PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT DATED [__________]

NEW ISSUE – BOOK-ENTRY ONLY

RATINGS: Moody's: "[____]"
S&P: "[____]"
Fitch: "[____]"
(See "RATINGS" herein)

In the opinion of Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP and Curls Bartling P.C., Co-Special Counsel, under existing law (i) assuming continuing compliance with certain covenants and the accuracy of certain representations, interest evidenced by the Certificates is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes and is not an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax and (ii) interest evidenced by the Certificates is exempt from State of California personal income taxes. Interest evidenced by the Certificates may be subject to certain federal taxes imposed only on certain corporations. For a more complete discussion of the tax aspects, see "TAX MATTERS" herein.

$140,000,000*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
SERIES 202[__]
(MULTIPLE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS)

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: [April] 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 Certificates captioned above (the "Certificates") will be sold to provide funds to: (i) finance and refinance the acquisition of certain capital improvement projects within the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") as further described herein, including through the retirement of certain commercial paper notes of the City issued for such purpose; (ii) [fund a debt service reserve account for the Certificates], and (iii) pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates. See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" and "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS."

The Certificates are executed and delivered pursuant to a Trust Agreement, dated as of May 1, 2009, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as supplemented and amended, the "Trust Agreement"), by and between the City and U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee (the "Trustee"), and in accordance with the Charter of the City (the "Charter"). 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 May 1, 2009, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as so supplemented and amended, 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 SOURCE 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 site 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 "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement." The Leased Property generally consists of (i) certain portions of the City's Laguna Honda Hospital, as further described herein, and (ii) the San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3), as further described herein. *[Describe other property to be added, if any.]* See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" herein.

The Certificates will be delivered in fully registered form and registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company ("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 [April] 1 and [October] 1 of each year, commencing [_________]. 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 maturity as described herein. See "THE CERTIFICATES – Prepayment of the Certificates."

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

BIDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE CERTIFICATES WILL BE RECEIVED BY THE CITY AT [_____] A.M. PACIFIC TIME ON [_________], AS PROVIDED IN THE OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE INVITING BIDS DATED [_________], UNLESS POSTPONED AS SET FORTH IN SUCH OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE. See "SALE OF THE CERTIFICATES" herein.

MATURITY SCHEDULE

(See inside cover)

The Certificates are offered when, as and if executed and received by the purchaser of the Certificates, subject to the approval of the validity of the Project Lease by Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP, San Francisco, California and Curls Bartling P.C., Oakland, 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 and Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth, A Professional Corporation, Newport Beach, California, Co-Disclosure Counsel. It is expected that the Certificates in book-entry form will be available for delivery through DTC on or about [__________].
Dated: [_________].

---

* Preliminary, subject to change.

MATURITY SCHEDULE

(Base CUSIP[1] Number: 79765D)

Certificate Payment Date ([April] 1)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Price/Yield[2]	CUSIP[1] Suffix

$_________ ____% Term Certificates due [April] 1, ____ – Price/Yield[2]_______% CUSIP[1] Number: ________

[1] CUSIP® is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP Global Services (CGS) is managed on behalf of the American Bankers Association by FactSet Research Systems Inc. Copyright© 2022 CUSIP Global Services. All rights reserved. CUSIP® data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services. This data is not intended to create a database and does not serve in any way as a substitute for the CGS database. CUSIP® numbers are provided for convenience of reference only. The City does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of such numbers.

[2] Reoffering prices/yields furnished by the purchaser of the Certificates. The City takes no responsibility for the accuracy thereof.

No dealer, broker, salesperson or other person has been authorized by the City to give any information or to make any representations 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.

This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract with the purchaser or purchasers 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 fact.

The information set forth herein, other than that provided by the City, has been obtained from sources that are believed to be reliable, but 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.

This Official Statement is submitted in connection with the execution and sale of the Certificates referred to herein and may not be reproduced or used, in whole or in part, for any other purpose, unless authorized in writing by the City. All summaries of the documents and laws are made subject to the provisions thereof and do not purport to be complete statements of any or all such provisions.

In connection with the offering of the Certificates, the underwriters may over-allot 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. The underwriters may offer and sell the Certificates to certain dealers and dealer banks at prices lower than the initial public offering prices stated on the inside cover hereof. Such initial public offering prices may be changed from time to time by the underwriters.

