tax Code"). With respect to the 2013A Certificates, such interest is not an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals and corporations, although for the purpose of computing the alternative minimum tax imposed on certain corporations, such interest is taken into account in determining certain income and earnings. With respect to the 2013B Certificates, however, such interest is an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals and corporations. Interest with respect to the Taxable 2013C Certificates is not excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes.

The opinions set forth in the preceding paragraph are subject to the condition that the City will comply with all requirements of the Tax Code that must be satisfied subsequent to the issuance of the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates. The City has covenanted to comply with each such requirement. Failure to comply with certain of such requirements may cause the inclusion of interest with respect to the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates in gross income for federal income tax purposes to be retroactive to the date of issuance of the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates.

If the initial offering price to the public (excluding bond houses and brokers) at which a 2013A Certificate or a 2013B Certificate is sold is less than the amount payable at maturity thereof, then such difference constitutes "original issue discount" for purposes of federal income taxes and State of California personal income taxes. If the initial offering price to the public (excluding bond houses and brokers) at which a 2013A Certificate or a 2013B Certificate is sold is greater than the amount payable at maturity thereof, then such difference constitutes "original issue premium" for purposes of federal income taxes and State of California personal income taxes. *De minimis* original issue discount and original issue premium is disregarded.

Under the Tax Code, original issue discount is treated as interest excluded from federal gross income and exempt from State of California personal income taxes to the extent properly allocable to each owner thereof subject to the limitations described in the first paragraph of this section. The original issue discount accrues over the term to maturity of the 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates, as applicable, on the basis of a constant interest rate compounded on each interest or principal payment date (with straight-line interpolations between compounding dates). The amount of original issue discount accruing during each period is added to the adjusted basis of such

2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates, as applicable, to determine taxable gain upon disposition (including sale, redemption, or payment on maturity) of such 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates, as applicable. The Tax Code contains certain provisions relating to the accrual of original issue discount in the case of purchasers of the 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates who purchase the 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates after the initial offering of a substantial amount of such maturity. Owners of such 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates should consult their own tax advisors with respect to the tax consequences of ownership of 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates with original issue discount, including the treatment of purchasers who do not purchase in the original offering, the allowance of a deduction for any loss on a sale or other disposition, and the treatment of accrued original issue discount on such 2013A Certificates or 2013B Certificates under federal individual and corporate alternative minimum taxes.

Under the Tax Code, original issue premium is amortized on an annual basis over the term of the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates (said term being the shorter of the 2013A Certificates' and the 2013B Certificates' maturity date or its call date). The amount of original issue premium amortized each year reduces the adjusted basis of the owner of the 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates, as applicable, for purposes of determining taxable gain or loss upon disposition. The amount of original issue premium on the 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates is amortized each year over the term to maturity of the 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates, as applicable, on the basis of a constant interest rate compounded on each interest or principal payment date (with straight-line interpolations between compounding dates). Amortized premium with respect to a 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates is not deductible for federal income tax purposes. Owners of premium 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates, including purchasers who do not purchase in the original offering, should consult their own tax advisors with respect to State of California personal income tax and federal income tax consequences of owning such 2013A Certificates or the 2013B Certificates, as applicable.

In the further opinion of Co-Special Counsel, the portion of lease payments designated as and comprising interest and received by the owners of the Certificates is exempt from California personal income taxes.

Owners of the Certificates should also be aware that the ownership or disposition of, or the accrual or receipt of interest with respect to, the Certificates may have federal or state tax consequences other than as described above. Co-Special Counsel expresses no opinion regarding any federal or state tax consequences arising with respect to the Certificates other than as expressly described above.

Current and future legislative proposals, if enacted into law, clarification of the Code or court decisions may cause interest on the 2013A Certificates and the 2013B Certificates to be subject, directly or indirectly, to federal income taxation or may cause interest on the Certificates to be subject to or no longer exempt from state income taxation, or otherwise prevent beneficial owners from realizing the full current benefit of the tax status of such interest. The introduction or enactment of any such legislative proposals, clarification of the Code or court decisions may also affect the market price for, or marketability of, the Certificates. Prospective purchasers of the Certificates should consult their own tax advisors regarding any pending or proposed federal or state tax legislation, regulations or litigation, as to which Co-Special Counsel expresses no opinion.

OTHER LEGAL MATTERS

Certain legal matters incident to the authorization, issuance and sale of the Certificates and with regard to the tax status of the interest represented by the Certificates (see "TAX MATTERS" herein) are subject to the separate legal opinions of Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation, San Francisco, California and Lofton & Jennings, San Francisco, California Co-Special Counsel. The signed legal opinions of Co-Special Counsel, dated and premised on facts existing and law in effect as of the date of original delivery of the Certificates, will be delivered to the initial purchaser of the Certificates at the time of original delivery of the Certificates.

The proposed form of the legal opinions of Co-Special Counsel are set forth in APPENDIX F hereto. The legal opinions to be delivered may vary that text if necessary to reflect facts and law on the date of delivery. The opinions will speak only as of their date, and subsequent distributions of it by recirculation of this Official Statement or otherwise will create no implication that Co-Special Counsel have reviewed or express any opinion concerning any of the matters referred to in the opinion subsequent to its date. In rendering their opinions, Co-Special Counsel

will rely upon certificates and representations of facts to be contained in the transcript of proceedings for the Certificates, which Co-Special Counsel will not have independently verified.

Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by the City Attorney and by Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California, Disclosure Counsel.

Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California has served as disclosure counsel to the City and in such capacity has advised the City with respect to applicable securities laws and participated with responsible Commission and City officials and staff in conferences and meetings where information contained in this Official Statement was reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Disclosure Counsel is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the statements or information presented in this Official Statement and has not undertaken to independently verify any of such statements or information. Rather, the City is solely responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the statements and information contained in this Official Statement. Upon the delivery of the Certificates, Disclosure Counsel will deliver a letter to the City which advises the City, subject to the assumptions, exclusions, qualifications and limitations set forth therein, that no facts came to attention of the firm which caused them to believe that this Official Statement as of its date and as of the date of delivery of the Certificates contained or contains any untrue statement of a material fact or omitted or omits to state any material fact necessary to make the statements therein, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading. No purchaser or holder of the Certificates, or other person or party other than the City, will be entitled to or may rely on such letter or Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP's having acted in the role of disclosure counsel to the City.

The legal opinions and other letters of counsel to be delivered concurrently with the delivery of the Certificates express the professional judgment of the attorneys rendering the opinions or advice regarding the legal issues and other matters expressly addressed therein. By rendering a legal opinion or advice, the giver of such opinion or advice does not become an insurer or guarantor of the result indicated by that opinion, or the transaction on which the opinion or advice is rendered, or of the future performance of parties to the transaction. Nor does the rendering of an opinion guarantee the outcome of any legal dispute that may arise out of the transaction.

PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED IN THE OFFERING

Public Financial Management, Inc. and Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co. LLC have served as Co-Financial Advisors to the City with respect to the sale of the Certificates. The Co-Financial Advisors have assisted the City in the review of this Official Statement and in other matters relating to the planning, structuring, and sale of the Certificates. The Co-Financial Advisors have not independently verified any of the data contained herein nor conducted a detailed investigation of the affairs of the City to determine the accuracy or completeness of this Official Statement and assume no responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of any of the information contained herein. The Co-Financial Advisors, Co-Special Counsel and Disclosure Counsel will all receive compensation from the City contingent upon the sale and delivery of the Certificates.

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE

The City has covenanted for the benefit of the Owners of the Certificates to provide certain financial information and operating data relating to the City (the "Annual Report") not later than 270 days after the end of the City's fiscal year (which currently ends on June 30), commencing with the report for fiscal year 2012-13, which is due not later than March 27, 2014, and to provide notices of the occurrence of certain enumerated events. The Annual Report will be filed by the City with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board ("MSRB"). The notices of enumerated events will be filed by the City with the MSRB. The specific nature of the information to be contained in the Annual Report or the notices of enumerated events is summarized in APPENDIX D: "FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE." These covenants have been made in order to assist the initial purchasers of the Certificates in complying with Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) (the "Rule"). The City has never failed to comply in all material respects with any previous undertakings with regard to the Rule to provide annual reports or notices of material events.

The City may, from time to time, but is not obligated to, post its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and other financial information on the City Controller's web site at www.sfgov.org/controller.

ABSENCE OF LITIGATION

No litigation is pending or threatened concerning the validity of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Property Lease, the Project Lease, the corporate existence of the City, or the entitlement to their respective offices of the officers of the City who will execute and deliver the Certificates and other documents and certificates in connection therewith. The City will furnish to the initial purchasers of the Certificates a certificate of the City as to the foregoing as of the time of the original delivery of the Certificates.

RATINGS

Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's"), Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ("S&P"), and Fitch Ratings ("Fitch"), have assigned municipal bond ratings of "___," "___" and "___," respectively, to the Certificates. Certain information not included in this Official Statement was supplied by the City to the rating agencies to be considered in evaluating the Certificates. The ratings reflect only the views of each rating agency, and any explanation of the significance of any rating may be obtained only from the respective credit rating agencies: Moody's, at www.moody.com; S&P, at www.sandp.com; and Fitch, at www.fitchratings.com. Investors are advised to read the entire Official Statement to obtain information essential to the making of an informed investment decision. No assurance can be given that any rating issued by a rating agency will be retained for any given period of time or that the same will not be revised or withdrawn entirely by such rating agency, if in its judgment circumstances so warrant. Any such revision or withdrawal of the ratings obtained may have an adverse effect on the market price of the Certificates. The City undertakes no responsibility to oppose any such downward revision, suspension or withdrawal.

SALE OF THE CERTIFICATES

The Certificates were sold at competitive bid on _____, 2013. The Certificates were awarded to _____ (the "Purchaser"), who submitted the lowest true interest cost bid, at a purchase price of \$ _____. Under the terms of its bid, the Purchaser will be obligated to purchase all of the Certificates if any are purchased; the obligation to make such purchase is subject to the approval of certain legal matters by Co-Special Counsel and certain other conditions to be satisfied by the City.

The Purchaser has certified the reoffering prices or yields for the Certificates set forth on the inside cover of this Official Statement, and the City takes no responsibility for the accuracy of those prices or yields. Based on the reoffering prices, the original issue premium on the reoffering of the Certificates is \$ _____, and the Purchaser's gross compensation (or "spread") is \$ _____. The Purchaser may offer and sell the Certificates to certain dealers and others at prices lower than the offering prices stated on the inside cover page. The offering prices may be changed from time to time by the Purchaser.

MISCELLANEOUS

Any statements in this Official Statement involving matters of opinion, whether or not expressly so stated, are intended as such and not as representations of fact. This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract or agreement between the City and the Purchasers or Owners and beneficial owners of any of the Certificates.

The preparation and distribution of this Official Statement have been duly authorized by the Board of Supervisors of the City.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____
Benjamin Rosenfield
Controller

APPENDIX A

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO – ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES

APPENDIX B

**COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012***

* The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report may be viewed online or downloaded from the City Controller's website at <http://www.sfgov.org/controller>.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS

The following is a summary of certain provisions of the Trust Agreement, Project Lease and the Property Lease. These summaries do not purport to be complete or definitive and reference should be made to such documents for a full and complete statement of their provisions. All capitalized terms not defined in this Official Statement have the meanings set forth in the Trust Agreement.

APPENDIX D

FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

\$[Par Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

\$ _____*
SERIES 2013A
(Port Facilities Project)
(Non-AMT)

\$ _____*
SERIES 2013B
(Port Facilities Project)
(AMT)

\$ _____*
TAXABLE SERIES 2013C
(Port Facilities Project)

This Continuing Disclosure Certificate (the "Disclosure Certificate") is executed and delivered by the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") in connection with the delivery of the certificates of participation captioned above (the "Certificates"). The Certificates are issued pursuant to that certain Trust Agreement (the "Trust Agreement"), dated as of ____ 1, 2013, between the City and [Name of Trustee], as trustee (the "Trust Agreement"). Pursuant to Section 8.10 of the Trust Agreement and Section 4.8 of that certain Project Lease dated as of ____ 1, 2013, by and between the Trustee and the City, the City covenants and agrees as follows:

SECTION 1. Purpose of the Disclosure Certificate. This Disclosure Certificate is being executed and delivered by the City for the benefit of the Holders and Beneficial Owners of the Certificates and in order to assist the Participating Underwriters (defined below) in complying with Securities and Exchange Commission (the "S.E.C.") Rule 15c2-12(b)(5).

SECTION 2. Definitions. In addition to the definitions set forth in the Trust Agreement, which apply to any capitalized term used in this Disclosure Certificate unless otherwise defined in this Section 2, the following capitalized terms will have the following meanings:

"Annual Report" will mean any Annual Report provided by the City pursuant to, and as described in, Sections 3 and 4 of this Disclosure Certificate.

"Beneficial Owner" will mean any person which: (a) has or shares the power, directly or indirectly, to make investment decisions concerning ownership of any Certificates (including persons holding Certificates through nominees, depositories or other intermediaries) including, but not limited to, the power to vote or consent with respect to any Certificates or to dispose of ownership of any Certificates; or (b) is treated as the owner of any Certificates for federal income tax purposes.

"Dissemination Agent" will mean the City, acting in its capacity as Dissemination Agent under this Disclosure Certificate, or any successor Dissemination Agent designated in writing by the City and which has filed with the City a written acceptance of such designation.

"Holder" will mean either the registered owners of the Certificates, or, if the Certificates are registered in the name of The Depository Trust Company or another recognized depository, any applicable participant in such depository system.

"Listed Events" will mean any of the events listed in Section 5(a) of this Disclosure Certificate.

* Preliminary, subject to change.

"MSRB" will mean the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board or any other entity designated or authorized by the Securities and Exchange Commission to receive reports pursuant to the Rule. Until otherwise designated by the MSRB or the Securities and Exchange Commission, filings with the MSRB are to be made through the Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) website of the MSRB currently located at <http://emma.msrb.org>.

"Participating Underwriter" will mean any of the original underwriters or purchasers of the Certificates required to comply with the Rule in connection with offering of the Certificates.

"Rule" will mean Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) adopted by the S.E.C. under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as the same may be amended from time to time.

SECTION 3. Provision of Annual Reports.

(a) The City will, or will cause the Dissemination Agent to, not later than 270 days after the end of the City's fiscal year (which is June 30), commencing with the report for the 2012-13 Fiscal Year (which is due not later than March 27, 2014), provide to the MSRB an Annual Report which is consistent with the requirements of Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate. If the Dissemination Agent is not the City, the City will provide the Annual Report to the Dissemination Agent not later than 15 days prior to said date. The Annual Report must be submitted in electronic format and accompanied by such identifying information as prescribed by the MSRB, and may cross-reference other information as provided in Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate; provided, that if the audited financial statements of the City are not available by the date required above for the filing of the Annual Report, the City will submit unaudited financial statements and submit the audited financial statements as soon as they are available. If the City's fiscal year changes, it will give notice of such change in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(b).

(b) If the City is unable to provide to the MSRB an Annual Report by the date required in subsection (a), the City will send a notice to the MSRB in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A.

(c) The Dissemination Agent will (if the Dissemination Agent is other than the City), file a report with the City certifying the date that the Annual Report was provided to the MSRB pursuant to this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 4. Content of Annual Reports. The City's Annual Report will contain or incorporate by reference the following information, as required by the Rule:

(a) the audited general purpose financial statements of the City prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to governmental entities;

(b) a summary of budgeted general fund revenues and appropriations;

(c) a summary of the assessed valuation of taxable property in the City;

(d) a summary of the ad valorem property tax levy and delinquency rate;

(e) a summary of aggregate annual scheduled lease payments or rental obligations with respect to outstanding certificates of participation and lease revenue bonds payable from the general fund of the City.

(f) a summary of outstanding and authorized but unissued general fund lease obligations, certificates of participation, and other long-term obligations payable from the general fund of the City.

Any or all of the items listed above may be set forth in a document or set of documents, or may be included by specific reference to other documents, including official statements of debt issues of the City or related public

entities, which are available to the public on the MSRB website. If the document included by reference is a final official statement, it must be available from the MSRB. The City will clearly identify each such other document so included by reference.

SECTION 5. Reporting of Listed Events.

(a) To the extent applicable and pursuant to the provisions of this Section 5, the City will give, or cause to be given, notice of the occurrence of any of the following events with respect to the Certificates:

- (1) Principal and interest payment delinquencies;
- (2) Nonpayment related defaults, if material;
- (3) Unscheduled draws on any debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;
- (4) Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;
- (5) Substitution of credit or liquidity providers or their failure to perform;
- (6) Adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB) or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax status of the Certificates, or other material events affecting the tax status of the Certificates;
- (7) Modifications to the rights of Certificate holders, if material;
- (8) Certificate calls, if material, and tender offers;
- (9) Defeasances;
- (10) Release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the Certificates, if material;
- (11) Rating changes;
- (12) Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership or similar event of the obligated person;
- (13) Consummation of a merger, consolidation or acquisition involving an obligated person or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the obligated person, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material; and
- (14) Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee.

(b) Whenever the City obtains knowledge of the occurrence of a Listed Event, the City will, in a timely manner not in excess of ten business days after the occurrence of the Listed Event, file a notice of such occurrence with the MSRB in electronic format, accompanied by such identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB.

SECTION 6. Termination of Reporting Obligation. The City's obligations under this Disclosure Certificate will terminate upon the legal defeasance, prepayment or payment in full of all of the Certificates. If such termination occurs prior to the final Certificate Payment Date of the Certificates, the City will give notice of such termination in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(b).

SECTION 7. Dissemination Agent. The City may, from time to time, appoint or engage a Dissemination Agent to assist it in carrying out its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate, and may discharge any such Dissemination Agent, with or without appointing a successor Dissemination Agent. The Dissemination Agent will have only such duties as are specifically set forth in this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 8. Amendment; Waiver. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the City may amend or waive this Disclosure Certificate or any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) If the amendment or waiver relates to the provisions of Sections 3(a), 3(b), 4 or 5(a), it may only be made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, change in law, or change in the identity, nature or status of an obligated person with respect to the Certificates or the type of business conducted;

(b) The undertaking, as amended or taking into account such waiver, would, in the opinion of the City Attorney or nationally recognized bond counsel, have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of the original delivery of the Certificates, after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances; and

(c) The amendment or waiver either (i) is approved by the owners of a majority in aggregate principal amount of the Certificates or (ii) does not, in the opinion of the City Attorney or nationally recognized bond counsel, materially impair the interests of the Holders.

In the event of any amendment or waiver of a provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the City will describe such amendment in the next Annual Report, and will include, as applicable, a narrative explanation of the reason for the amendment or waiver and its impact on the type (or, in the case of a change of accounting principles, on the presentation) of financial information or operating data being presented by the City. In addition, if the amendment relates to the accounting principles to be followed in preparing financial statements, (i) notice of such change will be given in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5, and (ii) the Annual Report for the year in which the change is made should present a comparison (in narrative form and also, if feasible, in quantitative form) between the financial statements as prepared on the basis of the new accounting principles and those prepared on the basis of the former accounting principles.

SECTION 9. Additional Information. Nothing in this Disclosure Certificate will be deemed to prevent the City from disseminating any other information, using the means of dissemination set forth in this Disclosure Certificate or any other means of communication, or including any other information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event, in addition to that which is required by this Disclosure Certificate. If the City chooses to include any information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event in addition to that which is specifically required by this Disclosure Certificate, the City will have no obligation under this Disclosure Certificate to update such information or include it in any future Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event.

SECTION 10. Remedies. In the event of a failure of the City to comply with any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, any Participating Underwriter, Holder or Beneficial Owner of the Certificates may take such actions as may be necessary and appropriate, to cause the City to comply with its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate; provided that any such action may be instituted only in a federal or state court located in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and that the sole remedy under this Disclosure Certificate in the event of any failure of the City to comply with this Disclosure Certificate will be an action to compel performance.

SECTION 11. Beneficiaries. This Disclosure Certificate will inure solely to the benefit of the City, the Dissemination Agent, the Participating Underwriters and Holders and Beneficial Owners from time to time of the Certificates, and will create no rights in any other person or entity.

SECTION 12. Counterparts. This Disclosure Certificate may be executed in several counterparts, each of which will be an original and all of which will constitute but one and the same instrument.

Date: _____, 2013.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Benjamin Rosenfield
Controller

Approved as to form:

DENNIS J. HERRERA
CITY ATTORNEY

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE EXHIBIT A

**FORM OF NOTICE TO THE
MUNICIPAL SECURITIES RULEMAKING BOARD
OF FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT**

Name of City: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Name of Issue: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
SERIES 2013A, SERIES 2013B AND TAXABLE SERIES 2013C
(PORT FACILITIES PROJECT)
Date of Delivery: _____, 2013

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City has not provided an Annual Report with respect to the above-named Certificates as required by Section 3 of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate of the City and County of San Francisco, dated the Date of Delivery. The City anticipates that the Annual Report will be filed by _____.

Dated: _____

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____ [to be signed only if filed]
Title: _____

APPENDIX E

DTC AND THE BOOK-ENTRY ONLY SYSTEM

The information in numbered paragraphs 1-11 of this Appendix E, concerning The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC") and DTC's book-entry system, has been furnished by DTC for use in official statements and the City takes no responsibility for the completeness or accuracy thereof. The City cannot and does not give any assurances that DTC, DTC Participants or Indirect Participants will distribute to the Beneficial Owners (a) payments of interest or principal with respect to the Certificates, (b) certificates representing ownership interest in or other confirmation of ownership interest in the Certificates, or (c) redemption or other notices sent to DTC or Cede & Co., its nominee, as the registered owner of the Certificates, or that they will so do on a timely basis, or that DTC, DTC Participants or DTC Indirect Participants will act in the manner described in this Appendix. The current "Rules" applicable to DTC are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the current "Procedures" of DTC to be followed in dealing with DTC Participants are on file with DTC.

Information Furnished by DTC Regarding its Book-Entry Only System

1. The Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), New York, NY, will act as securities depository for the certificates (as used in this Section, the "Securities"). The Securities will be issued as fully-registered securities registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC's partnership nominee) or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. One fully-registered Security certificate will be issued for each maturity of the Securities, in the aggregate principal amount of such issue, and will be deposited with DTC. If, however, the aggregate principal amount of any issue exceeds \$500 million, one certificate will be issued with respect to each \$500 million of principal amount, and an additional certificate will be issued with respect to any remaining principal amount of such issue.

2. DTC, the world's largest securities depository, is a limited-purpose trust company organized under the New York Banking Law, a "banking organization" within the meaning of the New York Banking Law, a member of the Federal Reserve System, a "clearing corporation" within the meaning of the New York Uniform Commercial Code, and a "clearing agency" registered pursuant to the provisions of Section 17A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. DTC holds and provides asset servicing for over 3.5 million issues of U.S. and non-U.S. equity issues, corporate and municipal debt issues, and money market instruments from over 100 countries that DTC's participants ("Direct Participants") deposit with DTC. DTC also facilitates the post-trade settlement among Direct Participants of sales and other securities transactions in deposited securities, through electronic computerized book-entry transfers and pledges between Direct Participants' accounts. This eliminates the need for physical movement of securities certificates. Direct Participants include both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, clearing corporations, and certain other organizations. DTC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation ("DTCC"). DTCC is the holding company for DTC, National Securities Clearing Corporation and Fixed Income Clearing Corporation, all of which are registered clearing agencies. DTCC is owned by the users of its regulated subsidiaries. Access to the DTC system is also available to others such as both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, and clearing corporations that clear through or maintain a custodial relationship with a Direct Participant, either directly or indirectly ("Indirect Participants"). The DTC Rules applicable to its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. More information about DTC can be found at www.dtcc.com and www.dtc.org.