This Official Statement contains forecasts, projections, estimates and other forward-looking statements that are based on current expectations. The words “expects,” “forecasts,” “projects,” “intends,” “anticipates,” “estimates,” “assumes” and analogous expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. Such forecasts, projections and estimates are not intended as representations of fact or guarantees of results. Any such forward-looking statements inherently are subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results or performance to differ materially from those that have been forecast, estimated or projected. Such risks and uncertainties include, among others, changes in social and economic conditions, federal, state and local statutory and regulatory initiatives, litigation, population changes, seismic events and various other events, conditions and circumstances, many of which are beyond the control of the City. These forward-looking statements speak only as of the date of this Official Statement. The City disclaims any obligation or undertaking to release publicly any updates or revisions to any forward-looking statement contained herein to reflect any changes in the expectations of the City with regard thereto or any change in events, conditions or circumstances on which any such statement is based.

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.

The City maintains a website and social media accounts. The information presented on such website and social media accounts 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 also are not incorporated herein by such references.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MAYOR

London N. Breed

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Shannon Walton, *Board President, District 10*

Connie Chan, *District 1*
Catherine Stefani, *District 2*
Aaron Peskin, *District 3*
Gordon Mar, *District 4*
Dean Preston, *District 5*

[______], *District 6*
Myrna Melgar, *District 7*
Rafael Mandelman, *District 8*
Hillary Ronen, *District 9*
Ahsha Safai, *District 11*

CITY ATTORNEY

David Chiu

CITY TREASURER

José Cisneros

OTHER CITY AND COUNTY OFFICIALS

Carmen Chu, *City Administrator*
Benjamin Rosenfield, *Controller*
Anna Van Degna, *Director, Controller's Office of Public Finance*

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Co-Special Counsel

Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP
San Francisco, California

Curls Bartling P.C.
Oakland, California

Municipal Advisor

KNN Public Finance, LLC
Berkeley, California

Co-Disclosure Counsel

Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP
San Francisco, California

Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth,
A Professional Corporation
Newport Beach, California

Trustee

[U.S. Bank National Association
San Francisco, California]

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONENTS
(continued)

APPENDICES

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

$[Par Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
SERIES 202[__]
(MULTIPLE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS)

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 202[__] (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (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 transaction 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, has conveyed the Leased Property (as defined hereafter) to [U.S. Bank National Association], as trustee (the "Trustee") under the Property Lease (the "Original Property Lease"), dated as of May 1, 2009, by and between the City, as lessor, and the Trustee, as lessee, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Property Lease (the "[Nth] Supplement to Property Lease"), dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as so supplemented and amended, the "Property Lease"), at a nominal annual rent. The Trustee has leased the Leased Property back to the City for the City's use under the Project Lease (the "Original Project Lease"), dated as of May 1, 2009, by and between the Trustee, as lessor, and the City, as lessee, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease (the "[Nth] Supplement to Project Lease"), dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as so supplemented and amended, the "Project Lease").

The Leased Property generally consists of (i) certain portions of the City's Laguna Honda Hospital (including the South Residence building, the North Residence building and the Pavilion building and their related land footprints on the Laguna Honda Hospital campus), and (ii) the San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3), each as further described herein. *[Describe other property to be added, if any.]* See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY." 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 Base Rental may be "abated" as discussed herein). Each payment of Base Rental will consist of principal and interest components, and when received by the Trustee in each rental period, will be deposited in trust for payment of the Certificates. The Trustee will create the "certificates of participation" in the Project Lease, representing proportional interests in the principal and interest components of the Base Rental payments it will receive from the City. The Trustee will apply the Base Rental payments it receives to pay principal and interest with respect to each Certificate when due according to the Trust Agreement (the "Original Trust Agreement"), dated as of May 1, 2009, by and between the City and the

---

* Preliminary, subject to change.

Trustee, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement (the "[Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement"), dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as so supplemented and amended, the "Trust Agreement"), which governs the security and terms of payment of the Certificates. The money received from the sale of the Certificates will be applied by the Trustee, at the City's direction, to (i) finance and refinance certain capital improvement projects within the City (as further described herein), including through the retirement of certain commercial paper notes of the City issued for such purpose, (ii) [fund the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund established for the Certificates under the Trust Agreement,] and (iii) pay costs of execution and delivery of the Certificates. See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" herein.

The Certificates are being delivered as Additional Certificates under the Trust Agreement and will be secured by Base Rental payments relating to the Leased Property on a parity basis with (i) all of the $42,835,000 City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation, Series 2012A (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (the "2012A Certificates"), currently outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $________, (ii) all of the $116,460,000 City and County of San Francisco Refunding Certificates of Participation Series 2019-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (the "2019-R1 Certificates"), currently outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $_______, (iii) all of the $70,640,000 City and County of San Francisco Refunding Certificates of Participation Series 2020-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (the "2020-R1 Certificates"), currently outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $________, and (iv) all of the $76,020,000 City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation Series 2021A (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (the "2021A Certificates" and, together with the outstanding 2012A Certificates, 2019-R1 Certificates and 2020-R1 Certificates, the "Prior Parity Certificates"), currently outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $________.

On October 11, 2019, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $156,600,000 ($______ remains unissued under this authorization). On December 20, 2019, the City further authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $83,600,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). On November 6, 2020, the City also authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $157,000,000 ($________ remains unissued under this authorization). On July 27, 2021, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $67,500,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). The City may decide not to execute and deliver the Additional Certificates remaining under these authorizations. The City may also authorize the execution and delivery of other Additional Certificates in the future. *[To be revised as necessary.]*

Guide to this Official Statement. The Project and the Leased Property are described herein in the section "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY." The application of the proceeds of sale of the Certificates is described in the sections "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" and "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS." The terms of the Certificates and repayment thereof and security for the Certificates are described in the sections "THE CERTIFICATES," "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES," and other sections in the front portion of this Official Statement. Current information about the City, its finances and its governance is provided in APPENDIX A. The City's most recent annual comprehensive financial report appears in APPENDIX B. A summary of the Project Lease, the Property Lease, and the Trust Agreement 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 Ordinance (as defined herein) providing for the execution and delivery of the Certificates, other legal documents and 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, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 336, 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, therefore, such materials are not incorporated herein by such references and are not deemed a part of this Official Statement.

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

General. The City is the economic and cultural center of the San Francisco Bay Area and northern California. The limits of the City encompass over 93 square miles, of which 49 square miles are land, with the balance consisting of tidelands and a portion of the San Francisco Bay (the "Bay"). The City is located at the northern tip of the San Francisco Peninsula, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the Bay and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to the east, the entrance to the Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge to the north, and San Mateo County to the south. Silicon Valley is about a 40-minute drive to the south, and the Napa-Sonoma wine country is about an hour's drive to the north. The City estimates the City's population in fiscal year 2020-21 was 851,916.

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 technology, retail, entertainment and the arts, conventions and tourism, service businesses, banking, professional and financial services, corporate headquarters, international and wholesale trade, multimedia and advertising, healthcare and higher education. The California State Supreme Court is also based in San Francisco.

The COVID-19 pandemic is a significant development that has materially adversely affected the City's economy and certain aspects of the City's financial condition. Many aspects of the City's finances and operations and the local economy have been and may continue to be materially adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. To date, City economic and tax revenue losses associated with the COVID-19 pandemic have been significant. Although City operations have stabilized and certain revenues have recovered, a resurgence of the pandemic may affect the City's ability to sustain regular operations at current levels, and may materially adversely impact the financial condition of the City. The projections and other forward-looking statements in this Official Statement are based on current expectations and are not intended as representations of fact or guarantees of results. Any such forward-looking statements inherently are subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results or performance to differ materially from those that have been forecast, estimated or projected. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Public Health Emergencies" and APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Public Health Emergency – COVID-19" herein. The City may post certain reports and other information relating to the COVID-19 pandemic when available on its investor information website located at https://sfcontroller.org/continuing-secondary-market-disclosure.

The City has historically been a major convention and tourist destination. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly adversely impacted, and may continue to adversely impact tourism and convention activities in the City. In 2021, the San Francisco Travel Association, a nonprofit membership organization ("SFTA"), reported 14.8 million visitors to the City, up 25% from 2020, but down 44% from a record high of

26.2 million visitors in 2019. Total spending by visitors in 2021 increased to $3.1 billion from $2.8 billion in 2020, but was down 70% from $10.3 billion in 2019, including spending on meetings and conventions.

The City is also a leading center for financial activity in the State. The headquarters of the Twelfth Federal Reserve District and the Eleventh District Federal Home Loan Bank are located in the City.