3. Purchases of Securities under the DTC system must be made by or through Direct Participants, which will receive a credit for the Securities on DTC's records. The ownership interest of each actual purchaser of each Security ("Beneficial Owner") is in turn to be recorded on the Direct and Indirect Participants' records. Beneficial Owners will not receive written confirmation from DTC of their purchase. Beneficial Owners are, however, expected to receive written confirmations providing details of the transaction, as well as periodic statements of their holdings, from the Direct or Indirect Participant through which the Beneficial Owner entered into the transaction. Transfers of ownership interests in the Securities are to be accomplished by entries made on the books of Direct and Indirect Participants acting on behalf of Beneficial Owners. Beneficial Owners will not receive certificates representing their ownership interests in Securities, except in the event that use of the book-entry system for the Securities is discontinued.

4. To facilitate subsequent transfers, all Securities deposited by Direct Participants with DTC are registered in the name of DTC's partnership nominee, Cede & Co., or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. The deposit of Securities with DTC and their registration in the name of Cede & Co. or such other DTC nominee do not effect any change in beneficial ownership. DTC has no knowledge of the actual Beneficial Owners of the Securities; DTC's records reflect only the identity of the Direct Participants to whose accounts such Securities are credited, which may or may not be the Beneficial Owners. The Direct and Indirect Participants will remain responsible for keeping account of their holdings on behalf of their customers.

5. Conveyance of notices and other communications by DTC to Direct Participants, by Direct Participants to Indirect Participants, and by Direct Participants and Indirect Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by arrangements among them, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Beneficial Owners of Securities may wish to take certain steps to augment the transmission to them of notices of significant events with respect to the Securities, such as redemptions, tenders, defaults, and proposed amendments to the Security documents. For example, Beneficial Owners of Securities may wish to ascertain that the nominee holding the Securities for their benefit has agreed to obtain and transmit the notices to Beneficial Owners. In the alternative, Beneficial Owners may wish to provide their names and addresses to the registrar and request that copies of notices be provided directly to them.

6. Redemption notices will be sent to DTC. If less than all of the Securities within an issue are being redeemed, DTC's practice is to determine by lot the amount of the interest of each Direct Participant in such issue to be redeemed.

7. Neither DTC nor Cede & Co. (nor any other DTC nominee) will consent or vote with respect to the Securities unless authorized by a Direct Participant in accordance with DTC's MMI Procedures. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an Omnibus Proxy to the City as soon as possible after the record date. The Omnibus Proxy assigns Cede & Co.'s consenting or voting rights to those Direct Participants to whose accounts the Securities are credited on the record date (identified in a listing attached to the Omnibus Proxy).

8. Redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments on the Securities will be made to Cede & Co., or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. DTC's practice is to credit Direct Participants' accounts upon DTC's receipt of funds and corresponding detail information from the City or the paying agent or bond trustee, on payable date in accordance with their respective holdings shown on DTC's records. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name," and will be the responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC nor its nominee, the paying agent or bond trustee, or the City, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Payment of redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments to Cede & Co. (or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC) is the responsibility of the City or the paying agent or bond trustee, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners will be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

9. DTC may discontinue providing its services as depository with respect to the Securities at any time by giving reasonable notice to the City or the paying agent or bond trustee. Under such circumstances, in the event that a successor depository is not obtained, Security certificates are required to be printed and delivered.

10. The City may decide to discontinue use of the system of book-entry-only transfers through DTC (or a successor securities depository). In that event, Security certificates will be printed and delivered to DTC.

11. The information in this section concerning DTC and DTC's book-entry system has been obtained from sources that the City believes to be reliable, but the City takes no responsibility for the accuracy thereof.

APPENDIX F

PROPOSED FORM OF CO-SPECIAL COUNSEL OPINION

[To come.]

APPENDIX G

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER
INVESTMENT POLICY**

APPENDIX A

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

This Appendix contains information that is current as of March 5, 2013.

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CITY GOVERNMENT	3
City Charter	3
Mayor and Board of Supervisors	3
Other Elected and Appointed City Officers	4
CITY BUDGET	5
Overview	5
Budget Process	5
November 2009 Charter Amendment Instituting Two-Year Budgetary Cycle	6
Role of Controller; Budgetary Analysis and Projections	7
General Fund Results; Audited Financial Statements	7
Five-Year Financial Plan	13
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget Update	13
City Budget Adopted for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14	13
Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances	14
Impact of Federal Budget Tax Increases and Expenditure Reductions on Local Finances	15
Budgetary Reserves and Economic Stabilization	15
Rainy Day Reserve	15
Budget Stabilization Reserve	16
General Reserve	16
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution	17
PROPERTY TAXATION	20
Property Taxation System – General	20
Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies	20
Tax Levy and Collection	22
Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property	24
OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES	25
Business Taxes	25
Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax)	26
Real Property Transfer Tax	27
Sales and Use Tax	28
Utility Users Tax	29

Emergency Response Fee; Access Line Tax	29
Parking Tax	30
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	30
1991 Health and Welfare Realignment	30
Public Safety Sales Tax	30
Other Intergovernmental Grants and Subventions	30
Charges for Services	30
CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES	31
General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area	31
Baselines	32
Reserves	33
EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-RETIREMENT OBLIGATIONS	33
Labor Relations	33
San Francisco Employees' Retirement System ("SFERS" or "Retirement System")	36
Medical Benefits	41
Total City Employee Benefits Costs	45
INVESTMENTS OF CITY FUNDS	46
CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS	48
Capital Plan	48
Tax-Supported Debt Service	49
General Obligation Bonds Authorized but Unissued	50
Refunding General Obligation Bonds	51
Lease Payments and Other Long-Term Obligations	52
Commercial Paper Program	53
Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Obligations	54
Overlapping Debt	54
MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	56
Hunters Point Shipyard (Phase 1 and 2) and Candlestick Point	57
Treasure Island	57
Piers 30-32 and Seawall Lot (SWL) 330 – Warrior's Multipurpose Recreation and Entertainment Venue	57
Transbay	58
Mission Bay	58
Seawall Lot (SWL) 337 and Pier 48 (Mission Rock)	58
Pier 70	59
Cruise Terminal	59
America's Cup	59
Moscone Convention Center	60
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES	60
Article XIII A of the California Constitution	61
Article XIII B of the California Constitution	61
Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution	61
Statutory Limitations	62
Proposition 1A	63
Proposition 22	63
Proposition 26	64
Future Initiatives	64
LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT	64
Pending Litigation	64
Risk Retention Program	65

CITY GOVERNMENT

City Charter

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

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

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

The Charter distributes governing authority among the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the various other elected officers, the City Controller and other appointed officers, and the boards and commissions that oversee the various City departments. Compared to the governance of the City prior to 1995, the Charter concentrates relatively more power in the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The Mayor appoints most commissioners subject to a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, unless otherwise provided in the Charter. The Mayor appoints each department head from among persons nominated to the position by the appropriate commission, and may remove department heads.

Mayor and Board of Supervisors

Edwin M. Lee is the 43rd and current Mayor of the City. The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City, with responsibility for general administration and oversight of all departments in the executive branch of the City. Mayor Lee was elected to his current four-year term as Mayor on November 8, 2011. Prior to being elected, Mayor Lee was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in January 2011 to fill the remaining year of former Mayor Gavin Newsom's term when Mayor Newsom was sworn in as the State's Lieutenant Governor. Mayor Lee served as the City Administrator from 2005 up until his appointment to Mayor. He also previously served in each of the

following positions: the City's Director of Public Works, the City's Director of Purchasing, the Director of the Human Rights Commission, the Deputy Director of the Employee Relations Division, and coordinator for the Mayor's Family Policy Task Force.

Table A-1 lists the current members of the Board of Supervisors

TABLE A-1

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Board of Supervisors**

Name	First Elected or Appointed	Current Term Expires
David Chiu, <i>Board President, District 3</i>	2008	2017
Mark Farrell, <i>District 2</i>	2010	2015
John Avalos, <i>District 11</i>	2008	2013
David Campos, <i>District 9</i>	2008	2017
Katy Tang, <i>District 4</i>	2013	2013
Jane Kim, <i>District 6</i>	2010	2015
Scott Wiener, <i>District 8</i>	2010	2015
Norman Lee, <i>District 7</i>	2012	2017
Eric Mar, <i>District 1</i>	2008	2017
Malia Cohen, <i>District 10</i>	2010	2015
London Breed, <i>District 5</i>	2012	2017

Other Elected and Appointed City Officers

Dennis J. Herrera was re-elected to his third four-year term as City Attorney in November 2009. The City Attorney represents the City in legal proceedings in which the City has an interest. Mr. Herrera was first elected City Attorney in December 2001. Before becoming City Attorney, Mr. Herrera had been a partner in a private law firm and had served in the Clinton Administration as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Maritime Administration. He also served as president of the San Francisco Police Commission and was a member of the San Francisco Public Transportation Commission.

Carmen Chu was appointed Assessor-Recorder of the City by Mayor Lee in February 2013. The Assessor-Recorder administers the property tax assessment system of the City. Before becoming Assessor-Recorder, Ms. Chu was elected in November 2008 and November 2010 to serve as the City's representative on the Board of Supervisors to the Sunset/Parkside District 4 after being appointed by then-Mayor Newsom in September 2007.

José Cisneros was re-elected to a four-year term as Treasurer of the City in November 2009. The Treasurer is responsible for the deposit and investment of all City moneys, and also acts as Tax Collector for the City. Mr. Cisneros has served as Treasurer since September 2004, following his appointment by then-Mayor Newsom. Prior to being appointed Treasurer, Mr. Cisneros served as Deputy General Manager, Capital Planning and External Affairs for the MTA.

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

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

CITY BUDGET

Overview

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

The City manages the operations of its nearly 60 departments, commissions and authorities, including the enterprise fund departments, through its annual budget. For the first time in July 2012 the City adopted a full two-year budget. The City's fiscal year 2012-13 adopted budget appropriates annual revenues, fund balance, transfers, and reserves of approximately \$7.35 billion, of which the City's General Fund accounts for approximately \$3.49 billion. In fiscal year 2013-14 appropriated revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves total approximately \$7.57 billion and \$3.60 billion of General Fund budget. For a further discussion of the fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14 adopted budgets, see "City Budget Adopted for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14" herein.

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

Budget Process

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

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

capital plan. For a further discussion of the Capital Planning Committee and the City's ten-year capital plan, see "CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS – Capital Plan" herein.

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

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

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

November 2009 Charter Amendment Instituting Two-Year Budgetary Cycle

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

Proposition A requires three significant changes:

- Specifies a two-year (biennial) budget, replacing the annual budget. Two-year budgets have been prepared for the following four pilot departments in fiscal year 2010-11: the Airport, the Port, the Public Utilities Commission, and MTA. MTA already implemented a two-year budgeting process as a result of the passage of a previous measure, also known as Proposition A, in November 2007. Two-year budgets were prepared for all departments beginning in fiscal year 2012-13.
- Requires a five-year financial plan, which forecasts revenues and expenses and summarizes expected public service levels and funding requirements for that period. The first five-year financial plan, including a forecast of expenditures and revenues and proposed actions to balance them in light of strategic goals, was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 7, 2011, and was updated on March 7, 2012. A new five-year financial plan, covering fiscal years 2013-14 through 2017-18 was introduced to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 2013. See "Five Year Financial Plan" below.
- Standardizes the processes and deadlines for the City to submit labor agreements for all public employee unions by May 15. Charges the Controller's Office with proposing to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors financial policies addressing reserves, use of volatile revenues, debt, and financial measures in the case of disaster recovery and requires the City to adopt budgets consistent with these policies once approved. The Controller's Office may recommend additional financial policies or amendments to existing policies no later than October 1 of any subsequent year.

On April 13, 2010, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted policies to 1) codify the City's current practice of maintaining an annual General Reserve for current year fiscal pressures not anticipated in the budget and roughly double the size of the General Reserve by fiscal year 2015-16, and 2) create a new Budget Stabilization Reserve funded by excess receipts from volatile revenue streams to augment the existing Rainy Day Reserve to help the City mitigate the impact of multi-year downturns. On November 8 and 22, 2011, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted additional financial policies limiting the future approval of Certificates of Participation and other long-term obligations to 3.25% of discretionary revenue, and specifying that selected nonrecurring revenues may only be spent

on nonrecurring expenditures. These policies are described in further detail below. The Controller's Office may propose additional financial policies by October 1 of any year.

Role of Controller; Budgetary Analysis and Projections

As Chief Fiscal Officer and City Services Auditor, the City Controller monitors spending for all officers, departments and employees charged with receipt, collection or disbursement of City funds. Under the Charter, no obligation to expend City funds can be incurred without a prior certification by the City 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 City 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 City Controller can certify these surplus funds as a source for supplemental appropriations that may be adopted throughout the year upon approval of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The City's annual expenditures are often different from the estimated expenditures in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance due to supplemental appropriations, continuing appropriations of prior years, and unexpended current-year funds.

Charter Section 3.105 directs the City Controller to issue periodic or special financial reports during the fiscal year. Each year, the City 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 City Controller issued the most recent of these reports, the fiscal year 2012-13 Six Month Budget Status Report (the "Six Month Report"), on February 12, 2013. In addition, under Proposition A of November 2009, the Mayor must submit a Five-Year Financial Plan every two years to the Board of Supervisors which forecasts revenues and expenditures for the next five fiscal years and proposes actions to balance them. The Board of Supervisors approved the City's first Five-Year Financial Plan on June 7, 2011. On March 7, 2012, an update to the Five-year Financial Plan was released by the Controller's Office, Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst. The next Five Year Financial Plan will be published in early March, 2013. See "Five Year Financial Plan" below. Finally, as discussed above, the City Charter directs the Controller to annually report on the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates in the Mayor's proposed budget. On June 14, 2012 the Controller released the Annual Revenue Letter (the "Annual Revenue Letter") reviewing the proposed fiscal year 2012-13 and 2013-14 Budget. All of these reports are available from the City Controller's website: www.sfcontroller.org. The information from the said website is not incorporated herein by reference.

General Fund Results; Audited Financial Statements

The General Fund portions of the fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 Original Budgets total \$3.49 billion, and \$3.60 billion respectively. This does not include expenditures of other governmental funds and enterprise fund departments such as the Airport, the MTA, the Public Utilities Commission, the Port, and the City-owned hospitals (San Francisco General and Laguna Honda). Table A-2 shows Final Revised Budget revenues and appropriations for the City's General Fund for fiscal years 2009-10 through 2011-12 and the Original Budgets for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14. See "PROPERTY TAXATION -Tax Levy and Collection," "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" and "CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES" herein.

The City's most recently completed Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (the "CAFR" which includes the City's audited financial statements) for fiscal year 2011-12 was issued on January 8, 2013. The fiscal year 2011-12 CAFR reported that as of June 30, 2012, the General Fund available for appropriation in subsequent years was \$220.3 million (see Table A-4), of which \$104.3 million was assumed in the fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget and \$103.6 million was assumed in the fiscal year 2013-14 Original Budget, and \$11.7 million remains available for future appropriations. This represents a \$51.8 million increase in available fund balance over the \$168.5 million available as of June 30, 2011 and resulted primarily from savings and greater-than-budgeted additional tax revenue, particularly payroll and property transfer tax revenues, in fiscal year 2011-12. In addition to this available year-end General Fund balance, the City's Rainy Day Reserve Economic Stabilization Account totaled \$31.1 million.

TABLE A-2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Budgeted General Fund Revenues and Appropriations for
Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2013-14

	(000s)				
	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
	Final Revised	Final Revised	Final Revised	Original	Original
	Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget ²	Budget ²
Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves	\$390,512	\$312,040	\$427,886	\$120,654	\$120,027
<u>Budgeted Revenues</u>					
Property Taxes	\$1,021,015	\$984,843	\$1,028,677	\$1,078,083	\$1,109,675
Business Taxes	371,848	342,350	389,878	452,806	488,811
Other Local Taxes	456,140	528,470	602,455	733,295	748,852
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	25,138	23,242	24,337	25,332	25,665
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	11,662	3,794	7,710	7,174	7,133
Interest and Investment Earnings	10,984	9,547	6,050	6,776	5,798
Rents and Concessions	19,884	22,346	22,894	21,424	20,964
Grants and Subventions	686,058	681,090	679,486	700,184	721,213
Charges for Services	146,680	145,443	153,678	166,763	171,774
Other	21,713	30,929	19,232	17,640	19,866
Total Budgeted Revenues	\$2,771,122	\$2,772,054	\$2,934,397	\$3,209,477	\$3,319,751
Bond Proceeds & Repayment of Loans	1,725	785	589	627	2,434
<u>Expenditure Appropriations</u>					
Public Protection	\$954,816	\$951,516	\$991,840	\$1,058,689	\$1,087,646
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	44,276	25,763	53,878	67,529	64,921
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	657,274	650,622	677,953	670,375	679,154
Community Health	481,805	513,625	573,970	609,892	620,199
Culture and Recreation	93,755	100,043	99,762	111,066	113,787
General Administration & Finance	174,907	178,709	190,014	197,994	207,196
General City Responsibilities ¹	96,336	88,755	99,274	103,613	111,085
Total Expenditure Appropriations	\$2,503,169	\$2,509,032	\$2,686,691	\$2,819,159	\$2,883,988
Budgetary reserves and designations, net	\$16,653	\$6,213	\$11,112	\$51,756	\$42,948
Transfers In	\$94,678	\$119,027	\$160,187	\$155,950	\$155,782
Transfers Out	(564,945)	(504,740)	(567,706)	(615,793)	(671,058)
Net Transfers In/Out	(\$470,267)	(\$385,713)	(\$407,519)	(\$459,843)	(\$515,276)
<u>Budgeted Excess (Deficiency) of Sources</u>					
Over (Under) Uses	\$173,270	\$183,921	\$257,550	\$0	\$0
Variance of Actual vs. Budget	138,770	243,965	299,547		
Total Actual Budgetary Fund Balance	\$312,040	\$427,886	\$557,097	\$0	\$0

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

² FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 Original Budget Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves will be reconciled with the previous year's Final Revised Budget.

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

The City prepares its budget on a modified accrual basis. Accruals for incurred liabilities, such as claims and judgments, workers' compensation, accrued vacation and sick leave pay are funded only as payments are required to be made. The audited General Fund balance as of June 30, 2012 was \$455.7 million (as shown in Table A-4) using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), derived from audited revenues of \$3.2 billion. Audited General Fund balances are shown in Table A-3 on both a budget basis and a GAAP basis with comparative financial information for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2008 through June 30, 2012.

TABLE A-3

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Summary of

Audited General Fund Balances

Fiscal Year Ended June 30 ¹

(000s)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Restricted for rainy day (Economic Stabilization account)	\$117,556	\$98,297	\$39,582	\$33,439	\$31,099 ²
Restricted for rainy day (One-time Spending account)	236	-	-	-	3,010 ²
Committed for budget stabilization (citywide)	-	-	-	27,183	74,330
Committed for Recreation & Parks expenditure savings reserve	3,266	6,575	4,677	6,248	4,946 ²
<u>Assigned, not available for appropriation</u>					
Assigned for encumbrances	63,068	65,902	69,562	57,846	62,699 ²
Assigned for appropriation carryforward	99,959	91,075	60,935	73,984	85,283 ²
Assigned for baseline appropriation funding mandates	1,491	-	-	-	- ²
Assigned for budget savings incentive program (citywide)	16,181	-	-	8,684	22,410 ²
Assigned for salaries and benefits (MOU)	12,777	316	4,198	7,151	7,100 ²
Assigned for litigation	2,626	-	-	-	- ²
Total Fund Balance Not Available for Appropriation	\$317,160	\$262,165	\$178,954	\$214,535	\$290,877 ³
<u>Assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation</u>					
Assigned for litigation & contingencies	\$38,969	\$32,900	\$27,758	\$44,900	\$23,637 ⁴
Assigned for General reserve	-	-	-	-	\$22,306
Assigned for subsequent year's budget	105,064	95,447	105,328	159,390	104,284 ⁵
Unassigned (available for future appropriation)	-	-	-	9,061	115,993 ⁶
Total Fund Balance Available for Appropriation	\$144,033	\$128,347	\$133,086	\$213,351	\$266,220 ⁶
Total Fund Balance, Budget Basis	\$461,193	\$390,512	\$312,040	\$427,886	\$557,097
<u>Budget Basis to GAAP Basis Reconciliation</u>					
Total Fund Balance - Budget Basis	\$461,193	\$390,512	\$312,040	\$427,886	\$557,097
Unrealized gain or loss on investments	(2,629)	(1,148)	1,851	1,610	6,838
Nonspendable fund balance	11,358	11,307	14,874	20,501	19,598 ⁷
Cumulative Excess Property Tax Revenues Recognized on Budget Basis	(34,629)	(56,426)	(71,967)	(43,072)	(46,140)
Cumulative Excess Health, Human Service, Franchise Tax and other Revenues on Budget Basis	(26,071)	(37,940)	(55,938)	(63,898)	(62,241)
Deferred Amounts on Loan Receivables	(3,587)	(4,630)	(9,082)	(13,561)	(16,551)
Pre-paid lease revenue	-	-	-	(1,460)	(2,876)
Total Fund Balance, GAAP Basis	\$405,635	\$301,675	\$191,778	\$328,006	\$455,725

¹ Summary of financial information derived from City CAFRs. GASB Statement 54, issued in March 2009, and implemented in the City's FY 2010-11 CAFR, establishes a new fund balance classification based primarily on the extent to which a government is bound to observe constraints imposed on the use of funds. Subsequent footnotes in this table provide the former descriptive titles for 2011 fund balance amounts.

² Prior to 2011, each line item was titled "reserved" for the purpose indicated

³ Prior to 2011, titled "Total Reserved Fund Balance"

⁴ Prior to 2011, titled "Designated for litigation and contingencies"

⁵ Prior to 2011, titled "Unreserved, undesignated fund balance available for appropriation"

⁶ Prior to 2011, titled "Total Unreserved Fund Balance"

⁷ Prior to 2011, titled "Reserved for Assets Not Available for Appropriation"

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

Table A-4, entitled "Audited Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances," is extracted from information in the City's CAFR for the five most recent fiscal years. Audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012 are included herein as Appendix B - "COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012." Prior years' audited financial statements can be obtained from the City Controller's website. Information from the City Controller's website is not incorporated herein by reference. Excluded from this Statement

of General Fund Revenues and Expenditures in Table A-4 are fiduciary funds, internal service funds, special revenue funds (which relate to proceeds of specific revenue sources which are legally restricted to expenditures for specific purposes) and all of the enterprise fund departments of the City, each of which prepares separate audited financial statements.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank.]