The City benefits from a highly skilled, educated and professional labor force. The City estimates the per-capita personal income of the City for fiscal year 2020-21 was $173,097. The San Francisco Unified School District ("SFUSD"), which is a separate legal entity from the City, operates 64 elementary schools serving grades TK-5, 8 alternative configured schools serving grades TK-8, 13 middle schools serving grades 6-8, 14 high schools serving grades 9-12, 12 early education schools, 3 continuation/alternative schools, and 5 County and Court Schools in academic year 2021-22. There are also 11 active charter schools authorized by SFUSD and operating within the boundaries of SFUSD. 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), UC Hastings Law, the University of the Pacific's School of Dentistry, Golden Gate University, City College of San Francisco (a public community college), the San Francisco Art Institute, the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, 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, is owned by the City and is operated by the San Francisco Airport Commission (the "Airport Commission"), and is the principal commercial service airport for the Bay Area and one of the nation's principal gateways for Pacific Rim traffic. In fiscal year 2020-21 SFO serviced approximately 13.7 million passengers (compared to approximately 40.5 million passengers in fiscal year 2019-20 and 57 million passengers in fiscal year 2018-19) and handled 471,793 metric tons of cargo (compared to 490,073 metric tons in fiscal year 2019-20 and 564,485 metric tons in fiscal year 2018-19). The City is also served by the Bay Area Rapid Transit District ("BART," an 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 ("Muni"), operated by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA"), provides bus and streetcar service within the City (investors should note that telecommuting resulting from emergency stay-at-home orders caused ridership into and within the City to decline significantly as described in APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Budgetary Risks – Commuting Pattern Changes"). 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.

Government. San Francisco is a city and county chartered pursuant to Article XI, Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Constitution of the State of California and is the only consolidated city and county in the State. Voters approved the City's current Charter at the November 1995 election. The City is governed by a Board of Supervisors elected from 11 districts to serve four-year terms, and a Mayor who serves as chief executive officer, elected citywide to a four-year term. The City's original budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 totals $13.2 billion and $12.8 billion, respectively. The General Fund portion of each year's original budget is $6.4 billion in fiscal year 2021-22 and $6.3 billion in fiscal year 2022-23, with the balance allocated to all other funds, including enterprise fund departments, such as the Airport Commission, SFMTA, the Port Commission and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC"). According to the Controller, at the start of fiscal year 2021-22, total net assessed valuation of taxable property in the City was approximately $312 billion, which represents an increase of 4.1% over fiscal year 2020-21.

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: "ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 202__."

THE CERTIFICATES

Authority for Execution and Delivery

The Certificates will be executed and delivered pursuant to the Trust Agreement. Each Certificate will represent 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 will be obligated under the Project Lease to pay the Base Rental in consideration for its use and occupancy of the Leased Property. The Leased Property will be leased by the City to the Trustee pursuant to the Property Lease.

The Original Trust Agreement, the Original Property Lease, and the Original Project Lease were approved by the Board of Supervisors of the City by its Resolution No. 351-08, adopted on July 29, 2008 and signed by the Mayor on August 5, 2008. The [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement and the [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease were approved by the Board of Supervisors of the City by its Ordinance No. [______], adopted on [________] and signed by the Mayor on [________] (the "Ordinance"). The Ordinance authorized the execution and delivery of up to $[_________] aggregate principal amount of Additional Certificates under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates. 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, because the Trustee is neither a public agency nor a nonprofit corporation. The City has obtained a judgment in the Superior Court for the City and County of San Francisco validating the Original Project Lease, the Original Property Lease, the Original Trust Agreement and certain other matters. No judicial validation action has been pursued or is expected to be pursued with respect to the validity of the [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, the [Nth] Supplement to Property Lease, or the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement. See "VALIDATION ACTION" herein.

Payment of Principal and Interest

The principal evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be payable on [April] 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 [April] 1 of each such year. Payment of the principal and premium, if any, of the Certificates upon prepayment or on 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 [April] 1 and [October] 1 of each year, commencing on [_________] (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 payments designated as interest components coming due on or prior to each of 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; provided, however, that payments of defaulted interest will be payable to the person in whose name such Certificate is registered at the close of business on a special record date fixed therefor by the Trustee, which will not be more than 15 days and not less than 10 days prior to the date of the proposed payment of defaulted interest.

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, 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 and interest evidenced and represented by the Certificates will be paid by the Trustee to DTC which will in turn remit such principal and interest to the participants in DTC for subsequent disbursement to the beneficial owners of the Certificates. Beneficial owners of the Certificates will not receive physical certificates representing their interest 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 Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or before [April] 1, 20[__] will not be subject to optional prepayment prior to their respective stated Certificate Payment Dates. The Certificates with a Certificate Payment Date on or after [April] 1, 20[__] are subject to prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates, in whole or in part on any date on or after [April] 1, 20[__], 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 amount represented by the Certificates to be prepaid plus accrued interest to the date fixed for prepayment, without premium.

Special Mandatory Prepayment

The Certificates will be subject to mandatory prepayment prior to their respective Certificate Payment Dates, in 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 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. Such mandatory prepayment of Base Rental will be applied pro rata among all certificates of participation outstanding under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates.

*Mandatory Sinking Account Installment Prepayment**

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

Sinking Account Payment Date ([April] 1)	Sinking Account Installment Amount
†	

† Certificate Payment Date.

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 the Certificates scheduled to be paid on each Certificate Payment Date to be prepaid. Within a maturity, the Trustee, with the consent of the City, will select Certificates for prepayment by lot in any manner that 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 only system is used for any Certificates, notice with respect thereto will be given 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 issue date and stated Certificate Payment Date of each Certificate to be prepaid in whole or in part. Such Prepayment 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 failure to receive any notice nor any defect therein will affect the sufficiency of the proceedings for such prepayment.

* Preliminary, subject to change.

Conditional Notice of Prepayment; 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, on or prior to such date, 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. 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, the City will continue to pay the Base Rental payments as if no such notice had been given.

Purchase of Certificates

Unless expressly provided otherwise in the Trust Agreement, money held in the Base Rental Fund under the Trust Agreement in respect of principal may be used to reimburse the City for the purchase of Certificates that would otherwise be subject to prepayment 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 under the Trust Agreement shall not exceed the applicable prepayment price of the Certificates that would be prepaid but for the operation of provisions of the Trust Agreement as described in this paragraph. Any such purchase must be completed prior to the time notice would otherwise be required to be given to prepay such Certificates. All Certificates so purchased shall be surrendered to the Trustee for cancellation and applied as a credit against the obligation to prepay such Certificates from such moneys.

PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY

The Certificates are being delivered as Additional Certificates under the Trust Agreement and will be secured by Base Rental payments relating to the Leased Property on a parity basis with all of the currently outstanding Prior Parity Certificates.

Plan of Finance

A portion of the proceeds of the Certificates will be used to finance and refinance certain capital improvement projects (collectively, the “Project”) within the City, including but not limited to certain projects within the City’s capital plan and generally consisting of critical repairs, renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities, streets and works utilized by various City departments and local economic stimulus projects. The projects generally consist of repairs, renovations, improvements and street reconstruction, repaving and other improvements, designed to help build a more resilient and equitable San Francisco as part of the City’s recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. Proceeds of the Certificates will also be used to retire certain commercial property notes of the City issued for the purpose of financing or refinancing these capital improvement projects.

The Leased Property

Upon the execution of the [Nth] Supplement to Property Lease and the [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, the Leased Property will generally consist of the site and facilities of (i) the Pavilion building (formerly known as the Link building), the North Residence building (formerly known as the East Residence building) and the South Residence building on the campus of Laguna Honda Hospital, together with certain limited rights of ingress and egress and appurtenant rights (collectively, the "Laguna Honda Hospital Portion" of the Leased Property) and (ii) the San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3). *[Describe other property to be added, if any.]*

Laguna Honda Hospital was established in 1866 as an almshouse for the City's poor and homeless. Laguna Honda Hospital is currently located at 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard in the City, and is operated by the City's Department of Public Health. In 2009, the City completed its Laguna Honda Hospital Replacement Program which included the construction of the Pavilion building, the North Residence building and the South Residence building. Together, these three buildings provide approximately 780 residents with long-term care regardless of their ability to pay, including skilled nursing, AIDS-related services, dementia services, hospice, rehabilitation and acute care. The City also provides adult day health care and senior nutrition programs through these facilities. The 62-acre Laguna Honda Hospital site is on property owned by the City and located on the western slopes of Twin Peaks, near the geographic center of the City, and the Laguna Honda Hospital Portion of the Leased Property represents only a portion of such site.

The Pavilion building is a 148,039-square foot, four-story building, housing offices, clinics and the mezzanine and space for other associated support activities of Laguna Honda Hospital. The Pavilion building is designed to accommodate 60 beds on one of its floors. The North Residence building is a 208,377-square foot, six-story building serving as hospital facilities. The North Residence building is designed to accommodate 420 beds on six floors. The South Residence building is a 156,993-square foot, six-story building serving as hospital facilities. The South Residence building is designed to accommodate 300 beds on five of its floors.