TABLE A-4

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Audited Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances
Fiscal Year Ended June 30¹
(000s)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Revenues:					
Property Taxes	\$939,812	\$999,528	\$1,044,740	\$1,090,776	\$1,056,143
Business Taxes ²	394,267	387,313	353,471	391,057	435,316
Other Local Taxes	519,867	479,194	520,733	608,197	751,301
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	23,212	24,750	24,249	25,252	25,022
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	8,398	5,618	17,279	6,868	8,444
Interest and Investment Income	15,779	9,193	7,900	5,910	10,262
Rents and Concessions	19,490	19,096	18,733	21,943	24,932
Intergovernmental	649,923	645,365	651,074	657,238	678,808
Charges for Services	135,473	135,926	138,615	146,631	145,797
Other	17,948	11,199	21,856	10,377	17,090
Total Revenues	\$2,724,169	\$2,717,182	\$2,798,650	\$2,964,249	\$3,153,115
Expenditures:					
Public Protection	\$881,009	\$889,594	\$948,772	\$950,548	\$991,275
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	69,944	61,812	40,225	25,508	52,815
Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development	613,135	630,112	632,713	610,063	626,194
Community Health	454,935	487,638	473,280	493,939	545,962
Culture and Recreation	105,036	97,415	94,895	99,156	100,246
General Administration & Finance	196,430	170,109	169,980	175,381	182,898
General City Responsibilities	71,885	73,904	87,267	85,422	96,132
Total Expenditures	\$2,392,374	\$2,410,584	\$2,447,132	\$2,440,017	\$2,595,522
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures	\$331,795	\$306,598	\$351,518	\$524,232	\$557,593
Other Financing Sources (Uses):					
Transfers In	\$70,969	\$136,195	\$94,115	\$108,072	\$120,449
Transfers Out	(543,640)	(550,910)	(559,263)	(502,378)	(553,190)
Other Financing Sources	5,050	4,157	3,733	6,302	3,682
Other Financing Uses	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	(\$467,621)	(\$410,558)	(\$461,415)	(\$388,004)	(\$429,059)
Extraordinary gain/(loss) from dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency					(815)
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues and Other Sources Over Expenditures and Other Uses	(\$135,826)	(\$103,960)	(\$109,897)	\$136,228	\$127,719
Total Fund Balance at Beginning of Year	\$541,461	405,635	\$301,675	\$191,778	\$328,006
Total Fund Balance at End of Year -- GAAP Basis	\$405,635	\$301,675	\$191,778	\$328,006	\$455,725
Assigned for Subsequent Year's Appropriations and Unassigned Fund Balance, Year End					
-- GAAP Basis	\$77,117	\$28,203	(\$2,050)	\$48,070	\$133,794 ³
-- Budget Basis	\$105,064	\$95,447	\$105,328	\$168,451	\$220,277 ⁴

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

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

³ Prior to adoption of GASB Statement 54 in 2011, titled "Unreserved & Undesignated Balance, Year End"

⁴ Total for FY 2011-12 amount is comprised of \$104.3 million in assigned balance subsequently appropriated for

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

Five-Year Financial Plan

The Five-Year Financial Plan is required under Proposition A, a Charter amendment approved by voters in November 2009. The Charter requires the plan to forecast expenditures and revenues for the next five-fiscal years, propose actions to balance revenues and expenditures during each year of the plan, and discuss strategic goals and corresponding resources for City departments. The first Five-Year Financial Plan, covering fiscal years 2011-12 through 2015-16, was prepared by the Mayor's Office and Controller's Office in collaboration with City departments and adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 7, 2011. An update to the adopted Five-Year Financial Plan was prepared by the Controller's Office, Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst on March 7, 2012.

A new proposed Five-Year Financial Plan was introduced to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 2013. For General Fund Supported Operations for fiscal year 2013-14 through fiscal year 2017-18, this proposed Plan projected budgetary shortfalls of \$124 million, \$256 million, \$368 million, \$423 million and \$487 million over the next five fiscal years. The \$487 million figure is a significant improvement from the first Five-Year Financial Plan which in 2011 projected a five-year shortfall of \$829 million. This Plan projected continued recovery in local tax revenues. However, projected increases in employee salary and benefits, citywide operating expenses, and departmental costs are rising faster than projected revenue growth. To the extent budgets are balanced with ongoing savings or revenues, future shortfalls will decrease.

The Mayor will submit a balanced two-year budget for fiscal year 2013-14 and fiscal year 2014-15 to the Board of Supervisors by June 1, 2013, closing the \$124 million and \$256 million budget gaps identified in the proposed Five Year Financial Plan. Strategies used to balance the budget are discussed in the budget section below. To the extent that the Mayor's budget is balanced with ongoing savings or revenues, this will reduce the projected deficits for subsequent fiscal years.

The City currently projects revenue growth of \$578 million over the five-year period of this Plan, and expenditure growth of \$1.065 billion. Employee pension costs, wages and other benefit growth are the single largest driver of cost growth and the imbalance between revenues and expenditures, growing by \$459 million, 43% of the total expenditure growth, during the five years of the plan. Other costs projected to increase include: Citywide Operating Costs (\$298 million, 28% of expenditure growth), Department of Public Health specific cost increases (\$133 million, 13%), Charter Mandated Baseline and Reserve Changes (\$118 million, 11%), and Other Department Specific Cost Increases (\$57 million, 5%).

The Plan proposes the following strategies to restore fiscal stability: controlling capital spending and debt restructuring; controlling wage and benefit costs; additional tax and fee revenues; adjustments to baselines and revenue allocations; limiting growth in contract and materials costs; reduced reliance on non-recurring revenues and savings; and ongoing departmental revenues and savings initiatives.

Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget Update

On February 12, 2013, the Controller's Office issued a Six Month Budget Status report which projected the General Fund would end fiscal year 2012-13 with a balance of \$174.0 million. The surplus is made up of \$11.7 million in better than anticipated starting fund balance, \$72.1 million in better than anticipated Citywide revenues, offset by a net departmental operating shortfall of \$18.9 million. Of this fiscal year 2012-13 ending balance, \$103.6 million has already been appropriated in the fiscal year 2013-14 budget, and \$32.2 million will be required to bring the General Reserve to mandated levels, leaving a surplus of \$38.3 million available for appropriation. The general revenue improvements are driven primarily by continued growth in local economic activity resulting in improved outlooks for real property transfer tax, payroll tax, hotel tax and interest income.

City Budget Adopted for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14

On July 25, 2012, Mayor Lee signed the Consolidated Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (the "Original Budget") for fiscal years ending June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014. This is the first two-year budget for the entire City, as directed by the November 2009 voter-approved Charter amendment. The Controller's Office issued its required Controller's Discussion of the Mayor's fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 Proposed Budget on June 14, 2012. The Mayor's budget closed the \$170 million and \$312 million general fund shortfalls for fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 identified in the Five Year Financial Plan Update and accommodated \$36 million of additional expenditure increases in each year through a combination of (a) increased sources totaling \$90 million

and \$104 million respectively, made up of improved general fund revenue projections (\$44 million and \$40 million), additional fiscal year 2010-11 available fund balance (\$28 million each year), reallocating more hotel tax revenues to the General Fund (\$4 million and \$13 million), increased State realignment funds (\$10 million each year), and one-time sources of \$5 million and \$12 million; plus (b) Citywide and departmental savings totaling \$97 million and \$206 million respectively, made up of negotiated wage and benefit cost control (\$13 million and \$55 million), reduced funding for growth in non-personnel expenditures (\$22 million and \$48 million), deferrals in education enrichment fund allocations to the San Francisco Unified School District and First Five Commission (\$18 million each year), reduced State revenue loss allowance funding (\$15 million and \$30 million), use of budget savings incentive reserve funds derived from Departmental expenditure savings to pay for one-time expenditures (\$8 million and \$9 million), other citywide savings from reduced capital equipment and information technology spending and from debt restructuring (\$21 million and \$45 million respectively), and department-specific savings (\$53 million and \$69 million).

On June 29, 2012 the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee unanimously approved the Mayor's proposed budget with revisions totaling \$17 million in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$15 million in fiscal year 2013-14. The revisions were funded by \$14 million in Committee reductions to the Mayor's budget and \$18 million of additional sources identified by the Mayor, including \$9 million in additional expenditure savings identified from fiscal year 2011-12, \$6.1 million in additional fiscal year 2010-11 Property Transfer Tax revenue above the amount required to be deposited in the Budget Stabilization Reserve and to fund baseline transfers, \$2.4 million in leftover funds in the budget's technical adjustment reserve and \$1 million from a reduction in a Small Business Revolving Loan fund.

The Original Budget for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14 totals \$7.35 billion and \$7.57 billion respectively, representing increases over prior year of \$520 million and \$220 million. The General Fund portion of each year's budget is \$3.49 billion in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$3.60 billion in fiscal year 2013-14 representing consecutive increases of \$290 million and \$110 million. There are 26,901 funded positions in the fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget and 27,124 in the fiscal year 2013-14 Original Budget representing prior year increases of 719 and 223 respectively.

In addition to being the first two-year budget, the budget for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14 was the first to adhere to the City's policy limiting the use of certain nonrecurring revenues to nonrecurring expenses proposed by the Controller's Office and approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors on November 22, 2011. The policy was approved by the Mayor on December 1, 2011 and can only be suspended for a given fiscal year by a two-thirds vote of the Board. Specifically, this policy limited the Mayor and Board's ability to use for operating expenses the following nonrecurring revenues: extraordinary year-end General Fund balance (defined as General Fund prior year unassigned fund balance before deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve or Budget Stabilization Reserve in excess of the average of the previous five years), the General Fund share of revenues from prepayments provided under long-term leases, concessions, or contracts, otherwise unrestricted revenues from legal judgments and settlements, and other unrestricted revenues from the sale of land or other fixed assets. Under the policy, these nonrecurring revenues may only be used for nonrecurring expenditures that do not create liability for or expectation of substantial ongoing costs, including but not limited to: discretionary funding of reserves, acquisition of capital equipment, capital projects included in the City's capital plans, development of affordable housing, and discretionary payment of pension, debt or other long term obligations.

Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances

The State continues its slow but steady economic recovery. Revenues from the State represent approximately 15% of the General Fund revenues appropriated in the fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget, and thus changes in State revenues could have a significant impact on the City's finances. In a typical year, the Governor releases two primary proposed budget documents: 1) the Governor's Proposed Budget required to be submitted in January; and 2) the "May Revise" to the Governor's Proposed Budget. The Governor's Proposed Budget is then considered and typically revised by the State Legislature. Following that process, the State Legislature adopts, and the Governor signs, the State budget. City policy makers review and estimate the impact of both the Governor's Proposed and May Revise Budgets prior to the City adopting its own budget.

On June 27, 2012, Governor Brown signed the 2012-13 California State budget into law. The budget closed a \$15.7 billion deficit and included a reserve of \$948 million. The budget assumed, and voters approved, the Governor's

initiative on the November 2012 ballot, which contained five- and seven- year tax increases as well as constitutional guarantees of county funding for the fiscal year 2011-12 realignment of public safety and welfare program responsibilities and funding formulas.

The City's Original Budget for fiscal year 2012-13 budget included a \$15 million allowance for State funding reductions that could be used to offset the impact of cuts in the State budget. The impact of the State budget on San Francisco falls mainly on individuals and families in the City who rely upon State childcare credits, income support and in-home support services. City finances will be impacted to the extent that the Board of Supervisors chooses to backfill programs cut by the State.

Governor Brown released his proposed fiscal year 2013-14 budget on January 10, 2013. Revenues and expenditures are generally in balance due to voter-approved tax increases, economic recovery and prior reductions, and the budget forecasts a \$1 billion budgetary balance. With the exception of education funding, State service and funding levels in the budget generally continue at levels established in fiscal year 2012-13. Both the State Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office forecast a similar situation for fiscal year 2014-15.

Impact of Federal Budget Tax Increases and Expenditure Reductions on Local Finances

On January 2, 2013, the federal government reached a temporary budget solution that reduced the level of cuts associated with sequestration in the current fiscal year and postponed the effects of federal sequestration until March 1st. As of February 21, 2013, the total estimated impact to the City and County of San Francisco in the current year is approximately \$25.2 million. Of this total, \$3.6 million is cuts to education programs and \$9.3 million is reductions to housing, energy and transportation programs outside the General Fund. The remaining \$12.3 million in reductions affect housing, health and human services programs. The fiscal effect of the reductions will be determined by the extent to which the Board of Supervisors chooses to backfill them. The only certain reduction to City revenue is the loss of \$2.0 million in Medicare revenue. The exact value of any reductions will depend on implementation details, which has not yet been determined.

Budgetary Reserves and Economic Stabilization

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

Rainy Day Reserve

In November 2003, City voters approved the creation of the City's Rainy Day Reserve into which the previous Charter-mandated cash reserve was incorporated. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires that if the City Controller projects total General Fund revenues for the upcoming budget year will exceed total General Fund revenues for the current year by more than five percent, then the City's budget shall allocate the anticipated General Fund revenues in excess of that five percent growth into the following two accounts within the Rainy Day Reserve and for other lawful governmental purposes.

- 50 percent of the excess revenues to the Rainy Day Economic Stabilization account;
- 25 percent of the excess revenues to the Rainy Day One-Time or Capital Expenditures account; and
- 25 percent of the excess revenues to any lawful governmental purpose.

Fiscal year 2011-12 revenue exceeded the deposit threshold, resulting in a \$6.0 million deposit to the Rainy Day Reserve Economic Stabilization Fund and a \$3.0 million deposit to the One-Time Capital Expenditures account.

Deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve's Economic Stabilization account are subject to a cap of 10% of actual total General Fund revenues as stated in the City's most recent independent annual audit. Amounts in excess of that cap in any year will be allocated to capital and other one-time expenditures. Moneys in the Rainy Day Reserve's Economic Stabilization account are available to provide a budgetary cushion in years when General Fund revenues are projected to decrease from prior-year levels (or, in the case of a multi-year downturn, the highest of any previous year's total General Fund revenues). Moneys in the Rainy Day Reserve's One-Time or Capital Expenditures account are available for capital and other one-time spending initiatives. Except for the transfer to SFUSD described below, no draw from the Rainy Day Reserve is budgeted in fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14.

If the City Controller projects that per-pupil revenues for the SFUSD will be reduced in the upcoming budget year, the Board of Supervisors and Mayor may appropriate funds from the Rainy Day Economic Stabilization account to the SFUSD. This appropriation may not exceed the dollar value of the total decline in school district revenues, or 25% of the account balance, whichever is less. In fiscal year 2011-12, \$8.4 million was appropriated to be transferred to the SFUSD to partially offset SFUSD's planned layoffs and declining per-pupil revenues. On January 15, 2013, the Mayor introduced legislation to increase the fiscal year 2012-13 appropriations to \$7.8 million, or 25% of the current reserve balance, an increase of \$1.5 million over budget. If the Board of Supervisors chooses to allocate the full 25% of the balance in fiscal year 2013-14, \$5.8 million would be appropriated, an increase of \$1.1 million over budget. Original Budget Assuming no other withdrawals or deposits, this would leave a balance remaining in the Rainy Day Reserve at the end of fiscal year 2013-14 of \$17.5 million.

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

Budget Stabilization Reserve

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

The fiscal year 2011-12 ending balance in the reserve was \$74.3 million due to deposits of transfer tax revenue and year-end unassigned General Fund balances above projections. A projected \$20.5 million deposit of excess real property transfer tax receipts in the current year will bring the balance in the reserve to be \$94.9 million.

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

General Reserve

The financial policies passed on April 13, 2010 codified the current practice of maintaining an annual General Reserve to be used for current-year fiscal pressures not anticipated during the budget process. The policy set the reserve equal to one percent of budgeted regular General Fund revenues, or \$32.2 million, in fiscal year 2012-13. The required starting balance of the reserve increases to 2% of General Fund revenues by fiscal year 2016-17.

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution

On February 1, 2012, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (the "SFRDA") ceased to exist by operation of law as a result of Assembly Bill No. X1 26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session) ("AB 26"), and a recent California Supreme Court decision described below. AB 26 was modified by Assembly Bill No. 1484 (Chapter 26, Statute of 2011-12) ("AB1484" and together with AB 26, the "Dissolution Act").

The Dissolution Act provides that all rights, powers, duties and obligations of a redevelopment agency under the Community Redevelopment Law that have not been repealed, restricted or revised pursuant to AB 26 will be vested in the successor agency. The successor agency for each redevelopment agency is generally the county or city that authorized the creation of the redevelopment agency. On January 26, 2012 the City adopted a Board of Supervisors resolution providing for the City to become the successor agency to the SFRDA (the "Successor SFRDA"). The resolution also approved the retention by the City of all the affordable housing assets of the SFRDA (including encumbered funds in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund) and authorized the Mayor's Office of Housing to manage the housing assets and exercise the housing functions that the SFRDA formerly performed. The resolution places most of the non-housing assets of the SFRDA under the jurisdiction of the Director of the Department of Administrative Services.

Pursuant to AB 1484, the Successor SFRDA is a separate public agency from the City, and the assets and liabilities of the former SFRDA will not be transferred to the City. The Successor SFRDA will succeed to the organizational status of the former SFRDA, but without any legal authority to participate in redevelopment activities, except in connection with approved enforceable obligations as provided in the Dissolution Act. In general, the debt of the former SFRDA will become the debt of the Successor SFRDA as the SFRDA's successor agency. Such debt will be payable only from the property tax revenues (former tax increment) or other revenue sources that originally secured such debt. The Dissolution Act does not provide for any new sources of revenue, including general fund revenues of the City, for any SFRDA bonds.

There are significant uncertainties regarding the meaning of certain provisions of the Dissolution Act and the impact of the Dissolution Act on the City, including, among other matters, the obligation imposed on the City in performing its duties as Successor SFRDA, performing the enforceable obligations as Successor SFRDA, paying the debt of the former SFRDA as Successor SFRDA and completing certain projects of the former SFRDA. Future legislation and court decisions may clarify some of these uncertainties. There is also uncertainty about how the City may pursue certain community development goals that the former SFRDA undertook and that are not covered by enforceable obligations, and the City's use of alternative funding sources for projects and programs to pursue such goals.

The total General Fund impact of the dissolution will depend on State decisions regarding the use of tax increment in redevelopment project areas. The State may or may not allow the redevelopment successor agency to retain cash balances to meet contractual obligations for affordable housing and infrastructure improvements. Property tax revenue estimates in the proposed Five Year Financial Plan assume tax increment is used for debt service, to meet obligations made to developers, and approximately \$3.4 million annually for non-debt service uses, resulting in residual tax increment available to be distributed to the taxing entities of approximately \$25.6 million in fiscal year 2013-14, rising to approximately \$42.3 million in fiscal year 2017-18, of which just under 57% would be allocated to the General Fund. This amount could increase depending on uses allowed by the State.

AB 26 and Supreme Court Decision

On December 29, 2011 the California Supreme Court issued its decision in *California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos* (No. S194861) ("Matosantos") regarding the constitutionality of two budget bills involving redevelopment, AB 26 and ABX1 27 (Chapter 6, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session) ("AB 27"). AB 26 dissolved all redevelopment agencies, and designated "successor agencies" with certain powers and duties. AB 27 would have allowed a redevelopment agency to continue to exist, notwithstanding AB 26, if the city or county that created the redevelopment agency made certain payments for the benefit of the local schools and other taxing entities. In *Matosantos* the Court upheld AB 26 requiring the dissolution of redevelopment agencies and the transfer of assets and obligations to successor agencies, but invalidated AB 27. The *Matosantos* decision also modified various deadlines for the implementation of AB 26.

As a consequence of the *Matosantos* decision, all California redevelopment agencies, including the former SFRDA, dissolved by operation of law on February 1, 2012. All property tax revenues that would have been allocated to redevelopment agencies, including the former SFRDA, will be allocated to the applicable Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund created by the County Auditor-Controller for the "successor agency." Such funds are to be used for payments on indebtedness and other "enforceable obligations" (as defined in the Dissolution Act), and to pay certain administrative costs and any amounts in excess of that amount are to be considered property taxes that will be distributed to taxing agencies.

The Dissolution Act requires successor agencies, such as the Successor SFRDA, to continue to make payments and perform other obligations required under enforceable obligations for former redevelopment agencies. AB 26 defines "enforceable obligations" to include bonds, loans, legally required payments, judgments or settlements, legally binding and enforceable agreements and certain other obligations. The Dissolution Act generally excludes from the definition of enforceable obligations any loans or agreements solely between a redevelopment agency and the city or county that created the agency. It also excludes any agreements that are void as violating the debt limit or public policy. Payment and performance of enforceable obligations is subject to review by oversight boards and by the State Controller and State Department of Finance.

The Dissolution Act expressly limits the liabilities of a successor agency in performing duties under the Dissolution Act to the amount of property tax revenues received by such successor agency under the Dissolution Act (generally equal to the amount of former tax increment received by the former redevelopment agency) and the assets of the former redevelopment agency. The Dissolution Act does not provide for any new sources of revenue, including general fund revenues of the City, for any SFRDA bonds (but as discussed below, the City's costs of performing its obligations under AB 26 and of pursuing the economic development goals of the former SFRDA are uncertain and could be significant).

Payment of Enforceable Obligations

The tax allocation bonds ("TABs") issued by the former SFRDA are secured solely by property tax revenues from the designated redevelopment project areas (former increment) formerly payable to the SFRDA (and now available to the Successor SFRDA to pay debt service on the TABs) and from certain funds and accounts established pursuant to the trust agreement relating to each series of the TABs. The City, as Successor SFRDA, is not obligated to pay the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on any TABs, except from property tax revenues from the redevelopment project area allocated to the Successor SFRDA and pledged to repayment of the TABs. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the TABs. The TABs are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien, or encumbrance upon, any property of the City or any of its income or receipts, except the property tax revenues from the redevelopment project area allocated to the Successor SFRDA and pledged to repayment of the TABs or the property or assets that the Successor SFRDA acquired as a successor agency to the former SFRDA under the Dissolution Act and that are pledged for such purposes.

In addition, the hotel tax bonds issued by the SFRDA are secured solely by amounts legally available to be received by or on behalf of the former SFRDA (and now available to the City as Successor Agency to the SFRDA to pay debt service on the hotel tax bonds) from the levy of 12% hotel tax ("Hotel Taxes") on all hotels within specific redevelopment project areas and from certain funds and accounts established pursuant to the indenture relating to the hotel tax bonds. The City, as Successor SFRDA, is not obligated to pay the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on any hotel tax bonds except from Hotel Taxes allocated to the Successor SFRDA. The hotel tax bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien, or encumbrance upon, any property of the City or any of its income or receipts, except the Hotel Taxes allocated to the City or Successor SFRDA.

Pursuant to the Dissolution Act, enforceable obligations (which, as mentioned above, include bonds as defined in the act) continue to exist. Nothing in the Dissolution Act is intended to give rise to or cause a default under documents governing enforceable obligations, or absolve a successor agency of payment or other obligations imposed by enforceable obligations. The Dissolution Act provides that pledges of revenues for enforceable obligations are to be honored.

Under the Dissolution Act, the County Auditor-Controller is required to determine the amount of property taxes that the redevelopment agencies would have received had they not been dissolved pursuant to the Dissolution Act, using assessed values on the last equalized roll on August 20, statutory formulas or contractual agreements with taxing

entities, and deposit such amount in the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund. The Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund is administered by the County Auditor-Controller for the benefit of the holders of enforceable obligations and the taxing entities that receive pass-through payments and property tax distributions.

Oversight Board

The Dissolution Act requires successor agencies to create a new Oversight Board to be composed of seven members and to act by majority vote. There are special provisions for appointment of the members for a consolidated city and county, such as the City: three members are appointed by the Mayor of the City and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors, one member by the Superintendent of Schools to represent the schools in the City, one member is appointed by the largest special district (by property tax share) with territory within the territorial jurisdiction of the former redevelopment agency (BART), one member by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to represent community college districts in the City, and one member is appointed by the Mayor of the City subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors representing employees of the former SFRDA. On January 24, 2012 the Board of Supervisors approved the Mayor's four appointments to the Oversight Board. In accordance with AB 26, the Oversight Board was established by May 1, 2012.

The Oversight Board and the Department of Finance has approved the ROPS for January 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013.

Impact of Dissolution Act and Information concerning SFRDA

Although provisions have been made under the Dissolution Act to provide funds (i.e. property tax revenues) to continue certain enforceable obligations of the Successor SFRDA, the costs of performing its duties under the Dissolution Act, including performing all enforceable obligations of the former SFRDA, and pursuing community development goals that the former SFRDA undertook and that are not covered by enforceable obligations are uncertain, and could impose significant costs on the City's general fund not offset by property tax revenues.

The following includes a very brief summary of certain financial and operating information relating to SFRDA. The provisions of the Dissolution Act are unclear as to numerous aspects of the operations and finances of the Successor SFRDA, including but not limited to the administration of enforceable obligations (including bonds), the flow and uses of tax increment moneys and the disposition of SFRDA assets. Therefore, there are significant uncertainties regarding the finances and operations of the Successor SFRDA entity and administration of its bonds once the City became the successor agency to the SFRDA. Interpretations and clarification of AB 26 are likely to come from future State legislation or administrative guidance and court decisions. At present, the City cannot predict many aspects or the overall outcome of AB 26 on the City's finances and the SFRDA bonds; however it is likely that at least certain aspects of the implementation of AB 26 may materially impact the finances of the City and may materially impact the SFRDA bonds. Further, future redevelopment and housing activities in the City that would have been undertaken by the SFRDA had it continued in existence will no longer occur if they are not required under preexisting enforceable obligations.

Commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, the City included financial information pertaining to the former SFRDA in the City's audited financial statements.

~~The City is the Successor SFRDA as of February 1, 2012. The most recent financial statement for the former SFRDA found that the successor agency held total assets of \$431,415,194 against total liabilities of \$1,095,588,434, including bonds and loans in the amount of \$1,063,480,959 as of June 30, 2012.~~

The former SFRDA had certain investments that were transferred to the Treasurer to hold and invest (use of these funds is subject to various legal restrictions). Such funds will be invested pursuant to the Treasurer's Investment Policy.

Except for a small group of unrepresented employees, the former SFRDA employees are in bargaining groups represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Employees (IFPTE) Local 21 and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 1021.

The former SFRDA had approximately 100 employees for fiscal year 2012 who became employees of the Successor SFRDA, and the Successor SFRDA must comply with the former SFRDA's collectively bargained agreements

applicable to these employees until the expiration of those agreements. Wages and benefits payable to employees under those agreements are to be paid as enforceable obligations from the monies in the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund. Under the former SFRDA collectively bargained agreements, the former SFRDA employees currently participate in the California Public Employees Retirement System ("CalPERS") for their pension plan and health care plan and the California Employers' Retiree Trust ("CERBT") Fund to fund other postemployment benefits ("OPEB"). The 2012 financial statement for the former SFRDA reports that unfunded actuarial accrued liability ("UAAL") of the CalPERS plan for the SFRDA employees was \$4.1 million as of June 30, 2011 and that the UAAL of the OPEB plan was \$12.5 million as of June 30, 2011.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Property Taxation System – General

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

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

Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies

Table A-5 provides a recent history of assessed valuations of taxable property within the City. The property tax rate is composed of two components: 1) the 1.0% countywide portion, and 2) all voter-approved overrides which fund debt service for general obligation bond indebtedness. The total tax rate shown in Table A-5 includes taxes assessed on behalf of the City as well as SFUSD, SFCCD, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD"), and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District ("BART"), all of which are legal entities separate from the City. See also, Table A-25: "Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations" below. In addition to *ad valorem* taxes, voter-approved special assessment taxes or direct charges may also appear on a property tax bill.

Additionally, although no additional rate is levied, a portion of property taxes collected within the City is allocated to the Successor SFRDA. 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 the Successor SFRDA to pay for outstanding and enforceable obligations, causing a loss of tax revenues from those parcels located within project areas to the City and other local taxing agencies, including SFUSD and SFCCD. Taxes collected for payment of debt service on general obligation bonds are not affected or diverted. The Successor SFRDA received \$110 million of property tax increment in fiscal year 2011-12, diverting about \$62 million that would have otherwise been apportioned to the City's discretionary general fund. Pursuant to a December 29, 2011 California State Supreme Court ruling, the dissolution of all redevelopment agencies was effective February 1, 2012. The City took steps to manage the transition of the former SFRDA's assets and obligations to the Successor SFRDA. See "San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution" herein.

The percent collected of property tax (current year levies excluding supplementals) has increased slightly from 97.96% for fiscal year 2010-11 to 98.18% for fiscal year 2011-12. Please note that this table has been modified from the corresponding table in previous disclosures in order to make the levy and collection figures consistent with

statistical reports provided to the State of California. Foreclosures, defined as the number of trustee deeds recorded by the Assessor-Recorder's Office, numbered 804 for fiscal year 2011-12. This compares to 927 in fiscal year 2010-11, 900 in fiscal year 2009-10, and 633 in fiscal year 2008-09. This represents 0.32%, 0.45%, 0.46%, and 0.40% of total parcels in fiscal years 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12, respectively.

TABLE A-5

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Assessed Valuation of Taxable Property
Fiscal Years 2007-08 through 2012-13
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Net Assessed Valuation (NAV) ¹	% Change from Prior Year	Total Tax Rate per \$100 ²	Total Tax Levy ³	Total Tax Collected ³	% Collected June 30
2007-08	\$130,004,479	8.5%	1.141	\$1,509,697	\$1,476,650	97.81%
2008-09	141,274,628	8.7%	1.163	1,702,533	1,661,717	97.60%
2009-10	150,233,436	6.3%	1.159	1,808,505	1,764,100	97.54%
2010-11	157,865,981	5.1%	1.164	1,888,048	1,849,460	97.96%
2011-12	158,649,888	0.5%	1.172	1,918,680	1,883,666	98.18%
2012-13	165,043,120	4.0%	1.169	1,929,519	n/a	n/a

¹

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 FY 2011-12 is based on year-end current year secured and unsecured levies as adjusted through roll corrections, excluding supplemental assessments, as reported on Treasurer/Tax Collector Report 100 and reported to the State of California (available on the website of the California State Controller's Office). Total Tax Levy for FY 2012-13 based on NAV times 1.1691% tax rate.

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

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

For fiscal year 2012-13, the total net assessed valuation of taxable property within the City is \$165.04 billion. Of this total, \$155.28 billion (94.1%) represents secured valuations and \$9.76 billion (5.9%) represents unsecured valuations. (See "Tax Levy and Collection" below, for a further discussion of secured and unsecured property valuations.)

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

Under Article XIII A of the State Constitution added by Proposition 13 in 1978, property sold after March 1, 1975 must be reassessed to full cash value at the time of sale. Every year, some taxpayers appeal the Assessor's determination of their properties' assessed value, and some of the appeals may be retroactive and for multiple years. The State prescribes the assessment valuation methodologies and the adjudication process that counties must employ in connection with counties' property assessments. With respect to the fiscal year 2012-13 levy, property owners representing approximately 17.8% of the total assessed valuation in the City filed appeals as of January 31, 2013 for a reduction of their assessed value.

The City typically experiences increases in assessment appeals activity during economic downturns and decreases in appeals as the economy rebounds. Historically, during severe economic downturns, partial reductions of up to approximately 30% of the assessed valuations appealed have been granted. Assessment appeals granted typically result in revenue refunds, and the level of refund activity depends on the unique economic circumstances of each fiscal year. Other taxing agencies such as SFUSD, SFCCD, BAAQMD, and BART share proportionately in any refunds paid as a result of successful appeals. To mitigate the financial risk of potential assessment appeal refunds,

the City funds appeal reserves for its share of estimated property tax revenues for each fiscal year. In addition, appeals activity is reviewed each year and incorporated into the current and subsequent years' budget projections of property tax revenues. Refunds of prior years' property taxes from the discretionary general fund appeal reserve fund for fiscal years 2007-08 through 2011-12 are listed in Table A-6 below.

TABLE A-6

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Refunds of Prior Years' Property Taxes
General Fund AAB Reserve
(000s)

Year Ended	Amount Refunded from Discretionary General Fund
June 30, 2008	20,914
June 30, 2009	7,288
June 30, 2010	14,015
June 30, 2011	41,730
June 30, 2012	53,288

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

In Spring 2012, the Assessor granted 21,228 temporary reductions in residential property assessed value worth a total of \$2.82 billion (equating to a reduction of about \$16.0 million in discretionary general fund taxes), compared to 18,834 temporary reductions with a value of \$2.35 billion (equating to a reduction of \$13.3 million in discretionary general fund taxes) granted in Spring 2011. The fiscal year 2012-13 \$2.82 billion temporary reduction total represented 1.71% of the fiscal year 2012-13 Net Assessed Valuation of \$165.04 billion shown in Table A-5. The average temporary reduction in assessed value granted, excluding timeshare properties, increased from \$171,388 in 2011 to \$175,980 in 2012. All of the temporary reductions granted are subject to review in the following year. Property owners who are not satisfied with the valuation shown on a Notice of Assessed Value may have a right to file an appeal with the Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) within a certain period of time. For regular, annual secured property tax assessments, the time period for property owners to file an appeal typically falls between July 2nd and September 15th.

As of February 28, 2013, the total number of open appeals before the Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) was 9,386, compared to 9,656 open AAB appeals as of February 28, 2012, including 5,146 filed since July 1, 2012 with the balance pending from prior fiscal years. The difference between the current assessed value and the taxpayers' opinion of values for the open AAB appeals is \$38.8 billion. Assuming the City did not contest any taxpayer appeals and the Board upheld all of the taxpayers' requests, this represents a negative potential property tax impact of \$445.7 million with an impact on the discretionary general fund of \$234.6million. The volume of appeals is not necessarily an indication of how many appeals will be granted, nor of the magnitude of the reduction in assessed valuation that the Assessor may ultimately grant. City revenue estimates take into account projected losses from pending and future assessment appeals.

Tax Levy and Collection

As the local tax-levying agency under State law, the City levies property taxes on all taxable property within the City's boundaries for the benefit of all overlapping local agencies, including SFUSD, SFCCD, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and BART. The total tax levy for all taxing entities in fiscal year 2012-13 is estimated to produce \$1.93 billion, not including supplemental, escape, and special assessments that may be assessed during the year. Of this amount, the City has budgeted to receive \$1.078 billion into the General Fund and \$119.2 million into special revenue funds designated for children's programs, libraries and open space. The Six Month Report projected property tax revenues into the General Fund to be \$14 million above budget. SFUSD and SFCCD are estimated to receive \$116.8 million and \$21.9 million, respectively, and the local ERAF is estimated to receive \$384.4 million (before adjusting for the State's Triple Flip sales tax and vehicle license fees ("VLF") backfill

shifts). The Successor SFRDA is estimated to receive \$114.8 million. The remaining portion is 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 is allocated about 57% of total property tax revenue before adjusting for the State's Triple Flip (whereby Proposition 57 dedicated 0.25% of local sales taxes, which were subsequently backfilled by a decrease to the amount of property taxes shifted to ERAF from local governments, thereby leaving the State to fund a like amount from the State's General Fund to meet Proposition 98 funding requirements for schools) and VLF backfill shifts.

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. This apportionment method authorizes the City Controller to allocate to the City's taxing agencies 100% of the secured property taxes billed but not yet collected. In return, as the delinquent property taxes and associated penalties and interest are collected, the City's General Fund retains such amounts. Prior to adoption of the Teeter Plan, the City could only allocate secured property taxes actually collected (property taxes billed minus delinquent taxes). Delinquent taxes, penalties and interest were allocated to the City and other taxing agencies only when they were collected. The City has funded payment of accrued and current delinquencies through authorized internal borrowing. The City also maintains a Tax Loss Reserve for the Teeter Plan as shown on Table A-7.

TABLE A-7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Teeter Plan
Tax Loss Reserve Fund Balance
(000s)

Year Ended	Amount Funded
June 30, 2008	14,330
June 30, 2009	16,220
June 30, 2010	17,507
June 30, 2011	17,302
June 30, 2012	17,980

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 ending June 30, 2013 are shown in Table A-8. The City cannot determine from its assessment records whether individual persons, corporations or other organizations are liable for tax payments with respect to multiple properties held in various names that in aggregate may be larger than is suggested by the table.

TABLE A-8

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Top 10 Parcels Total Assessed Value
Fiscal Year 2012-13
(000s)

Assessee	Location	Parcel Number	Type	Total Assessed Value ¹	% of Basis of Levy ²
HWA 555 Owners LLC	555 California St	0259 026	Commercial Office	\$922,558	0.56%
Paramount Group Real Estate Fund	1 Market St	3713 007	Commercial Office	755,777	0.46%
Emporium Mall LLC	845 Market St	3705 056	Commercial Retail	422,217	0.25%
HD333 LLC	333 Market St	3710 020	Commercial Office	394,666	0.24%
SHC Embarcadero LLC	4 The Embarcadero	0233 044	Commercial Office	389,419	0.24%
Post-Montgomery Associates	165 Sutter St	0292 015	Commercial Retail	379,674	0.23%
SF Hilton Inc	1 Hilton Square	0325 031	Commercial Hotel	376,676	0.23%
SHR St Francis LLC	301-345 Powell St	0307 001	Commercial Hotel	367,002	0.22%
PPF Off One Maritime Plaza LP	300 Clay St	0204 021	Commercial Office	360,181	0.22%
One Embarcadero Center Venture	1 The Embarcadero	0230 028	Commercial Office	337,278	0.20%
				\$4,705,447	2.84%

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

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

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

Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property

A portion of the City's total net assessed valuation consists of utility property subject to assessment by the State Board of Equalization. State-assessed property, or "unitary property," is property of a utility system with components located in many taxing jurisdictions assessed as part of a "going concern" rather than as individual parcels of real or personal property. Unitary and certain other State-assessed property values are allocated to the counties by the State Board of Equalization, taxed at special county-wide rates, and the tax revenues distributed to taxing jurisdictions (including the City itself) according to statutory formulae generally based on the distribution of taxes in the prior year. The fiscal year 2012-13 valuation of property assessed by the State Board of Equalization is \$2.58 billion, as recorded on the fiscal year 2012-13 Certificate of Assessed Valuation.

OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES

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

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

Business Taxes

Businesses in the City may be subject to two types of taxes. The first is a payroll expense tax, assessed at a rate of 1.5% on gross payroll expense attributable to all work performed or services rendered within the City. The tax is authorized by Article 12-A of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code. Recent changes to the tax exempted small businesses with annual payroll of less than \$250,000 and subjected partnership profit distributions to the tax. The net effect of these provisions was estimated to be approximately \$10.5 million in new revenues beginning in fiscal year 2009-10. The City also levies a registration tax on businesses, which varies from \$25 to \$500 per year per subject business based on the prior year computed payroll tax liability.

Business taxes are projected in the Six Month report to be \$460.5 million in fiscal year 2012-13 representing an increase of \$7.7 million (1.7%) over fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget and \$22.8 million (5.2%) over fiscal year 2011-12 revenue. The budgeted amount for Business Taxes in fiscal year 2013-14 is \$489.8 million representing an increase of \$28.3 (6.1%) million over the fiscal year 2012-13 projection. Total business tax revenues include \$451.7 million and \$480.8 million in payroll taxes projected and budgeted during fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14, respectively, and \$8.8 million projected in business license registration fees during fiscal year 2012-13 and \$9.0 million budgeted during fiscal year 2013-14. The budget for fiscal year 2013-14 payroll tax includes \$5.6 million in additional one time revenue resulting from the America's Cup yachting event.

TABLE A-9

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Business Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
All Funds
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Revenue	Change	
2008-09	388,654	(7,371)	-1.9%
2009-10	354,020	(34,634)	-8.9%
2010-11	391,779	37,759	10.7%
2011-12	437,677	45,898	11.7%
2012-13 projected	460,512	22,835	5.2%
2013-14 budgeted	489,811	29,299	6.4%

Includes Payroll Tax and Business Registration Tax revenues, and portion of Payroll Tax allocated to special revenue funds for the Community Challenge Grant program, which was \$2.36 million in FY 2011-12. Figures for FY 2008-09 through FY 2011-12 are year end actuals. Figures for FY 2012-13 are Six-Month Report projections and FY 2013-14 are Original

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

In April 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance 68-11 that established a payroll expense tax exclusion for certain business located in the Central Market and Tenderloin Area. The Ordinance expires according to its terms in 2019. The Controller projects the loss to the City in payroll expense tax revenue due to Ordinance 68-11 to be approximately \$4.2 million annually. Additionally, fiscal year 2011-12 payroll tax amounts include a \$3.5 million General Fund loss from a requirement pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 906E, that \$500 credits be provided to Payroll Tax payers if prior year Payroll Tax revenues grew more than 7.5% from the year before. Fiscal year 2011-12 payroll tax revenues ended the year 11.4% higher than fiscal year 2010-11.

The Gross Receipts Tax and Business Registration Fees Ordinance (Proposition E) was approved by San Francisco voters on November 6, 2012. The ordinance replaces the existing tax which is 1.5% of a business' payroll with a tax on a business' gross receipts at rates that vary by the size and type of business. The new tax structure will be phased-in over a five year period and at the end of the period the gross receipts tax rates will remain fixed. The new tax structure will generate annual tax revenues equal to what would have been generated under the existing tax structure plus the amount of the additional administrative cost of the new system. In addition, the existing business registration fee structure will be replaced by a new higher graduated registration fee structure projected generate a net revenue increase to the City of approximately \$28.5 million beginning in fiscal year 2013-14. The gross receipts tax will apply to businesses with \$1 million or more in gross receipts, adjusted by the Consumer Price Index going forward. The ordinance increases the number and types of businesses in the City that pay business tax and registration fees from approximately 7,500 currently to 15,000. Current payroll tax exclusions will be converted into a gross receipts tax exclusion of the same size, terms and expiration dates.

Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax)

Pursuant to the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code, a 14.0% transient occupancy tax is imposed on occupants of hotel rooms and is remitted by hotel operators monthly. A quarterly tax-filing requirement is also imposed. Hotel tax revenue growth is a function of changes in occupancy, average daily room rates (ADR) and room supply. Revenue per available room (RevPAR), the combined effect of occupancy and ADR, reached a historic high of \$183 through December of fiscal year 2012-13 (year-to-date). Increases in RevPAR are expected to continue albeit at a slower pace through fiscal year 2013-14. Total hotel tax revenue for fiscal year 2012-13 is projected to be \$257.9 million in the Six Month Report and budgeted to be \$275.6 million in fiscal year 2013-14.

San Francisco and a number of other jurisdictions in California and the U.S. are currently involved in litigation with online travel companies regarding the companies' duty to remit hotel taxes on the difference between the wholesale and retail prices paid for hotel rooms. On February 6, 2013, the Los Angeles Superior Court issued a summary judgment concluding that there was no obligation on the part of online travel companies to remit hotel tax to the City. San Francisco is now the fourth City in California to receive a judgment overturning administrative hearings it conducted to require payment from online travel companies. San Francisco has received approximately \$63 million in disputed hotel taxes paid by the companies. The portion of these remittances that will be retained or returned, as well as related legal fees and 7% annual interest on any amounts refunded, will depend on developments with these lawsuits.

Because the allocation of hotel tax revenues is set by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors as described in the Administrative Provisions of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, all of the gain or loss in revenue from budgeted levels falls to the General Fund, contributing to the large variances from prior periods. Table A-10 sets forth a history of transient occupancy tax receipts for fiscal years 2008-09 through 2013-14.

TABLE A -10

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Transient Occupancy Tax Receipts
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
All Funds

Fiscal Year	Tax Rate	Revenue (000s)	Change	
2008-09	14.00%	219,777	(5,037)	-2.2%
2009-10	14.00%	192,082	(27,695)	-12.6%
2010-11	14.00%	215,512	23,430	12.2%
2011-12	14.00%	242,843	27,331	12.7%
2012-13 projected	14.00%	257,899	15,056	6.2%
2013-14 budgeted	14.00%	275,557	17,658	6.8%

Figures are all funds. Figures for FY 2008-09 through FY 2011-12 are CAFR actuals plus the portion of hotel tax revenue used to pay debt service on hotel tax revenue bonds. Figures for FY 2012-13 are from the Six Month Budget Update published February 12, 2013 and FY 2013-14 amounts are Original Budget.

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

Real Property Transfer Tax

A tax is imposed on all real estate transfers recorded in the City. Transfer tax revenue is more susceptible to economic and real estate cycles than most other City revenue sources. Current 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; \$20.00 per \$1,000 for properties valued more than \$5.0 million and less than \$10.0 million; and \$25 per \$1,000 for properties valued at more than \$10.0 million.

Real property transfer tax revenue in fiscal year 2012-13 is projected to be \$224.7 million in the Six Month report, approximately \$8.9 million (3.8%) less than the revenue received in fiscal year 2012-13 due to an expected flattening of real property sales from the fiscal year 2011-12 peak. Fiscal year 2013-14 budget for real property transfer tax revenues is \$183.1 million, reflecting continued slowing market activity.

Table A-11 sets forth a history of real property transfer tax receipts for fiscal years 2008-09 through 2011-12, projected receipts for fiscal year 2012-13, and budgeted receipts for fiscal year 2013-14.

TABLE A-11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Real Property Transfer Tax Receipts
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Revenue	Change	
2008-09	48,957	(37,262)	-43.2%
2009-10	83,694	34,737	71.0%
2010-11	135,184	51,489	61.5%
2011-12	233,591	98,407	72.8%
2012-13 projected	224,668	(8,923)	-3.8%
2013-14 budgeted	183,123	(41,545)	-18.5%

Figures for FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12 are audited actuals. Figures for FY 2012-13 are from the Six Month Budget Update published February 12, 2013 and FY 2013-14 amounts are Original Budget.

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

Sales and Use Tax

The State collects the City's local sales tax on retail transactions along with State and special district sales taxes, and then remits the local sales tax collections to the City. The rate of tax is one percent; however, the State takes one-quarter of this, and replaces the lost revenue with a shift of local property taxes to the City from local school district funding. The local sales tax revenue is deposited in the City's General Fund.

Local sales tax collections in fiscal year 2012-13 are projected to be at \$121.9 million in the Six Month report, a minimal increase of \$0.2 million from Original Budget and a \$4.8 (4.1%) million increase from fiscal year 2011-12 revenue. The Original Budget projects continued revenue growth during fiscal year 2013-14 at \$130.0 million, representing a \$8.1 (6.7%) million increase over projected receipts in fiscal year 2012-13. The fiscal year 2013-14 budget includes \$2.2 million in additional one-time revenue from the America's Cup yacht racing event.

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. Table A-12 reflects the City's actual sales and use tax receipts for fiscal years 2008-09 through 2011-12, projected receipts for fiscal year 2012-13, and budgeted receipts for fiscal year 2013-14, as well as the imputed impact of the property tax shift made in compensation for the one-quarter of the sales tax revenue taken by the State.

TABLE A-12

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Sales and Use Tax Receipts
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Tax Rate	City Share	Revenue	Change	
2008-09	9.50%	0.75%	101,662	(9,749)	-8.8%
2008-09 adj.*	9.50%	1.00%	137,415	(11,314)	-7.6%
2009-10	9.50%	0.75%	96,605	(5,057)	-5.0%
2009-10 adj.*	9.50%	1.00%	128,286	(9,129)	-6.6%
2010-11 **	9.50%	0.75%	106,302	9,698	10.0%
2010-11 adj.*	9.50%	1.00%	140,924	12,639	9.9%
2011-12	8.50%	0.75%	117,071	10,769	10.1%
2011-12 adj.*	8.50%	1.00%	155,466	14,542	10.3%
2012-13 <i>projected</i>	8.50%	0.75%	121,914	4,843	4.1%
2012-13 adj.* <i>projected</i>	8.50%	1.00%	161,244	5,778	3.7%
2013-14 <i>budgeted</i>	8.50%	0.75%	130,023	8,109	6.7%
2013-14 adj.* <i>budgeted</i>	8.50%	1.00%	170,453	9,209	5.7%

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

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

Figures for FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12 are audited actuals. Figures for FY 2012-13 are from the Six Month Budget Update published February 12, 2013 and FY 2013-14 amounts are Original Budget.

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

Utility Users Tax

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

Fiscal year 2012-13 Utility User Tax revenues are projected at \$93.7 million in the Six Month report, representing a \$1.8 (2.0%) million increase from Original Budget and \$2.0 million (2.2%) above prior year actual revenues. Utility User Tax revenue is budgeted to remain flat in fiscal year 2013-14 at \$93.7 million.

Emergency Response Fee; Access Line Tax

The City imposes an Access Line Tax ("ALT") on every person who subscribes to telephone communications services in the City. The ALT replaced the Emergency Response Fee ("ERF") in 2009. It applies to each telephone line in the City and is collected from telephone communications service subscribers by the telephone service supplier. The tax does not apply to wireless telephone communications services. Access Line Tax revenues are projected in the Six Month report to be \$40.3 million, \$2.7 (6.2%) million less than Original Budget and \$0.7 (1.7%) million less than fiscal year 2011-12 revenue. ALT revenues are budgeted at \$44.3 million in fiscal year 2013-14 an increase of \$4.0 (9.0%) million from the fiscal year 2012-13 Six Month report projection. The budget assumed the bottoming out of revenue in fiscal year 2011-12 from declines in the previous two years would stabilize.

Parking Tax

A 25% tax is imposed on the charge for off-street parking spaces. The tax is authorized by the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code. The tax is paid by the occupants of the spaces, and then remitted monthly to the City by the operators of the parking facilities.

Fiscal year 2012-13 Parking Tax is projected at \$80.0 million in the Six Month report, \$3.5 (4.6%) million more than original budget and \$3.4 (4.4%) million above fiscal year 2011-12. The recovery in business activity and employment as reflected in increases to payroll and sales tax revenues is driving increases in parking tax revenues.

Original Budget for fiscal year 2013-14 parking tax revenue is \$78.8 million, a \$2.3 million increase (3.0%) from fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget and \$1.2 million (1.5%) reduced from the fiscal year 2012-13 projection. Parking tax revenues are deposited into the General Fund, from which an amount equivalent to 80% is transferred to the MTA for public transit as mandated by Charter Section 16.110.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES

1991 Health and Welfare Realignment

In fiscal year 1991-92, the State transferred to counties the responsibility for determining service levels and administering most mental health, public health and some social service programs, thereby reducing the State's obligations. The State also increased its share of certain welfare costs formerly borne by counties. In order to meet these obligations, counties share in the proceeds of a 0.5% statewide sales tax and a portion of vehicle license fees ("VLF"). In fiscal year 2012-13 these sources are projected to provide \$164.9 million to the General Fund which constitutes an increase of \$24.9 (17.8%) million from fiscal year 2011-12 and a \$14 (8.5%) million increase from fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget. These increases are a result of the combined effect of a large one-time back payment of statewide sales tax revenue for several years of social services caseload growth, and funding shifts related to state realignment completed in fiscal year 2011-12. Original Budget fiscal year 2013-14 Original Budget for these sources is \$155.2 million, a decrease of \$8.7 (5.3%) million reflecting the loss of the one-time state sales tax back payment mitigated by continued improvement in state sales tax revenue. VLF collections are expected to remain flat during fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14.

Public Safety Sales Tax

State Proposition 172, passed by California voters in November 1993, provided for the continuation of a one-half percent sales tax for public safety expenditures. This revenue is a function of the City's proportionate share of statewide sales activity. Revenue from this source for fiscal year 2012-13 was projected to be \$81.2 million in the Six Month report an increase of \$6.2 million (6.0%) from fiscal year 2011-12 and \$2.2 (2.8%) million more than fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget. In fiscal year 2013-14 revenue from this subvention is budgeted at \$81.7 million reflecting a modest \$0.5 million (0.6%) increase from fiscal year 2012-13 projections.

Other Intergovernmental Grants and Subventions

In addition to those categories listed above, \$548.7 million was projected in the Six Month report from grants and subventions from State and federal governments to fund public health, social services, and other programs in the General Fund. This represents a \$13.6 million (2.5%) increase from fiscal year 2011-12 and a \$ 0.6 million (0.1%) reduction from fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget. The Original Budget in the General Fund for fiscal year 2013-14 is \$569.5 million which is a \$20.8 million (3.8%) increase from the fiscal year 2012-13 projection. A large portion of the budgeted increase in fiscal year 2013-14 is the removal of a \$15.0 million allowance for unspecified funding reductions in fiscal year 2012-13.

Charges for Services

Charges for services in the General Fund in fiscal year 2012-13 are projected to be \$151.7 million in the Six Month report and budgeted at \$159.7 million for fiscal year 2013-14, representing growth of \$16.9 million (12.5%) and \$8.0 million (5.3%) respectively from prior year.

Fiscal year 2012-13 growth reflects Fire Department ambulance billing recoveries increases over fiscal year 2011-12 due to AB 678 - Medi-Cal: Ground Emergency Medical Transport, passed by the State legislature in 2011.

CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

Unique among California cities, San Francisco as a charter city and county must provide the services of both a city and a county. Public services include police, fire and public safety; public health, mental health and other social services; courts, jails, and juvenile justice; public works, streets, and transportation, including port and airport; construction and maintenance of all public buildings and facilities; water, sewer, and power services; parks and recreation; libraries and cultural facilities and events; zoning and planning, and many others. Employment costs are relatively fixed by labor and retirement agreements, and account for upwards of 50% of all City expenditures. In addition, the Charter imposes certain baselines, mandates, and property tax set-asides, which dictate expenditure or service levels for certain programs, and allocate specific revenues or specific proportions thereof to other programs, including MTA, children's services and public education, and libraries. Budgeted baseline and mandated funding in fiscal year 2012-13 is \$661.6 million in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$697.7 million in fiscal year 2013-14. The Six Month report projected that improved general revenues result in these baseline and mandated funding transfers to be increased by \$8.9 million compared to budget in fiscal year 2012-13.

General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area

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

TABLE A-13

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Expenditures by Major Service Area
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
(000s)

Major Service Areas	FY 2008-09 Original Budget	FY 2009-10 Original Budget	FY 2010-11 Original Budget	FY 2011-12 Original Budget	FY 2012-13 Original Budget	FY 2013-14 Original Budget
Public Protection	\$899,378	\$955,519	\$947,327	\$998,237	\$1,058,689	\$1,087,646
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	654,162	642,810	655,026	672,834	670,375	679,154
Community Health	513,858	488,330	519,319	575,446	609,892	620,199
General Administration & Finance	182,139	177,892	169,526	199,011	197,994	207,196
Culture and Recreation	104,232	95,114	97,510	100,740	111,066	113,787
General City Responsibilities	78,524	104,476	103,128	110,725	145,560	144,666
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	53,143	33,414	26,989	51,588	67,529	64,921
Total	\$2,485,436	\$2,497,555	\$2,518,824	\$2,708,581	\$2,861,106	\$2,917,569

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

Public Protection primarily includes the Police Department, the Fire Department, and the Sheriff's Office. These departments are budgeted to receive \$373.3 million, \$212.0 million and \$137.1 million of General Fund support respectively in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$390.3 million, \$215.8 million, and \$140.0 million respectively in fiscal year 2013-14. Within Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development, the Department of Human Services, which includes aid assistance and aid payments and City grant programs, is budgeted to receive \$231.0 million of General Fund support in the fiscal year 2012-13 and \$236.1 million in fiscal year 2013-14.

The Public Health Department is budgeted to receive \$446.6 million in General Fund support for public health programs and the operation of San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital in fiscal year 2012-13 and \$511.7 million in fiscal year 2013-14. As of the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Six Month report, the Department of Public Health projected ending the fiscal year with a net General Fund deficit of \$45.9 million. This deficit may be partially offset by year end if potential revenues from prior-year settlements and other reimbursements are received in the current year. Overall revenues are projected to be \$22.7 million less than budgeted and expenditures are projected to be \$23.1 million higher than budgeted.

For budgetary purposes, enterprise funds are characterized as either self-supported funds or General Fund-supported funds. General Fund-supported funds include the Convention Facility Fund, the Cultural and Recreation Film Fund, the Gas Tax Fund, the Golf Fund, the Grants Fund, the General Hospital Fund, and the Laguna Honda Hospital Fund. The MTA is classified as a self-supported fund, although it is budgeted pursuant to a formula under the Charter to receive a \$213.3 million General Fund transfer in the fiscal year 2012-13 Original Budget.

Baselines

The Charter requires funding for baselines and other mandated funding requirements. The chart below identifies the required and budgeted levels of appropriation funding for key baselines and mandated funding requirements. Revenue-driven baselines are based on the projected aggregate City discretionary revenues, whereas expenditure-driven baselines are typically a function of total spending.

TABLE A-14

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO				
Baselines & Set-Asides				
Fiscal Years 2012-13 & 2013-14				
(Millions)				
	FY 2012-13	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2013-14
	Required Baseline	Original Budget	Required Baseline	Original Budget
Baselines & Set-Asides				
Municipal Transportation Authority	\$154.86	\$154.86	\$160.63	\$160.63
Parking and Traffic Commission	58.07	58.07	60.23	60.23
Children's Services	115.21	127.21	119.49	126.76
Library Preservation	52.95	52.95	54.92	54.92
Public Education Enrichment Funding				
Unified School District	32.66	32.66	33.92	33.92
First Five Commission	17.70	17.70	18.38	18.38
City Services Auditor	12.36	12.36	12.45	12.45
Human Services Homeless Care Fund	13.71	13.71	13.71	13.71
Property Tax Related Set-Asides				
Municipal Symphony	2.03	2.03	2.12	2.12
Children's Fund Set-Aside	44.72	44.72	46.03	46.03
Library Preservation Set-Aside	37.27	37.27	38.36	38.36
Open Space Set-Aside	37.27	37.27	38.36	38.36
Staffing and Service-Driven				
Police Minimum Staffing	Requirement potentially not met during course of budget year		Requirement potentially not met during course of budget year	
Fire Neighborhood Firehouse Funding	Requirement met		Requirement met	
Treatment on Demand	Requirement not met		Requirement not met	
Total Baseline Spending	\$585.51	\$597.51	\$605.55	\$612.82

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

With respect to Police Department staffing, the Charter mandates a police staffing baseline of not less than 1,971 full-duty officers. The Charter-mandated baseline staffing level may be reduced in cases where civilian hires result in the return of a full-duty officer to active police work. The Charter also provides that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors may convert a position from a sworn officer to a civilian through the budget process. With respect to the Fire Department, the Charter mandates baseline 24-hour staffing of 42 firehouses, the Arson and Fire Investigation Unit, no fewer than four ambulances, and four Rescue Captains (medical supervisors).

Reserves

The City's fiscal year 2012-13 budget includes reserves that are available for appropriation to City departments by action of the Board of Supervisors, including the General Reserve (\$32.2 million), the Salaries and Benefit Reserve (\$13.1 million), and the Litigation Reserve (\$11.0 million) Original Budget. These are the fiscal year 2012-13 appropriations to the reserves and do not include carry-forward of prior year balances.

The Charter requires some set-asides of departmental expenditure savings in the form of a Citywide Budget Savings Incentive Reserve and a Recreation and Park Budget Savings Incentive Reserve.

See "Budgetary Reserves and Economic Stabilization and Limitations on Use of Selected Nonrecurring Revenues."

EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-RETIREMENT OBLIGATIONS

The cost of salaries and benefits for City employees represents approximately 50% of the City's expenditures, totaling \$3.5 billion in the fiscal year 2011-12 Original Budget (all-funds), and \$3.8 billion and \$4.0 billion in the fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 budgets. Looking only at the General Fund, the combined salary and benefits budget was \$1.7 billion in the fiscal year 2011-12 Original Budget and \$1.8 billion per year in the fiscal year 2012-13 and fiscal year 2013-14 budgets. This section discusses the organization of City workers into bargaining units, the status of employment contracts, and City expenditures on employee-related costs including salaries, wages, medical benefits, retirement benefits and the City's retirement system, and post-retirement health and medical benefits. Employees of SFUSD, SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court are not City employees.

Labor Relations

The City's budget for fiscal years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 includes 31,407 and 32,659 budgeted City positions, respectively. City workers are represented by 37 different labor unions. The largest unions in the City are the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU"), Local 1021; the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (the "IFPTE"), Local 21; and the unions representing police, fire, deputy sheriffs and transit workers.

The wages, hours and working conditions of City employees are determined by collective bargaining pursuant to State law (California Government Code Sections 3500-3511, the "Meyers-Milias-Brown Act") and the Charter. Except for nurses and a few hundred unrepresented employees, the Charter requires that bargaining impasses be resolved through final and binding interest arbitration conducted by a panel of three arbitrators. The award of the arbitration panel is final and binding unless legally challenged. Wages, hours and working conditions of nurses are not subject to interest arbitration, but are subject to Charter-mandated economic limits. In addition, in November 2010, the voters in the City approved Proposition G, which requires that disputes regarding the wages, hours and working conditions of transit operators be resolved through a final and binding interest arbitration proceeding. Strikes by City employees are prohibited by the Charter. Since 1976, no City employees have participated in a union-authorized strike.

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

In May 2012, the City negotiated two-year agreements (for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14) with most of its labor unions.¹ In general, the parties agreed to: 1) reforms and/or elimination of certain pay premiums; and 2) some structural reforms of the City's healthcare benefit and cost-sharing structures by having employees contribute more toward the cost of enrolling in "employee only" health benefits during the term of the 2 year contract. SEIU "miscellaneous" employees and staff nurses agreed to healthcare benefit reforms that will take place beyond the term of the July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014 contract.

City employees, who are in non-Police, Fire and Nurse classifications will receive a base wage increase for the first time since 2008, as follows: 1% on July 1, 2013; 1% on January 4, 2014 and 1% on March 29, 2014. The two SEIU-represented units' wage increases differ, as follows: SEIU "miscellaneous" employees will receive 2% on January 4, 2014 and 1% on March 29, 2014 and the SEIU Staff Nurses will receive 3% on March 29, 2014.

On February 1, 2012, the City became the successor agency to the dissolved SFRDA (the "Successor SFRDA"). As a successor agency, the City acquired approximately 100 former SFRDA employees, who are covered by various Memoranda of Agreement. On March 29th, 2012, the Successor Agency and the unions representing former SFRDA employees signed a Letter of Agreement facilitating continuing staffing arrangements for active projects. Approximately half of the former SFRDA employees were retained and transferred to the Successor Agency. Negotiations for successor agreements on remaining terms are continuing. The existing contracts remain in place until an agreement has been reached. See "City Budget – San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution" above.

Pursuant to Charter Section 8A.104, the MTA is responsible for negotiating contracts for the transit operators and employees in service-critical bargaining units. These contracts are subject to approval by the MTA Board. The MTA and the union representing the transit operators (TWU, Local 250-A) agreed to a three-year successor agreement that expires on June 30, 2014. The concessions are valued at \$41.1 million dollars over the life of the agreement. Table A-14 shows the membership of each operating employee bargaining unit and the date the current labor contract expires.

¹ The City's labor contracts with the Police Officers' Association, Firefighters' union and their related management classes, represented by the Municipal Executives' Association, will not expire until June 30, 2015. The City negotiated a three-year agreement with the Supervising Nurses (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2015).

TABLE A-15

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (All Funds)
Employee Organizations as of July 1, 2012

Organization	Budgeted Positions	Expiration Date of MOU
Automotive Machinists, Local 1414	400	June 30, 2014
Bricklayers, Local 3/Hod Carriers, Local 36	18	June 30, 2014
Building Inspectors Association	77	June 30, 2014
Carpenters, Local 22	110	June 30, 2014
Carpet, Linoleum & Soft Tile	2	June 30, 2014
CIR (Interns & Residents)	230	June 30, 2014
Cement Masons, Local 580	33	June 30, 2014
Deputy Sheriffs Association	865	June 30, 2014
District Attorney Investigators Association	39	June 30, 2014
Electrical Workers, Local 6	817	June 30, 2014
Glaziers, Local 718	10	June 30, 2014
International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, Local 16	18	June 30, 2014
Ironworkers, Local 377	15	June 30, 2014
Laborers International Union, Local 261	1007	June 30, 2014
Municipal Attorneys' Association	432	June 30, 2014
Municipal Executives Association	1068	June 30, 2014
MEA - Police Management	2	June 30, 2015
MEA - Fire Management	9	June 30, 2015
Operating Engineers, Local 3	57	June 30, 2014
Painters	121	June 30, 2014
Pile Drivers, Local 34	18	June 30, 2014
Plumbers, Local 38	340	June 30, 2014
Probation Officers Association	159	June 30, 2014
Professional & Technical Engineers, Local 21	4733	June 30, 2014
Roofers, Local 40	11	June 30, 2014
S.F. Institutional Police Officers Association	2	June 30, 2014
S.F. Firefighters, Local 798	1729	June 30, 2015
S.F. Police Officers Association	2421	June 30, 2015
SEIU, Local 1021	10992	June 30, 2014
SEIU, Local 1021 Staff & Per Diem Nurses	1514	June 30, 2014
SEIU, Local 1021 H-1 Rescue Paramedics	12	June 30, 2013
Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104	47	June 30, 2014
Stationary Engineers, Local 39	662	June 30, 2014
Supervising Probation Officers, Operating Engineers, Local 3	23	June 30, 2014
Teamsters, Local 853	158	June 30, 2014
Teamsters, Local 856 (Multi-Unit)	103	June 30, 2014
Teamsters, Local 856 (Supervising Nurses)	119	June 30, 2015
TWU, Local 200 (SEAM multi-unit & claims)	316	June 30, 2014
TWU, Local 250-A Auto Service Workers	193	June 30, 2014
TWU-250-A Miscellaneous	94	June 30, 2014
TWU-250-A Transit Operators	2103	June 30, 2014
Union of American Physicians & Dentists	190	June 30, 2015
Unrepresented Employees	138	June 30, 2013
Total	<u>31,407</u> ¹	

¹ Budgeted positions do not include SFUSD, SFCCD, or Superior Court Personnel.

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

San Francisco Employees' Retirement System ("SFERS" or "Retirement System")

History and Administration

SFERS is charged with administering a defined-benefit pension plan (the "Retirement System") that covers substantially all City employees and certain other employees. The Retirement System was initially established by approval by City voters on November 2, 1920 and the California 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. [City Charter Section 12.100]

To aid in the administration of the Retirement System, the Retirement Board appoints an Executive Director and an Actuary. [City Charter Section 12.100] The Executive Director serves as chief executive officer, with responsibility extending to all divisions of the Retirement System. [City Charter Section 12.100] The Actuary's responsibilities include the production of data and a summary of plan provisions for the independent consulting actuarial firm retained by the Retirement Board to prepare an annual valuation report and other analyses as described below. The independent consulting actuarial firm is currently Cheiron, Inc., a nationally recognized firm selected by the Retirement Board pursuant to a competitive process.

In 2010, the Retirement System filed an application with the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") for a Determination Letter. In March 2012, IRS issued a favorable Determination Letter for SFERS. Issuance of a Determination Letter constitutes a finding by the IRS that operation of the defined benefit plan in accordance with the plan provisions and documents disclosed in the application qualifies the plan for federal tax exempt status. A tax qualified plan also provides tax advantages to the City and to members of the Retirement System. The favorable Determination Letter included IRS review of all SFERS provisions, including the new provisions of Proposition C approved by the City voters in November 2011.

Membership

The Retirement System estimates that the total active membership as of July 1, 2012 (the date of most recent valuation report) was 33,655, compared to 33,475 members a year earlier. Active membership includes 4,543 vested members and 1,015 reciprocal members. Vested members are individuals who (i) have separated from City service, (ii) have worked for the City for five or more years, and (iii) have elected to receive a deferred vested pension in the future. Reciprocal members are individuals who have established membership in a reciprocal pension plan such as CalPERS and may be eligible to receive a reciprocal pension from the Retirement System in the future. The total new enrollees in the Retirement System were 2,228 in fiscal year 2011-12 and 2,055 in fiscal year 2010-11. Retirement allowances are paid to approximately 25,000 retired members and beneficiaries monthly. Benefit recipients include retired members, vested members receiving a vesting allowance, and qualified survivors.

Beginning July 1, 2008, the Retirement System had a Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) program for Police Plan members who were eligible and elected participation. The program "sunset" on June 30, 2011. A total of 354 eligible Police Plan members elected to participate in DROP during the three-year enrollment window. As of June 30, 2012, approximately 184 police officers are enrolled in the program and all will retire over the next two fiscal years.

Table A-16 shows total Retirement System participation for fiscal years 2007-08 through 2011-12.

TABLE A-16

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Employees' Retirement System
Fiscal Years 2007 - 08 through 2011 - 12

As of 1-Jul	Active Members	Vested Members	Reciprocal Members	Total Non-retired	Retirees/ Continuants	Active to Retiree Ratio
2008	30,650	3,877	869	35,396	21,514	1.425
2009	29,919	4,096	890	34,905	22,294	1.342
2010	28,222	4,515	978	33,715	23,500	1.201
2011	27,955	4,499	1,021	33,475	24,292	1.151
2012	28,097	4,543	1,015	33,655	25,190	1.115

Sources: SFERS' Actuarial Valuation reports as of July 1, 2012, July 1, 2011, July 1, 2010, July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2008.

Funding Practices

The annual actuarial valuation of the Retirement System is a joint effort of the Retirement System and its independent consulting actuarial firm. The City Charter proscribes certain actuarial methods and amortization periods to be used by the Retirement System in preparing the actuarial valuation. [City Charter Sections 12.100 and A8.510] Before the valuation is conducted, the consulting actuarial firm recommends three long-term economic assumptions: a long-term investment earnings assumption, a long-term wage/inflation assumption and a long-term consumer price index assumption.

At its December 2011 meeting, after review of the analysis and recommendation prepared by the consulting actuarial firm, the Retirement Board voted to phase in reductions to the Retirement System's long-term investment earnings assumption, long-term wage/inflation assumption and long-term consumer price index assumption over a three-year period as follows: long-term investment earnings assumption from 7.75% to 7.50% (fiscal year 2011-12 to 7.66%; fiscal year 2012-13 to 7.58%; fiscal year 2013-14 to 7.50%); long-term wage inflation assumption from 4.00% to 3.75% (fiscal year 2011-12 to 3.91%; fiscal year 2012-13 to 3.83%; fiscal year 2013-14 to 3.75%); and long-term consumer price index assumption from 3.50% to 3.25% (fiscal year 2011-12 to 3.41%; fiscal year 2012-13 to 3.33%; fiscal year 2013-14 to 3.25%). These economic assumptions together with demographic assumptions based on periodic demographic studies are utilized to prepare the actuarial valuation of the Retirement System each year. Upon receipt of the consulting actuarial firm's valuation report, Retirement System staff provides a recommendation to the Retirement Board for their acceptance of the consulting actuary's valuation report. In connection with such acceptance, the Retirement Board acts to set the annual employer contribution rates required by the Retirement System as determined by the consulting actuarial firm and approved by the Retirement Board. [City Charter Section A8.510]

The consulting actuarial firm and the Retirement Board set the actuarially required employer contribution rate using three related calculations:

First, the normal cost is established for the Retirement System. The normal cost of the Retirement System represents the portion of the actuarial present value of benefits that SFERS will be expected to fund that is attributable to a current year's employment. The Retirement System uses the entry age normal cost method, which is an actuarial method of calculating the anticipated cost of pension liabilities, designed to fund promised benefits over the average future life of the Retirement System members.

Second, the contribution calculation takes account of the amortization of a portion of the amount by which the actuarial value of Retirement System liabilities exceeds the actuarial value of Retirement System assets, such amount being known as an "unfunded accrued actuarial liability" or "UAAL."

The UAAL is the difference between estimated liabilities and the value of smoothed plan assets and can be thought of as a snapshot of the funding of benefits as of the valuation date. There are a number of assumptions and

calculation methods that bear on each side of this asset-liability comparison. On the asset side, the actuarial value of Retirement System assets is calculated using a five-year smoothing technique, so that gains or losses in asset value are recognized over that longer period rather than in the immediate time period such gain or loss is identified. As for calculating the pension benefit liability, certain assumptions must be made about future costs of pension benefits to generate an overall liability amount. If the Retirement System's results are better or worse than the estimated UAAL, the result is called an actuarial gain or loss, respectively, and under the Retirement Board's Actuarial Methods Policy any such gain or loss is amortized over a 15-year period. Similarly, if the estimated liabilities change due to changes in the aforementioned assumptions, the effect of such changes is also amortized over a 15-year period.

Third, after calculating the normal cost and the adjustment for UAAL, the consulting actuarial firm amortizes supplemental costs associated with the various SFERS benefit plans. Supplemental costs are additional costs resulting from the past service component of SFERS benefit increases. In other words, when the Charter is amended to extend additional benefits to some or all beneficiaries of the Retirement System, the Retirement System's payment liability is increased by the amount of the new benefit earned in connection with the service time already accrued by the then-current beneficiaries. These supplemental costs for each beneficiary are amortized over no more than 20 years.

The consulting actuarial firm combines the three calculations described above to arrive at a total contribution requirement for funding the Retirement System in that fiscal year. This total contribution amount is satisfied from a combination of employer and employee contributions. Employee contribution rates are mandated by the Charter. [e.g. City Charter Section A8.587-8(a)] 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. The employer contribution rate is established by Retirement Board action each year and is expressed as a percentage of salary applied to all wages covered under the Retirement System. The most recent voter-approved retirement changes are described below.

Prospective purchasers of the City's bonds should carefully review and assess the assumptions regarding the performance of the Retirement System. There is a risk that actual results will differ significantly from assumptions. In addition, prospective purchasers of the City's bonds are cautioned that the information and assumptions speak only as of the respective dates contained in the underlying source documents, and are therefore subject to change.

Recent Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan

The levels of SFERS plan benefits are established under the Charter and approved directly by the voters, rather than through the collective bargaining process. Changes to retirement benefits require a voter-approved Charter amendment. Recent changes to SFERS plan benefits have been intended to reduce pension costs associated with future City employees. For example, in November 2011, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition C, which

- a) created new SFERS benefit plans for Miscellaneous and Safety employees commencing employment on or after January 7, 2012, which raise the minimum service retirement age for Miscellaneous members from 50 to 53; limit covered compensation to 85% of the IRC §401(a)(17) limits for Miscellaneous members and 75% of the IRC §401(a)(17) limits for Safety members; calculate final compensation using highest three-year average compensation; and decrease vesting allowances for Miscellaneous members by lowering the City's funding for a portion of the vesting allowance from 100% to 50%;
- b) provided that employees commencing employment on or after January 7, 2012 otherwise eligible for membership in CalPERS may become members of SFERS;
- c) effective July 1, 2012, provides for an increase or decrease of employee contributions to SFERS for certain SFERS members based on the employer contribution rate set by the Retirement Board for that year. (For example, Miscellaneous employees who earn less than \$50,000 per year would pay the minimum Charter-mandated employee contribution rate; Miscellaneous employees who earn between \$50,000 and \$100,000 per year would pay a fluctuating contribution rate in the range of +4% to -4% of the Charter-mandated employee contribution rate; and Miscellaneous employees who earn \$100,000 or more per year would pay a fluctuating contribution rate in the range of +5% to -5% of the Charter-mandated employee contribution rate. Similar fluctuating employee contributions are required from Safety employees also); and

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

The impact of Proposition C is incorporated in the actuarial valuations beginning with the July 1, 2012 Actuarial Valuation report.

Since 2008, the voters of San Francisco have approved three other retirement plan amendments:

- Proposition D enacted in June 2010, which enacted new SFERS retirement plans for Miscellaneous and Safety employees commencing on or after July 1, 2010, which changed average final compensation used in the benefit formula from highest one-year average compensation to highest two-year average compensation, increased the employee contribution rate for City safety and CalPERS members hired on or after July 1, 2010 from 7.5% of covered pay to 9.0%, and provides that, in years when the City's required contribution to SFERS is less than the employer normal cost as described above, the amount saved would be deposited into the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund.
- The enactment of DROP, a Deferred Retirement Option Program available to certain police members effective July 1, 2008, authorized by City voters' approval on an initiative proposition in the February 2008 election. In June 2011, the Board of Supervisors voted to allow the program to sunset on June 30, 2011
- Proposition B enacted in June 2008 which increased the years of service required for City employees hired after January 10, 2009 to qualify for employer-funded retiree health benefits, established a separate Retiree Health Care Trust Fund to fund retiree health costs, and increased retirement benefits and retirement cost-of-living adjustments for "miscellaneous" employees (i.e., those covered under Charter Section A8.409).

SFERS Recent Funding Performance and City Employer Contribution History

From fiscal year 1996-97 through fiscal year 2003-04, the City's contribution to the Retirement System was zero as determined by the consulting actuarial firm of the Retirement System and adopted by the Retirement Board. The zero percent employer funding requirements for this period was due primarily to higher-than-projected investment earnings and lower-than-projected wage increases. Beginning in fiscal year 2004-05, the Retirement Board reinstated required employer contributions based on the funding requirements as determined by the consulting actuarial firm in the manner described above in "Funding Practices." In fiscal year 2011-12, total City employer contributions to the Retirement System were \$288 million, which was 18.09% of that portion of members' earned wages that are includable for calculation and contribution purposes ("Pensionable Salary"). This amount includes \$129 million from the City General Fund. For the fiscal year 2012-13 total City employer contributions to the Retirement System are budgeted at \$375 million, which is 20.71% of Pensionable Salary. This amount includes \$185 million from the General Fund. The latest actuarial report as of July 1, 2012 provides that future employer contribution rates are projected to increase to 28% for fiscal year 2014-2015 as the Retirement System recognizes the 2011 economic assumption changes and the losses incurred by the Retirement System in fiscal years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Table A-17 shows Retirement System contributions for fiscal years 2007-08 through 2011-12. "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 value of assets held in trust adjusted according to the Retirement System's actuarial methods as summarized above. "Pension Benefit Obligation" reflects the accrued actuarial liability of the Retirement System. The "Market Funded" column is determined by dividing the market value of assets by the Pension Benefit Obligations. The "Actuarial Funded" column is determined by dividing the actuarial value of assets by the Pension Benefit Obligations. "Employee and Employer Contributions" reflects the total of mandated employee contributions and employer Actuarial Retirement Contributions received by the Retirement System for fiscal years 2006-07 through 2011-12.

TABLE A-17

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Employee Retirement System (in \$000s)
Fiscal Years 2007-08 through 2011-12

As of	Market Value	Actuarial Value	Pension Benefit	Percent	Employee &	Employer
1-Jul	of Assets	of Assets	Obligation	Funded	Contribution	Contribution
						Rates ⁽¹⁾
2007	16,952,044	14,929,287	13,541,388	110.0	308,348	6.24%
2008	15,832,521	15,941,390	15,358,824	103.8	319,183	5.91%
2009	11,886,729	16,004,730	16,498,649	97.0	312,715	4.99%
2010	13,136,786	16,069,100	17,643,400	91.1	413,562	9.49%
2011	15,598,839	16,313,100	18,598,700	87.7	490,578	13.56%
2012	15,293,700	16,027,700	19,393,900	82.6	608,957	18.09%

⁽¹⁾ Employer contribution rates for fiscal years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 are 20.71% and 24.82% respectively.

Sources: SFERS' audited financial statements and supplemental schedules June 30, 2012, 2011, 2010, 2009, and 2008.
SFERS Actuarial Valuation report as of July 1, 2012, July 1, 2011, July 1, 2010, July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2008.

Table A-17 reflects that the Percent Funded ratio (that is, the Actuarial Value of Assets divided by the Pension Benefit Obligation) decreased to 82.6%, corresponding to an unfunded actuarial liability (UAAL) of approximately \$3.4 billion. The UAAL is the difference between the Actuarial Value of Assets and the total Pension Benefit Obligation. This means that as of June 30, 2012, for every dollar of pension benefits the City is obligated to pay, it had approximately \$0.83 in assets available for payment.

Asset Management and Actuarial Valuation

The assets of the Fund are invested in a broadly diversified manner across the institutional global capital markets. In addition to U.S. equities and fixed income securities, the Fund holds international equities, global sovereign and corporate debt, global public and private real estate and an array of alternative investments including private equity and venture capital limited partnerships. See page 68 of the CAFR, attached as Appendix B to this Official Statement, for a breakdown of the asset allocation as of June 30, 2012. The Fund does not hold hedge funds. 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, 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3000, San Francisco, California 94102, or by calling (415) 487-7020. Certain documents are available at the Retirement System website at www.sfers.org. The information available on the Retirement System's website is not incorporated herein by reference.

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

As of February 28, 2013, the Retirement System estimated that the market value of its assets was approximately \$16.7 billion. The estimated market value represents, as of the date specified, the estimated value of the Retirement System's portfolio if it were liquidated on that date. The Retirement System cannot be certain of the value of certain of its portfolio assets and, accordingly, the market value of the portfolio could be more or less. Moreover, appraisals for classes of assets that are not publicly traded are based on estimates which typically lag changes in actual market value by three to six months. Representations of market valuations are not subject to audit (other than at year end).

The Retirement System investment portfolio is structured for long-term performance. The Retirement System continually reviews investment and asset allocation policies as part of its regular operations and continues to rely on an investment policy which is consistent with the principles of diversification and the search for long-term value. Market fluctuations are an expected investment risk for any long-term strategy. Significant market fluctuations are expected to have significant impact on the value of the Retirement System investment portfolio.

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

Other Employee Retirement Benefits

As noted above, various City employees are members of CalPERS, an agent multiple-employer public employee defined benefit plan for safety members and a cost-sharing multiple-employer plan for miscellaneous members. The City makes certain payments to CalPERS in respect of such members, at rates determined by the CalPERS board. Such payment from the General Fund equaled \$18.1 million in fiscal year 2009-10 and \$17.6 million in fiscal year 2010-11. For fiscal year 2011-12, the City prepaid its annual CalPERS obligation at a level of \$23.4 million. Further discussion of the City's CalPERS plan obligations are summarized in Note 9 to the City's CAFR, as of June 30, 2012, attached to this Official Statement as Appendix B. A discussion of other post-employment benefits, including retiree medical benefits, is provided below under "Medical Benefits – *Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45.*"

Medical Benefits

Administration through Health Service System; Audited System Financial Statements

Medical benefits for eligible active City employees and eligible dependents, for retired City employees and eligible dependents, and for surviving spouses and domestic partners of covered City employees (the "City Beneficiaries") are administered by the City's Health Service System (the "Health Service System" or "HSS") pursuant to City Charter Sections 12.200 *et seq.* and A8.420 *et seq.* Pursuant to such Charter Sections, the Health Service System also administers medical benefits to active and retired employees of SFUSD, SFCCD, and the San Francisco Superior Court (collectively the "System's Other Beneficiaries"). However, the City is not required to fund medical benefits for the System's Other Beneficiaries and therefore this section focuses on the funding by the City of medical benefits for City Beneficiaries. With the transition of the SFRDA employees to the City budget, the benefits for these employees continue to be provided by CalPERS.

The Health Service System is overseen by the City's Health Service Board (the "Health Service Board"). The seven member Health Service Board is composed of members including a seated member of the City's Board of Supervisors, appointed by the Board President; an individual who regularly consults in the health care field, appointed by the Mayor; a doctor of medicine, appointed by the Mayor; and until May 15, 2013; four members of the Health Service System, active or retired, elected from among their members. After May 15, 2013 one of the members elected from among the members will be replaced by a member nominated by the Controller and approved by the Health Service Board (See Proposition C below). The plans (the "HSS Medical Plans") for providing medical care to the City Beneficiaries and the System's Other Beneficiaries (collectively, the "HSS Beneficiaries") are determined annually by the Health Service Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Charter Section A8.422.

The Health Service System oversees a trust fund (the "Health Service Trust Fund") established pursuant to Charter Sections 12.203 and A8.428 through which medical benefits for the HSS Beneficiaries are funded. The Health Service System issues annually a publicly available, independently audited financial report that includes financial statements for the Health Service Trust Fund. This report may be obtained by writing to the San Francisco Health Service System, 1145 Market Street, Second Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, or by calling (415) 554-1727. Audited annual financial statements for several years are also posted in the Health Service System website: www.myhss.org/finance. The information available on such website is not incorporated in this Official Statement by reference.

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

Determination of Employer and Employee Contributions for Medical Benefits

Contributions by the participating employers and HSS Beneficiaries to HSS Medical Plans are determined according to applicable provisions of the Charter. To the extent annual medical premiums exceed the contributions made by employers and HSS Beneficiaries as required by the Charter, such excess must be paid by HSS Beneficiaries or, if elected by the Health Service Board, from net assets held in the Health Service Trust Fund.

All City Beneficiaries receive a base contribution from the City toward the monthly cost of their medical benefits calculated pursuant to Charter Section A8.423. Under that section, the Health Service System conducts a survey annually of the 10 most populous counties in California (other than the City) to determine "the average contribution made by each such County toward the providing of health care plans, exclusive of dental or optical care, for each employee of such County." Under City Charter Section A8.428, the City is required to contribute to the Health Service Trust Fund an amount equal to such "average contribution" for each City Beneficiary.

In addition to the average contribution described above, the City makes additional medical and other benefit contributions on behalf of City Beneficiaries who are active employees as negotiated and agreed to by such employees' applicable collective bargaining units. City bargaining units have negotiated additional City contributions for enhanced single medical coverage, dependent medical coverage and for additional benefits such as dental care for the members of such bargaining units. These contribution amounts are also paid by the City into the Health Service Trust Fund.

Medical benefits for City Beneficiaries who are retired or otherwise not employed by the City (e.g., surviving spouses and surviving domestic partners of City retirees) ("Nonemployee City Beneficiaries") are funded through contributions from such Nonemployee City Beneficiaries and the City as determined pursuant to Charter Section A8.428. The Health Service System medical benefit eligibility requirements for Nonemployee City Beneficiaries are described below under "*Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45.*"

Contributions relating to Nonemployee City Beneficiaries include the City contribution of the "average contribution" corresponding to such Nonemployee City Beneficiaries as described in Charter Section A8.423 along with the following:

- Monthly contributions from Nonemployee City Beneficiaries in amounts equal to the monthly contributions required from active employees excluding health coverage or subsidies for health coverage paid for active employees as a result of collective bargaining. However, such monthly contributions from Nonemployee City Beneficiaries covered under Medicare are reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare.
- In addition to the average contribution described in the second paragraph of this subsection, the City contributes additional amounts in respect of the Nonemployee City Beneficiaries sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the Health Service System in providing the same health coverage to Nonemployee City Beneficiaries as is provided for active employee City Beneficiaries, excluding health coverage or subsidies for health coverage paid for active employees as a result of collective bargaining.
- After application of the calculations described above, the City contributes 50% of monthly contributions required for the retired city participant and the first dependent.

The Health Service System has changed to a calendar plan year effective January 1, 2013. This change permitted HSS to adopt a new pharmacy fully insured benefit plan for retirees in the City Plan (Employer Group Waiver Plan) which saved over \$5.8M and reduced the GASB pharmacy liability. In addition, HSS moved active Blue Shield members from a "fully insured product" to a "flex funded product" in which the City assumes risk up to a set point saving over \$26M. Overall the actions taken during rate setting reduced HSS costs by over \$30M and resulted in a premium rate increase of less than 1.4%.

Health Care Reform

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-114), and on March 30, 2010 signed the Health Care and Education Reconciliation of 2010 (collectively, the

"Health Care Reform Law"). The Health Care Reform Law is intended to extend health insurance to over 32 million uninsured Americans by 2019, and includes other significant changes with respect to the obligation to carry health insurance by individuals and the provision of health care by private and public employers, such as the City. Due to the complexity of the Health Care Reform Law it is likely that additional legislation will be considered and enacted in future years.

The Health Care Reform Law is designed to be implemented in phases from 2010 to 2018. The provisions of the Health Care Reform Law to be implemented in future years include, the expansion of Medicaid, subsidies for health insurance for certain individuals, mandates that require most Americans obtain health insurance, and incentives for employers with over 50 employees to provide health insurance for their employees or pay a fine. Many aspects of the law have yet to be clarified and will require substantial regulation or subsequent legislative action. On June 28, 2012 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled to uphold the employer mandate, the individual mandate and the state Medicaid expansion requirements.

Provisions of Health Care Reform already implemented by HSS include, discontinued eligibility for non-prescription drugs reimbursement through FSAs in 2011, eliminated copayments for wellness visits, eliminated lifetime caps on coverage, and expanded eligibility to cover member dependent children up to age 26 in 2011, eliminated copayments for women's preventative health including contraception in 2012 and W-2 reporting on total healthcare premium costs for 2012 plan year and implementation of a medical loss ratio rebate on self-insured plans. In addition, a separate summary of benefits was required to be sent to every member and provided to every new member beginning in 2012. In 2013, healthcare flexible spending accounts (FSAs) will be limited to \$2500 annually and for the 2013 plan year a comparative effectiveness fee will be charged directly to HSS of \$1 per beneficiary for members of the Self-Insured plan (approximately 9,350); in 2014 and 2015 this amount will increase to \$2/year.

On August 31, 2012 the US DHHS issued regulatory guidance on the "Federal Transitional Pre-Existing Condition Fee" assessing a \$63/year fee on each HSS beneficiary for plan years 2014-2016. This "fee" will be over \$6.6 million dollars per year. In 2014, the City will need to modify health benefit eligibility to cover temporary employees who work more than 30 hours per week or 130 hours per month to only a 90 day waiting period for coverage.

Local Elections: Proposition C (2011)

On November 8, 2011, the San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, a charter amendment that will change the way the City and current and future employees share in funding SFERS pension and health benefits. With regard to health benefits, elected officials and employees hired on or before January 9, 2009, contribute up to 1% of compensation toward their retiree health care, with matching contribution by the City. For employees or elected officials who left the City workforce before June 30, 2001, and retire after January 6, 2012, Proposition C requires that the City contributions toward retiree health benefits remain at the same levels they were when the employee left the City workforce. Proposition C changes the Health Service System and Health Service Board (HSB) including the following: 1) replace one elected member of the HSB with a member nominated by the City Controller and approved by HSB; 2) change HSB's voting requirement for approving member health plans from two-third to a simple majority; 3) remove the requirement for a plan permitting the member to choose any licensed medical provider; 4) allow for the option to change to a calendar year plan year; and 5) allow HSB to spend money on ways to limit health care costs. Factors that could cause additional medical costs or savings include: 1) Projected City savings might be reduced if future labor negotiations or arbitration awards result in any salary increases to offset higher employee retirement contributions. 2) To the extent that changes to pension formulas in this measure cause employees to delay or speed up retirement dates, this could provide additional City savings or costs related to retiree pension and health insurance subsidies. 3) To the extent that changes in the composition of the Health Service Board result in changes to approved health benefit programs, costs could be higher or lower. 4) To the extent that changes in the composition of the Health Service Board result in changes to approved health benefit programs, costs could be higher or lower. Changing to a calendar plan year allows HSS to convert our City Plan retiree pharmacy benefit to a higher discounted federal program called Employer Group Waiver Plan (EGWP) as of 2013. This will save an estimated \$2.3 million annually, will lower the City's retiree pharmacy expenditures by \$8.5 million annually, and will lower the City's GASB 45 liability.

Employer Contributions for Health Service System Benefits

For fiscal year 2011-12, the Health Service System received approximately \$612.7 million from participating employers for Health Service System benefit costs. Of this total, the City contributed approximately \$511.3 million; approximately \$151.1 million of this \$511.3 million amount was for health care benefits for approximately 26,086 retired City employees and their eligible dependents and approximately \$360.2 million was for benefits for approximately 60,644 active City employees and their eligible dependents. For fiscal year 2012-13, the Health Service System has budgeted to receive approximately \$642.9 million from participating employers for Health Service System benefit costs. The 2013 aggregate plan costs for the city will increase by only 1.4%. This flattening of the healthcare cost curve is due to a number of factors including lower use of healthcare during recessions, aggressive contracting by HSS, encouraging competition among our vendors, and changing our Blue Shield plan from a fully-funded to a flex-funded product. Flex-funding allows lower premiums to be set by our actuarial consultant, AON-Hewitt, without the typical margins added by Blue Shield; however, more risk is assumed by the City and reserves are required to protect against this risk. The HSB also subsidized dependent coverage in the Blue Shield plan to stabilize the risk pools and minimize migration between Blue Shield and Kaiser which contributed to the lower 2013 increase. In 2014 this flattened trend is anticipated to continue, the Health Service Board has allocated the Early Retiree Reimbursement Program funds collected of \$3.6M to subsidize dependent coverage based on percent paid by employee/retiree which will continue to stabilize risk pools. The Health Service Board is currently setting rates for 2014.

Post-Employment Health Care Benefits and GASB 45

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

GASB 45 Reporting Requirements. The City was required to begin reporting the liability and related information for unfunded post-retirement medical and other benefits ("OPEBs") in the City's financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008. This reporting requirement is defined under Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement 45 ("GASB 45"). GASB 45 does not require that the affected government agencies, including the City, actually fund any portion of this post-retirement health benefit liability – rather, GASB 45 requires government agencies to determine on an actuarial basis the amount of its total OPEB liability and the annual contributions estimated to fund such liability over 30 years. Any underfunding in a year is recognized as a liability on the government agency's balance sheet. The City has not established an OPEB trust fund.

City's Estimated Liability. The City is required by GASB 45 to prepare a new actuarial study of its post-retirement benefits obligation every two years. In its October 8, 2012 report, Cheiron, Inc. estimated that the City's unfunded liability was approximately \$4.42 billion as of July 1, 2010. This estimate assumed a 4.25% return on investments and had an ARC for fiscal year 2011-12 of approximately \$397.9 million. The ARC represents a level of funding that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover the normal cost of each year and any unfunded actuarial liabilities (or funding excesses) amortized over thirty years. The ARC was determined based on the July 1, 2010 actuarial valuation. The covered payroll (annual payroll of active employees covered by the plan) was \$2.3 billion and the ratio of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability to the covered payroll was 191.9%.

The difference between the estimated ARC and the amount expended on post-retirement medical benefits in any year is the amount by which the City's overall liability for such benefits increases in that year. The City's most recent CAFR estimated that the 2011-12 annual OPEB cost was \$405.9 million, of which the City funded \$156.1 million which caused, among other factors, the City's long-term liability to increase by \$249.7 million (as shown on the City's balance sheet and below). The annual OPEB cost consists of the ARC, one year of interest on the net OPEB obligation, and recognition of one year of amortization of the net OPEB obligation. While GASB 45 does not require funding of the annual OPEB cost, any differences between the amount funded in a year and the annual OPEB cost is recorded as an increase or decrease in the net OPEB obligation. See Note 9(c) and (d) to the City's CAFR, as of June 30, 2012, included as Appendix B to this Official Statement. Trend information is displayed in Table A-18 (dollars in thousands):

TABLE A-18

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Four-year Trend
(000s)

Fiscal Year Ended	Annual OPEB	Percentage of Annual OPEB Cost Contributed	Net OPEB Obligation
6/30/2009	\$430,924	27.8%	\$605,397
6/30/2010	374,214	33.9%	852,782
6/30/2011	392,151	37.2%	1,099,177
6/30/2012	405,850	38.5%	1,348,883

The October 2012 Cheiron Report estimates that the total long-term actuarial liability will reach \$5.7 billion by 2030. The calculations in the Cheiron Report are sensitive to a number of critical assumptions, including, but not limited to, the projected rate of increase in health plan costs.

Actuarial projections of the City's OPEB liability will be affected by Proposition B as well as by changes in the other factors affecting that calculation. For example, the City's actuarial analysis shows that by 2031, Proposition B's three-percent of salary funding requirement will be sufficient to cover the cost of retiree health benefits for employees hired after January 10, 2009. See "Retirement System – Recent Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan" above. As of June 30, 2012, the fund balance in the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund established by Proposition B stood at \$17.9 million. Future projections of the City's GASB 45 liability will be lowered by the HSS implementation of the Employer Group Waiver Plan (EGWP) prescription benefit program for City Plan retirees. See "– Local Elections: Proposition C (2011)."

Total City Employee Benefits Costs

The City continued to budget only for current-year benefits expenditures, without any set-aside for accrued or future liabilities, in the fiscal year 2011-12 Original Budget. To begin to address the issue of accrued liabilities for future retiree health costs, the City created a new Post Employment Benefits Fund in fiscal year 2007-08. The actual fund balance as of January 9, 2013 is approximately \$23.9 million. The costs were funded in part by employees and in part by the City. The City will continue to monitor and update its actuarial valuations of liability as required under GASB 45. Table A-18 provides a five-year history for all health benefits costs paid including pension, health, dental and other miscellaneous benefits. For all fiscal years shown, a "pay-as-you-go" approach was used by the City for health care benefits.

Table A-19 below provides a summary of the City's employee benefit actual and budgeted costs from fiscal years 2008-09 to fiscal year 2013-14.

TABLE A-19

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Employee Benefit Costs, All Funds
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2013-14
(000s)

	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
	actual	actual	actual	actual	Budget	Budget
SFERS and PERS Retirement Contributions	\$197,614	\$294,088	\$368,185	\$428,265	\$435,675	\$517,478
Social Security & Medicare	147,576	145,969	140,828	147,682	153,071	155,975
Health - Medical + Dental, active employees ¹	274,753	284,426	296,032	330,919	356,797	377,760
Health - Retiree Medical ¹	144,110	154,347	175,799	181,822	173,306	189,370
Other Benefits ²	18,998	17,009	22,758	21,362	19,707	16,596
Total Benefit Costs	\$783,051	\$895,839	\$1,003,602	\$1,110,050	\$1,138,555	\$1,257,180

FY 2008-09 through FY 2011-12 figures are audited actuals. FY 2012-13 is original budget and FY 2013-14 is the Mayor's proposed budget.

¹ Does not include Health Service System administrative costs. Does include flexible benefits that may be used for health insurance

² "Other Benefits" includes unemployment insurance premiums, life insurance, and other miscellaneous employee benefits

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

INVESTMENTS OF CITY FUNDS

Investment Pool

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

Investment Policy

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

The Investment Policy is reviewed and monitored annually by a Treasury Oversight Committee established by the Board of Supervisors. The Treasury Oversight Committee meets quarterly and is comprised of members drawn from (a) the Treasurer; (b) the Controller; (c) a representative appointed by the Board of Supervisors; (d) the County Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee; (e) the Chancellor of the Community College District or his/her designee; and (f) Members of the general public. See "APPENDIX G – City and County of San Francisco Office of the Treasurer – Investment Policy" for a complete copy of the Treasurer's Investment Policy, dated October 2012. The Investment Policy is also posted at the Treasurer's website: www.sftreasurer.org. The information available on such website is not incorporated herein by reference.

Investment Portfolio

As of December 31, 2012, the City's surplus investment fund consisted of the investments classified in Table A-20, and had the investment maturity distribution presented in Table A-21.

TABLE A-20

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Portfolio
Pooled Funds
As of December 31, 2012

<u>Type of Investment</u>	<u>Par Value</u>	<u>Book Value</u>	<u>Market Value</u>
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 1,010,000,000	\$ 1,013,676,471	\$ 1,025,614,350
Federal Agencies	3,815,683,000	3,827,093,302	3,865,155,224
State and Local Obligations	88,530,000	91,177,638	90,335,934
Public Time Deposits	960,000	960,000	960,000
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	275,000,000	275,000,000	274,806,935
Banker's Acceptances	-	-	-
Commercial Paper	80,000,000	79,704,250	79,925,708
Medium Term Notes	51,358,000	53,241,757	52,310,804
Money Market Funds	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Total	<u>\$ 5,571,531,000</u>	<u>\$ 5,590,853,418</u>	<u>\$ 5,639,108,956</u>

December 2012 Eamed Income Yield: 0.87%

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

TABLE A-21

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Maturity Distribution
Pooled Funds
As of December 31, 2012

<u>Maturity in Months</u>			<u>Par Value</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0	to	1	\$ 485,000,000	8.70%
1	to	2	6,435,000	0.12%
2	to	3	100,000,000	1.79%
3	to	4	29,670,000	0.53%
4	to	5	87,648,000	1.57%
5	to	6	106,200,000	1.91%
6	to	12	421,685,000	7.57%
12	to	24	1,098,980,000	19.72%
24	to	36	1,089,953,000	19.56%
36	to	48	647,840,000	11.63%
48	to	60	1,498,120,000	26.89%
			<u>\$ 5,571,531,000</u>	<u>100.00%</u>

Weighted Average Maturity: 939 Days

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

Further Information

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

Additional information on the City's investments, investment policies, and risk exposure as of June 30, 2012 are described in Appendix B: "COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012," Notes 2(d) and 5.

CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS

Capital Plan

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

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

The Capital Plan is required to be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors by each March 1 in odd-numbered years and adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on or before May 1 of the same year. The fiscal year 2014-2023 Capital Plan was approved by the CPC on February 25, 2013 and is expected to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors in April 2013. The Capital Plan contains \$25.1 billion in capital investments over the coming decade for all City departments, including \$4.7 billion in projects for General Fund-supported departments. The Capital Plan proposes \$88.0 million for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects in fiscal year 2013-14. The amount for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects is assumed to grow to \$231 million in fiscal year 2022-23. The Capital Plan is not incorporated by reference herein but may be found at <http://onesanfrancisco.org/>.

Major capital projects for General Fund-supported departments included in the Capital Plan consist of upgrades to public health, police, fire and park facilities; street and right-of-way improvements; the removal of barriers to accessibility; park improvements; the replacement of the Hall of Justice; and seismic upgrades to the Veteran's Memorial Building, among other capital projects. Approximately \$2.0 billion of the capital projects of General Fund supported departments are financed with general obligation bonds and other long-term obligations. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, the General Fund, and other sources.

In addition to the City General Fund-supported capital spending, the Capital Plan recommends \$14.5 billion in enterprise fund department projects to continue major transit, economic development and public utility projects such as the Central Subway project, runway and terminal upgrades at San Francisco International Airport, Pier 70 infrastructure investments, and the Sewer System Improvement Program, among others. Approximately \$8.2 billion of enterprise fund department capital projects is financed with voter-approved revenue bonds and other long-term

obligations. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, user/operator fees, General Fund, and other sources.

Failure to make the capital improvements and repairs recommended in the 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; and (v) increasing future repair and replacement costs.

Tax-Supported Debt Service

Under the State Constitution and the Charter, City bonds secured by *ad valorem* property taxes ("general obligation bonds") can only be authorized with a two-thirds approval of the voters. As of December 31, 2012, the City had approximately \$1.80 billion aggregate principal amount of general obligation bonds outstanding.

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

TABLE A-22

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds Debt Service
 As of December 31, 2012 ^{1 2}

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Debt Service
2013	138,561,718	42,214,475	180,776,193
2014	121,869,486	77,786,504	199,655,990
2015	95,989,884	72,001,381	167,991,265
2016	100,453,046	67,478,194	167,931,240
2017	92,204,110	62,799,455	155,003,565
2018	92,743,225	58,375,732	151,118,957
2019	91,020,545	54,134,562	145,155,107
2020	88,241,232	49,837,975	138,079,207
2021	83,265,457	45,643,912	128,909,369
2022	89,013,401	41,897,074	130,910,475
2023	90,855,251	37,810,651	128,665,902
2024	91,541,206	33,451,650	124,992,856
2025	90,341,476	28,979,532	119,321,008
2026	83,771,279	24,570,002	108,341,281
2027	87,350,840	20,467,423	107,818,263
2028	90,454,035	16,320,434	106,774,469
2029	88,551,751	12,068,255	100,620,006
2030	82,635,095	7,895,429	90,530,524
2031	40,156,950	3,988,577	44,145,527
2032	41,435,000	2,401,475	43,836,475
2033	4,835,000	762,000	5,597,000
2034	5,075,000	520,250	5,595,250
2035	5,330,000	266,500	5,596,500
TOTAL ³	\$1,795,694,987	\$761,671,442	\$2,557,366,429

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

² Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

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

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

General Obligation Bonds Authorized but Unissued

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

In November 1992, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$350.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide moneys to fund the City's Seismic Safety Loan Program (the "Loan Program"). The purpose of the Loan Program is to provide loans for the seismic strengthening of privately-owned unreinforced masonry buildings in San Francisco for affordable housing and market-rate residential, commercial and institutional purposes. In April 1994, the City issued \$35.0 million in taxable general obligation bonds to fund the Loan Program and in October 2002, the City redeemed all outstanding bonds remaining from such issuance. In February 2007 the Board of Supervisors approved the issuance of additional indebtedness under this authorization in an amount not to exceed \$35.0 million. Such issuance would be achieved pursuant to the terms of a Credit Agreement with Bank of America, N.A. (the "Credit Bank"), under which the Credit Bank agreed to fund one or more loans to the City from time to time as evidenced by the City's issuance to the Credit Bank of the Taxable General Obligation Bond (Seismic Safety Loan Program), Series 2007A. The funding by the Credit Bank of the loans at the City's request and the terms of repayment of such loans are governed by the terms of the Credit Agreement. Loan funds received by the City from the Credit Bank are in turn used to finance loans to Seismic Safety Loan Program borrowers. In March 2007 the City initiated an initial borrowing of \$2.0 million, and in October 2007, the City borrowed approximately \$3.8 million from the Credit Bank. In January 2008, the City borrowed approximately \$3.9 million and in November 2008, the City borrowed \$1.3 million from the Credit Bank. Further borrowings under the Credit Agreement with the Credit Bank (up to the \$35.0 million not-to-exceed amount) are expected as additional loans to Seismic Safety Loan Program borrowers are approved.

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

In November 2008, voters approved Proposition A, which authorized the issuance of up to \$887.4 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the building or rebuilding and improving the earthquake safety of the San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition A in the amount of approximately \$131.7 million in March 2009. The City issued the second series in the amount of approximately \$294.6 million in March 2010. The City issued its third series in the amount of approximately \$251 million in August 2012.

In June 2010, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$412.3 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and retrofitting of neighborhood fire and police stations, the auxiliary water supply system, a public safety building, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related costs. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition B in the amount of \$79.5 million in December 2010 and the second series of bonds in the amount of \$183.3 million in March 2012. The City issued its third series in the amount of approximately \$38.3 million in August 2012.

In November 2011, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$248.0 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds to repair and repave City streets and remove potholes; strengthen and seismically upgrade street structures; redesign street corridors by adding or improving pedestrian signals, lighting, sidewalk extensions, bicycle lanes, trees and landscaping; construct and renovate curb ramps and sidewalks to increase accessibility and safety for everyone, including persons with disabilities; and add and upgrade traffic signals to improve MUNI service and traffic flow. The City issued the first series of bonds under Proposition B in the amount of approximately \$74.3 million in March 2012.

In November 2012, voters approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of up to \$195.0 million in general

obligation bonds to provide funds for the construction, reconstruction, renovation, demolition, environmental remediation and/or improvement of park, open space, and recreation facilities located in the City and under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission or under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission. The City expects to issue the first series of bonds under Proposition B in June 2013.

Refunding General Obligation Bonds

The Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 272-04 on May 11, 2004 (the "2004 Resolution"). The Mayor approved the 2004 Resolution on May 13, 2004. The 2004 Resolution authorized the issuance of not to exceed \$800.0 million aggregate principal amount of its General Obligation Refunding Bonds from time to time in one or more series for the purpose of refunding all or a portion of the City's then outstanding General Obligation Bonds. On November 1, 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted, and the Mayor approved, Resolution No. 448-11 (the "2011 Resolution," and together with the 2004 Resolution, the "Refunding Resolutions"). The 2011 Resolution authorized the issuance of not to exceed \$1,355,991,219 aggregate principal amount of the City's General Obligation Refunding Bonds from time to time in one or more series for the purpose of refunding certain outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City.

Table A-23 below lists for each of the City's voter-authorized general obligation bond programs the amount originally authorized, the amount issued and outstanding, and the amount of remaining authorization for which bonds have not yet been issued. Series are grouped by program authorization in chronological order. The authorized and unissued column refers to total program authorization that can still be issued, and does not refer to any particular series. As of December 31, 2012, the City had authorized and unissued general obligation bond authority of approximately \$983 million.

TABLE A-23

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO General Obligation Bonds (as of December 31, 2012)				
Description of Issue (Date of Authorization)	Series	Issued	Outstanding ¹	Authorized & Unissued ²
Seismic Safety Loan Program (11/3/92)	2007A	\$30,315,450	\$27,399,987	\$284,684,550
Branch Library Facilities Improvement (11/7/00)	2008A	31,065,000	26,690,000	
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks (2/5/08)	2008B	42,520,000	36,800,000	
	2010B	24,785,000	15,995,000	
	2010D	35,645,000	35,645,000	
	2012B	73,355,000	62,465,000	8,695,000
San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (11/4/08)	2009A	131,650,000	107,810,000	
	2010A	120,890,000	78,005,000	
	2010C	173,805,000	173,805,000	
	2012D	251,000,000	251,100,000	209,955,000
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (6/8/10)	2010E	79,520,000	76,080,000	
	2012A	183,330,000	155,650,000	
	2012E	38,265,000	38,265,000	111,185,000
Road Repaving & Street Safety (11/8/11)	2012C	74,295,000	63,940,000	173,705,000
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks (11/6/12)				195,000,000
SUB TOTALS		\$1,290,440,450	\$1,149,649,987	\$983,224,550
General Obligation Refunding Bonds:				
Series 2006-R1 issued 10/31/06		90,690,000	62,165,000	
Series 2006-R2 issued 12/18/06		66,565,000	34,785,000	
Series 2008-R1 issued 5/29/08		232,075,000	70,875,000	
Series 2008-R2 issued 5/29/08		39,320,000	27,865,000	
Series 2008-R3 issued 7/30/08		118,130,000	118,130,000	
Series 2011-R1 issued 11/9/2011		339,475,000	332,225,000	
SUB TOTALS		886,255,000	646,045,000	
TOTALS		\$2,176,695,450	\$1,795,694,987	\$983,224,550

¹ Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of the personal assessment assessed value of all real and district indebtedness or any redevelopment agency indebtedness.

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 Authorized but Unissued."

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

Lease Payments and Other Long-Term Obligations

The Charter requires that any lease-financing agreements with a nonprofit corporation or another public agency must be approved by a majority vote of the City's electorate, except (i) leases approved prior to April 1, 1977, (ii) refunding lease financing expected to result in net savings, and (iii) certain lease financing for capital equipment. The Charter does not require voter approval of lease financing agreements with for-profit corporations or entities.

Table A-24 sets forth the aggregate annual lease payment obligations supported by the City's General Fund with respect to outstanding lease revenue bonds and certificates of participation as of December 31, 2012. Note that the annual payment obligations reflected in Table A-23 include the fully accreted value of any capital appreciation obligations that will accrue as of the final payment dates.

TABLE A-24

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO Lease Revenue Bonds and Certificates of Participation As of December 31, 2012

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Payment Obligation
2013	26,640,000	24,035,516	50,675,516
2014	52,396,550	59,460,147	111,856,697
2015	56,745,751	52,859,075	109,604,826
2016	55,325,000	45,362,197	100,687,197
2017	51,850,000	43,070,852	94,920,852
2018	50,655,000	40,746,447	91,401,447
2019	48,720,000	38,542,640	87,262,640
2020	40,800,000	36,547,926	77,347,926
2021	41,770,000	34,725,672	76,495,672
2022	42,820,000	32,899,862	75,719,862
2023	44,675,000	31,012,370	75,687,370
2024	46,870,000	29,015,730	75,885,730
2025	46,450,000	26,882,584	73,332,584
2026	46,145,000	24,816,396	70,961,396
2027	48,310,000	22,643,511	70,953,511
2028	48,770,000	20,377,467	69,147,467
2029	51,000,000	18,058,628	69,058,628
2030	50,510,000	15,658,861	66,168,861
2031	41,785,000	13,372,303	55,157,303
2032	31,000,000	11,238,623	42,238,623
2033	30,010,000	9,703,868	39,713,868
2034	31,445,000	8,111,955	39,556,955
2035	18,870,000	6,676,999	25,546,999
2036	17,065,000	5,674,407	22,739,407
2037	15,030,000	4,752,794	19,782,794
2038	15,690,000	3,902,287	19,592,287
2039	16,375,000	3,014,711	19,389,711
2040	17,095,000	2,088,419	19,183,419
2041	17,845,000	1,121,651	18,966,651
2042	9,680,000	313,971	9,993,971
TOTAL ¹	\$1,112,342,301	\$666,687,869 ^{2 3}	\$1,779,030,170

¹ Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

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

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

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

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

In 1990, voters approved Proposition C, which amended the Charter to authorize the City to lease-purchase equipment through a nonprofit corporation without additional voter approval but with certain restrictions. The City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation (the "Corporation") was incorporated for that purpose. Proposition C provides that the outstanding aggregate principal amount of obligations with respect to lease financings may not exceed \$20.0 million, such amount increasing by five percent each fiscal year. As of December 31, 2012, the total authorized amount for such financings was \$58.5 million. The total principal amount outstanding as of December 31, 2012 was \$29.7 million.

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

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

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

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

Commercial Paper Program

The Board authorized on March 17, 2009 and the Mayor approved on March 24, 2009 the establishment of a not-to-exceed \$150.0 million Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation Program (the "CP Program"). Under the proposed CP Program, Commercial Paper Notes (the "CP Notes") will be issued from time to time to pay approved project costs in connection with the acquisition, improvement, renovation, and construction of real property and the acquisition of capital equipment and vehicles in anticipation of long-term financing to be issued when market conditions are favorable. Projects will be eligible to access the CP Program once the Board and the Mayor have approved the project and the long-term, permanent financing for the project. In June 2010, the City obtained letters of credit securing the CP Notes issued by J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. with a maximum principal amount of \$50 million and by U.S. Bank, N.A. with a maximum principal amount of \$50 million. The letters of credit expires June 2013.

As of March 7, 2013, the outstanding principal amount of CP Notes is \$67.2 million. The weighted average interest rate for the CP Notes is approximately 0.17%.

Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Obligations

The Board of Supervisors authorized on December 16, 2008 and the Mayor approved on December 19, 2008, the issuance of not to exceed \$45.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Moscone Center Improvement Project) to finance improvements to the Moscone Convention Center. The proceeds from the sale of the Certificates will be used to provide funding for various improvements to the City's convention facilities known as Moscone South, Moscone North, and Moscone West. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in May 2013.

The Board of Supervisors authorized on October 26, 2010 and the Mayor approved on November 5, 2010, the issuance of not to exceed \$38,000,000 in City and County of San Francisco certificates of participation to partially finance the rebuilding of severely distressed public housing sites, while increasing affordable housing and ownership opportunities and improving the quality of life for existing residents and the surrounding communities (the HOPE SF Project). The City anticipates issuing the certificates in the Summer of 2013.

The Board of Supervisors authorized on July 26, 2011 and the Mayor approved on August 1, 2011, the issuance of not to exceed \$170,000,000 in City and County of San Francisco certificates of participation to finance the construction and installation of certain improvements in connection with the renovation of the San Francisco War Memorial Veterans Building. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in the Summer of 2013.

The Board of Supervisors authorized on May 1, 2012 and the Mayor approved on May 8, 2012 the issuance of not to exceed \$45,000,000 in City and County of San Francisco certificates of participation to finance the design, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, expansion, improvement, equipping, renewal, restoration, and/or replacement of certain capital improvements to properties of the Port Commission. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in the Winter of 2013.

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

Overlapping Debt

Table A-25 shows bonded debt and long-term obligations as of December 31, 2012 sold in the public capital markets by the City and those public agencies whose boundaries overlap the boundaries of the City in whole or in part. Long-term obligations of non-City agencies generally are not payable from revenues of the City. In many cases long-term obligations issued by a public agency are payable only from the General Fund or other revenues of such public agency. In the table, lease obligations of the City which support indebtedness incurred by others are included. As noted below, the Charter limits the City's outstanding general obligation bond debt to 3% of the total assessed valuation of all taxable real and personal property within the City.

TABLE A-25

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations

2011-2012 Assessed Valuation (net of non-reimbursable & homeowner exemptions):	\$158,649,887,998	
	Outstanding	
<u>DIRECT GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND DEBT</u>	12/31/2012	
General City Purposes Carried on the Tax Roll	<u>\$1,795,694,987</u>	
GROSS DIRECT DEBT	\$1,795,694,987	
<u>DIRECT LEASE PAYMENT AND LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS</u>		
San Francisco COPs, Series 2001A (30 Van Ness Ave. Property)	28,895,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2003 (Juvenile Hall Replacement Project)	35,870,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation, Equipment LRBs Series 2007A, 2008A, 2010A, 2011A, and 2012A	29,755,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation Emergency Communication Refunding Series, 2010-R1	18,655,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation Moscone Expansion Center, Series, 2008-1, 2008-2	129,000,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation LRBs Open Space Fund (Various Park Projects) Series 2006, 2007	58,095,000	
San Francisco Finance Corporation LRBs Library Preservation Fund Series, 2009A	31,755,000	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Moscone Convention Center 1992	4,347,301 ¹	
San Francisco Refunding Certificates of Participation, Series 2004-R1 (San Francisco Courthouse Project)	21,950,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2007A (City Office Buildings - Multiple Properties)	142,575,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009A Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Laguna Honda Hospital)	153,650,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009B Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Street Improvement Project)	36,120,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009C Office Project (525 Golden Gate Avenue) Tax Exempt	35,360,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2009D Office Project (525 Golden Gate Avenue) Taxable BABs	129,550,000	
San Francisco Refunding Certificates of Participation, Series 2010A	127,735,000	
San Francisco COPs, Refunding Series 2011AB (Moscone)	86,195,000	
San Francisco COPs, Series 2012A Multiple Capital Improvement Projects (Street Improvement Project)	<u>42,835,000</u>	
LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$1,112,342,301	
GROSS DIRECT DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$2,908,037,288	
<u>OVERLAPPING DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS</u>		
Bayshore Hester Assessment District	\$680,000	
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (33%) Sales Tax Revenue Bonds	96,108,333	
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (29%) General Obligation Bonds, Series 2005A, 2007B	107,002,750	
San Francisco Community College District General Obligation Bonds - Election of 2001, 2005	358,270,000	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Hotel Tax Revenue Bonds - 2011	42,930,000	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Obligations (Property Tax Increment)	931,966,209	
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Obligations (Special Tax Bonds)	220,405,000	
Association of Bay Area Governments Obligations (Special Tax Bonds)	44,765,938	
San Francisco Unified School District General Obligation Bonds, Series Election of 2003, 2006, and 2011	<u>680,085,000</u>	
TOTAL OVERLAPPING DEBT & LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS	\$2,482,213,230	
GROSS COMBINED TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	<u>\$5,390,250,518</u> ²	
<u>Ratios to Assessed Valuation:</u>	<u>Actual Ratio</u>	<u>Charter Req.</u>
Gross Direct Debt (General Obligation Bonds)	1.13%	< 3.00% ³
Gross Direct Debt & Long-Term Obligations	1.83%	n/a
Gross Combined Total Obligations	3.40%	n/a

¹ The accreted value as of July 1, 2012 is \$31,250,842

² Excludes revenue and mortgage revenue bonds and non-bonded third party financing lease obligations. Also excludes tax allocation bonds sold in August, 2009.

³ Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of the assessed value of all real and personal property within the City's boundaries that is subject to local property taxation.

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

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

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

On November 8, 2005, voters approved the issuance of up to \$246.3 million in general obligation bonds to improve, construct and equip existing and new facilities of the SFCCD. SFCCD issued an aggregate principal amount of \$90.0 million of the November 2005 authorization in June 2006. In December 2007, SFCCD issued an additional \$110.0 million of such authorization. SFCCD issued the remaining authorization of \$46.3 million in spring 2010.

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

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

MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Numerous development and construction projects are in progress throughout the City at any given time. This section describes several of the most significant privately owned and managed real estate developments currently under way in the City. The information in this section has been prepared by the City based on City-approved plans as well as unofficial plans and representations of the developer in each case, and includes forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements consist of expressions of opinion, estimates, predictions, projections, plans and the like; such forward-looking statements in this section are those of the developers and not of the City. The City makes no prediction, representation or assurance that the plans and projects described will actually be accomplished, or the time frame in which the developments will be completed, or as to the financial impact on City real estate taxes, developer fees, other tax and fee income, employment, retail or real estate activity, or other consequences that might be expected or projected to result from the successful completion of each development project. Completion of development in each case may depend on the local economy, the real estate market, the financial health of the developer and others involved in the project, specific features of each development and its attractiveness to buyers, tenants, and others, as well as the financial health of such buyers, tenants, and others. Further, the recent legislation to end redevelopment agencies as part of the State's fiscal year 2011-12 budget may have an adverse impact on the projects described below and many other development projects in the City. See "San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Dissolution" above. Completion and success of each development will also likely depend on other factors unknown to the City.

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

The Hunters Point Shipyard, a former naval base is a master planned community of approximately 500 acres located on the southeastern waterfront of San Francisco. The first phase of development, which was conveyed from the Navy in 2005, is currently underway and includes up to 1,600 homes, 27% to 40% of which will be affordable, and 26 acres of parks and open space. Nearly all of the horizontal construction for Phase 1 is complete and the developer is preparing to commence vertical development on the first four blocks of homes in 2012. In August 2010, the development of the balance of the Shipyard and Candlestick Point received its final approvals from the Board of Supervisors. This includes (i) approximately 10,500 residential housing units across the project site, approximately 32% of which will be offered at below-market rates in a mix of both rental and for-sale housing; (ii) the complete rebuilding of the Alice Griffith Public Housing Development, also known as Double Rock; (iii) approximately 2.5 million square feet of "green" office, research and development uses on the Shipyard; (iv) approximately 150,000 square feet of green office, research and development or other commercial space on Candlestick Point; (v) more than 300 acres of new and restored parks and open space, which includes neighborhood parks, new waterfront parks around the entire perimeter of the Shipyard, connecting to the region's Bay Trail, and a major renovation of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area into a "Crissy Field" of the southeast, with restored habitat areas and public access to the water; (vi) approximately 635,000 square feet of regional and neighborhood retail on Candlestick Point; (vii) space for a 10,000-seat performance venue on Candlestick Point; and (viii) space for a new 69,000-seat, world-class football stadium for the San Francisco 49ers football team. The Project is estimated to create thousands of ongoing construction opportunities during the 20- to 30-year construction period, and 10,000 permanent jobs at full build-out. In August 2011, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) selected the Alice Griffith Public Housing Development and the surrounding Bayview neighborhood as a recipient of the \$30.5 million Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant. The Alice Griffith Plan was one of six finalists submitted by communities nationwide competing for HUD Choice Neighborhoods funding.

Treasure Island

Former Naval Station Treasure Island, which ceased operations in 1997, consists of approximately 405 acres on Treasure Island and 90 acres on adjoining Yerba Buena Island, located in the San Francisco Bay, and connected to the City by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The development plans for Treasure Island include up to 8,000 new homes, up to 25% of which will be offered at below-market rates; up to 500 hotel rooms; a 400-slip marina; restaurants; retail and entertainment venues; and a brand-new, world-class 300-acre parks and open space system. The compact mixed-use transit-oriented development is clustered around a new ferry terminal and is designed to prioritize walking, biking and public transit. The development plans include cutting-edge green office building standards and best practices in low-impact development. In August 2010, then-Mayor Gavin Newsom, U.S. House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and U.S. Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus signed the terms for the conveyance of former Naval Station Treasure Island from the Navy to the City, representing another major step towards realizing an environmentally sustainable new community on Treasure Island and the thousands of construction and permanent jobs it will bring. In April 2011, the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) Board of Directors and the Planning Commission certified the project's Environmental Impact Report, as well as approved numerous project documents. In June 2011, the Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the certification of the Environmental Impact Report, as well as approved numerous project documents, including a Disposition and Development Agreement, Development Agreement, Interagency Cooperation Agreement and Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (TIHDI) Agreement. Together, these agreements form the comprehensive vision for the future of the former military base and represent a significant milestone in moving the project closer towards implementation. The first phase of construction could begin in the summer of 2014 and would consist primarily of horizontal infrastructure improvements to enable subsequent phases of vertical construction. The complete build-out of the project is anticipated to occur over fifteen to twenty years.

Piers 30-32 and Seawall Lot (SWL) 330 – Warrior's Multipurpose Recreation and Entertainment Venue

The Golden State Warriors, a National Basketball Association (NBA) team, is proposing to develop a waterfront multipurpose recreation and entertainment venue and associated development on Piers 30-32 and SWL 330. Piers 30-32 are located directly south of the Bay Bridge. On the Piers 30-32 site, the Warriors propose constructing a state-of-the-art multi-purpose recreation and entertainment venue for Warriors' home games, concerts, and family

shows. A significant portion of the Piers 30-32 site will be public, open space. There will also be retail and a limited amount of parking.

On SWL 330, which sits across the Embarcadero from Piers 30-32, the Warriors propose a mixed-use development, which will include residential units and potentially a hotel use. The SWL site will also have ground floor retail and parking.

Economic Planning Systems (EPS) was commissioned to author a Fiscal Feasibility Report, which provides both the Economic and Financial benefits of the project for the City. The Fiscal Feasibility Report projects that the project could create \$80 million annually in economic activity and generate approximately 5,000 construction jobs and 2,800 permanent jobs within San Francisco. In addition, the Fiscal Feasibility projects that the project could generate approximately \$19 million annually in annual revenue to the City.

Transbay

The Transbay Transit Center broke ground on August 11, 2010, and is scheduled to open in August 2017. Demolition of existing structures on the site was completed in August 2011. The Transbay Transit Center Project will replace the outdated Transbay Terminal at First and Mission Streets with a modern transit hub, extend the Caltrain commuter rail line underground 1.3 miles into the Financial District, and redevelop the area surrounding the Transbay Transit Center with 4,500 new homes 1,200 to be "affordable" below-market homes, a 1.6 million square-foot tower, parks, and a retail main street. The Pelli Clarke Pelli Architects-designed Center will serve more than 100,000 people per day through nine transportation systems, including the proposed California High Speed Rail, which will be designed to connect San Francisco to Los Angeles in less than 2-1/2 hours. The Center is designed to embrace the goals of green architecture and sustainability. The heart of the Center, "City Park," a 5.4-acre public park that will sit atop the facility, and there will be a living green roof for the transit facility. The Center will have a LEED rating of Silver. The project is estimated to create more than 48,000 jobs in its first phase of construction, which will last seven years. The \$4.2 billion Transbay Transit Center Project is funded by various public and private funding partners, including the federal government, the State, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the San Francisco County and San Mateo County Transportation Authorities, and AC Transit, among others. The first phase of the program, which includes constructing the new transit center, is fully funded.

Mission Bay

The development plans for Mission Bay include a new University of California-San Francisco (UCSF) research campus containing 2.65 million square feet of building space on 43 acres donated by Catellus and the City; UCSF's 289-bed women's, children's and cancer hospital; 4.4 million square feet of biotech, 'cleantech' and health care office space; 6,000 housing units, with 1,800 (30%) affordable to moderate-, low-, and very low-income households; 800,000 square feet of retail space; a 500-room hotel with up to 50,000 square feet of retail entertainment uses; 41 acres of public open space, including parks along Mission Creek and San Francisco Bay, plus eight acres of open space within the UCSF campus; a new 500-student public school; and a new fire and police station. Mission Bay is approximately 50% complete.

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

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

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

Pier 70

Plans for Pier 70 call for substantial development, including major parks and historic building rehabilitation, on this 69-acre site. The Port, which controls Pier 70 and OEWD in its capacity as lead negotiator, is currently in negotiations with Forest City, a developer that has been selected to build a new mixed-use neighborhood on a 25-acre portion of Pier 70 known as the Waterfront Site. In the spring and summer of 2013, the parties are anticipated to seek Port Commission and Board of Supervisors endorsement of a non-binding term sheet that lays out an agreed-upon development concept and financial terms.

Current development plans for the Pier 70 Waterfront Site include: 8 acres of parks and open space; 2,250,000 square feet of office; 1,000 housing units, 20% of them made affordable to low-income households; and 270,000 square feet of small-scale production and arts space intended to establish the new district as destination with unique, artistic character. This built area includes three historic industrial buildings that will be as rehabilitated as part of the Waterfront Site development.

Outside of the Waterfront Site, other plans for Pier 70 call for the creation of Crane Cove Park, development of new buildings along Illinois Street, the sustained operation of the shipyard, and the preservation of additional historic buildings. Pier 70 qualifies for the National Register of Historic Places and is in the process of seeking Historic District status.

Cruise Terminal

On February 26, 2013 the Port of San Francisco cut the ribbon opening the \$67 million core and shell of the new James R. Herman cruise ship terminal at Pier 27 for use during the America's Cup races in the summer of 2013. The \$44 million second phase will commence after the America's Cup and will install maritime equipment, complete an operations area within a portion of Pier 29, and complete improvements to the ground transportation area and Northeast Wharf Plaza. When complete in late 2014, the \$111 million, approximately 88,000 square foot, two-level cruise terminal will replace the current outmoded and insufficient facility at Pier 35 and will include a 2.5 acre park along the Embarcadero ground transportation area capability and a strengthened connection between the Bay and the base of Telegraph Hill.

The proposed size of the terminal was defined as optimal to serve current and anticipated ship berthing requirements and associated passenger flows. The Pier 27 cruise terminal was designed to optimally handle vessels carrying 2,600 passengers and will have the capacity to serve vessels carrying up to 4,000 passengers, totaling 40-80 cruise calls a year. The facility will continue to be used for maritime events, such as Fleet Week, foreign naval diplomatic calls, Tall Ship festivals and visits by oceanic research vessels. When there are no cruise calls, the cruise terminal will provide approximately 60,000 square feet of designated space for shared uses, including meetings and special events.

Bay Area Economics was commissioned to provide an economic impact study for the Pier 27 project. The study projects that the project could create approximately \$29.4 million annually in direct economic activity, \$42.2 million in total impacts, and generate approximately 408 jobs within San Francisco. In addition, the Bay Area Economics study projects that the project could generate approximately \$900,000 annually in direct tax revenues that accrue to the City's General Fund. Regionally, Bay Area Economics estimated \$43.4 million in direct impacts and \$66.9 million in total impacts, and approximately 470 jobs in the Bay Area.

America's Cup

On December 31, 2010, the City was selected to host two America's Cup World Series regattas in the summer of 2012 and the 34th America's Cup Challenger Selection Series and Match Finals in the summer of 2013. To accommodate the events, the Port has invested in a series of Waterfront improvements along the central and northeast waterfront, primarily on Piers 27-29 for the America's Cup Village and at Piers 30-32 for team bases. By the time of the Challenger Series and Match events, the City will have completed the Brannan Street Wharf project, the core and shell of the Pier 27 James R. Herman Cruise Terminal building and the Pier 43 Bay Link Trail and will have made significant investments in deferred maintenance needs at Piers 30-32, Pier 23 and several of the aprons and marginal wharves used for the Events. After the conclusion of the events, the City will complete the James R. Herman Cruise Ship Terminal and Northeast Wharf Plaza. A March 12, 2013 update from the Bay Area Council

Economic Institute projects that the America's Cup Events will generate \$900 million in direct San Francisco spending, creating 6,481 San Francisco jobs and producing \$13 million in tax receipts for the City and County of San Francisco.

Moscone Convention Center

The Moscone Center Expansion Project would add approximately 353,000 square feet to the portion of the existing Moscone Center located on Howard Street between 3rd and 4th Streets in the Yerba Buena Gardens neighborhood of San Francisco. Nearly half of this additional space (140,000 square feet) would be created by excavating and expanding the existing below-grade exhibition halls that connect the Moscone North and South buildings under Howard Street, with the remaining consisting of new and repurposed lobby area (approximately 43,000 ft²), new multi-purpose/meeting room area (approximately 84,000 square feet), and new and repurposed building support area (approximately 86,000 ft²). The project would also expand the existing above-grade Moscone North, South, and Esplanade buildings to enhance their public connection and presence on Howard Street and make the Moscone Center more pedestrian-oriented. The project also proposes two enclosed pedestrian bridges spanning across Howard Street connecting at level 2 of the Moscone North and South expansions while framing the main public arrival space between the two new buildings and providing enhanced off-street circulation for Moscone convention attendees.

In addition to adding new rentable square footage, the project architects seek to create an iconic sense of arrival that enhances Moscone's civic presence on Howard Street and reconnects it to the surrounding neighborhood through the creation of reintroduced lost mid-block passageways. As such, the project proposes two new, enclosed pedestrian bridges connecting the upper levels of the new Moscone North and Moscone South as well as an upgrade to the existing pedestrian bridge across Howard Street. This would help to frame the main public arrival space between the two new buildings, provide enhanced circulation for Moscone convention attendees, and reduce on-street congestion all while maintaining full-time elevated public access across Howard Street from Yerba Buena Gardens to the cultural facilities.

The project would not affect Yerba Buena Gardens, the cultural facilities (ice rink, bowling alley, carousel, and outdoor play area), Sister Cities Garden, MLK Memorial and Fountain, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts Gallery & Forum building, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts Theater, the existing restaurants Samovar and B, the Esplanade Ballroom or Moscone West though it would impact the Compass and Children's Gardens.

Without expansion, independent consultants predict that Moscone will lose up to \$2 billion in future revenue as competitor markets build larger, more contiguous exhibition spaces with more flexible meeting and ballroom spaces. The project allows the City to recover approximately \$734 million of this future revenue through a phased construction schedule that keeps Moscone in continuous revenue generating operation.

The proposed project is a joint partnership between the City and the hotel industry, acting through the Tourist Improvement District Management Corporation, with the City paying approximately one-third of all expansion costs and the hotel community paying approximately two-thirds. The project includes extensive community outreach to surrounding neighbors, businesses and affected parties. The Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the creation of the Moscone Expansion District and the issuance of \$507 million in Certificates of Participation on February 5, 2013. Project sponsors propose to initiate environmental review in early 2013 with the goal of starting construction in late 2014, continuing intermittently around existing convention reservations through 2018.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES

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

Article XIII A of the California Constitution

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

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

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

Article XIII B of the California Constitution

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

Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution

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

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

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

Article XIII D contains several provisions making it generally more difficult for local agencies, such as the City, to levy and maintain "assessments" (as defined in Article XIII D) for local services and programs. The City has created a number of special assessment districts both for neighborhood business improvement purposes and community benefit purposes, and has caused limited obligation bonds to be issued in 1996 to finance construction of a new public right of way. The City cannot predict the future impact of Proposition 218 on the finances of the City, and no assurance can be given that Proposition 218 will not have a material adverse impact on the City's revenues.

Statutory Limitations

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

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

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

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

Even if a court were to conclude that Proposition 62 applies to charter cities, the City's exposure would be insignificant. The effective date of Proposition 62 was November 1986. Proposition 62 contains provisions that apply to taxes imposed on or after August 1, 1985. Since August 1, 1985, the City has collected taxes on businesses, hotel occupancy, utility use, parking, property transfer, stadium admissions and vehicle rentals. See "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" herein. Only the hotel and stadium admissions taxes have been increased since that date. The increases in these taxes were ratified by the voters on November 3, 1998 pursuant to the requirements of

Proposition 218. With the exception of the vehicle rental tax, the City continues to collect all of the taxes listed above. Since these remaining taxes were adopted prior to August 1, 1985, and have not been increased, these taxes would not be subject to Proposition 62 even if Proposition 62 applied to a charter city.

Proposition 1A

Proposition 1A, a constitutional amendment proposed by the State Legislature and approved by the voters in November 2004, provides that the State may not reduce any local sales tax rate, limit existing local government authority to levy a sales tax rate, or change the allocation of local sales tax revenues, subject to certain exceptions. As set forth under the laws in effect as of November 3, 2004, Proposition 1A generally prohibits the State from shifting any share of property tax revenues allocated to local governments for any fiscal year to schools or community colleges. Any change in the allocation of property tax revenues among local governments within a county must be approved by two-thirds of both houses of the Legislature. Proposition 1A provides, however, that beginning in fiscal year 2008-09, the State may shift to schools and community colleges up to 8% of local government property tax revenues, which amount must be repaid, with interest, within three years, if the Governor proclaims that the shift is needed due to a severe state financial hardship, the shift is approved by two-thirds of both houses and certain other conditions are met. The State may also approve voluntary exchanges of local sales tax and property tax revenues among local governments within a county.

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

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

Proposition 22

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

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

Proposition 26

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

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

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

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

Future Initiatives

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.

LITIGATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Pending Litigation

There are a number of lawsuits and claims routinely pending against the City, including those summarized in Note 16 to the City's CAFR as of June 30, 2012, attached as Appendix B to this Official Statement. Included among these are a number of actions which if successful would be payable from the City's General Fund. In the opinion of the City Attorney, such suits and claims presently pending will not impair the ability of the City to make debt service payments or otherwise meet its General Fund lease or debt obligations, nor materially impair the City's ability to fund current operations.

Risk Retention Program

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: *pm* Mayor Edwin M. Lee *gs*
RE: Approval of Official Statement for Certificates of Participation (Port
Facilities Project)
DATE: May 7, 2013

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is the resolution providing for the sale of certificates of participation (the "Certificates") evidencing undivided, proportionate interests in the right to receive certain rental payments to be made by the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") under a Project Lease to finance capital projects at the Port of San Francisco; providing for the sale of the Certificates by competitive sale; approving the form and publication of an Official Notice of Sale and a Notice of Intention to Sell the Certificates; approving the form of a Preliminary Official Statement and the form and execution of an Official Statement relating to the sale of the Certificates; approving the form of a Continuing Disclosure Certificate; granting general authority to City officials to take necessary actions in connection with the execution, sale and delivery of the Certificates; approving modifications to documents; and ratifying previous actions taken in connection therewith.

I request that this item be calendared in Budget and Finance Committee.

Should you have any questions, please contact Jason Elliott (415) 554-5105.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAY -7 PM 3:46
AK