The San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3) sits on 158 acres of land located at 1 Moreland Drive, San Bruno, California. The San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3) is the City's newest and largest jail facility constructed as a replacement facility for the then-existing jail on the site, and was completed in 2005. The 768-bed facility consists of 283,257 square feet, including a guard tower, an administrative services area, an attorney visiting area, staff exercise areas and locker rooms, a maintenance area and central plant, and a kitchen and laundry facility sufficient to accommodate both jail facilities.

Certain information regarding the Leased Property is summarized below:

Summary of Certain Information Regarding the Leased Property

Facility	Address	Completion Date of Improvements	Gross Square Feet (Building)	Estimated Value[(1)]
Laguna Honda Hospital (North Residence, South Residence & Pavilion Building)	375 Laguna Honda Blvd., San Francisco, CA	2009	513,409	$[800,000,000][(2)]
San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3)	1 Moreland Drive, San Bruno, CA	2005	283,257	$[178,436,701][(3)]
[Describe other property to be added, if any.]				

(1) Such estimated values do not necessarily reflect the fair market value, or the actual sales price upon a sale or actual rent upon commercial leasing of the Leased Property. Given the size and unique nature of each of the components of the Leased Property, comparable sales were not available to estimate value. Neither the Certificates nor the Base Rental payments are secured by any mortgage or deed of trust on the Leased Property or any portion thereof. See "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES" herein.

(2) The amount represents the City's estimated valuation as of [September 23, 2019] based on both a cost/replacement and income approach.

(3) Based on the insured value as of [July 1, 2020].

Source: City and County of San Francisco.

[The Project Lease will require the City 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 CLTA or ALTA policy of title insurance (with no survey required) with respect to the [________], which policy, when combined with the policy or policies of title insurance issued in connection with the issuance and delivery of the Prior Parity Certificates (and the property associated with the Pavilion building, the North Residence building, the South Residence building and the San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3)), will be in an aggregate amount at least equal to the initial aggregate principal amount of the Certificates and the then-outstanding aggregate principal amounts of the Prior Parity Certificates, inclusive, and 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 such outstanding Prior Parity Certificates. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – The Project Lease – Insurance" and "– [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease."]

The City may substitute other improved real property for all or part of the Leased Property under the conditions set forth in the Project Lease. There is no requirement that any substitute property be of the same or a similar nature or function as the then existing Leased Property, and there is no requirement that any substitute property have a market value or fair rental value as great as the then existing Leased Property or such portion thereof that is sought to be released from the Project Lease. See "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Substitution, Release, and Addition of Leased Property" and APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – The Project Lease – Addition, Release and Substitution."

The lease term with respect to the Leased Property or a designated portion thereof will end on [April] 1, 20[__], unless such term is extended or sooner terminated as provided in the Project Lease.

ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

Following is a table of estimated sources and uses of funds with respect to the Certificates:

***Sources of Funds*:**

Certificate Par Amount
Original Issue Premium
Less: Purchaser's Discount
Total Sources

***Uses of Funds*:**

Deposit to 202[__] Project Account[(1)]
Deposit to 202[__] Reserve Account
Costs of Delivery[(2)]
Total Uses

---

(1) Of the amount deposited in the 202[__] Project Account, $[_______] will be applied to the payment of commercial paper issued to finance the Project and $[________] (representing 0.2% of the 202[__] Project Account for project costs) will be used to pay the Controller's City Services Auditor fee.

(2) Includes amounts for administrative costs to the City for the issuance of the Certificates, legal fees, Trustee's fees and expenses, municipal advisory fees, rating agency fees, appraisals and property condition report fees, title insurance fees, printing costs and any other delivery costs, and rounding amounts.

CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The Trust Agreement requires that Base Rental payments payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease on each [March 25] and [September 25] 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, on [April] 1 and [October] 1 of each year, commencing on [_________], to make interest payments or principal and interest payments, as applicable, with respect to the Certificates as the same become due and payable, as shown in the table below.

The Prior Parity Certificates are currently outstanding and payable from Base Rental payments required to be made with respect to the Leased Property under the Project Lease. The following table shows total annual Base Rental payments due with respect to the Certificates and the Prior Parity Certificates secured by Base Rental payments under the Project Lease:

Payment Date	Certificates Principal	Interest	Total	2012A Certificates	2019-R1 Certificates	2020-R1 Certificates	2021A Certificates	Total Fiscal Year Annual Debt Service
Total								

SECURITY AND SOURCE 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 has a final termination date of [April] 1 , 20[__], or upon early payment of all of the certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates, unless extended upon an 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, its rights with respect to and its interest in and to all amounts on hand from time to time in the funds and accounts established under the Trust Agreement (excluding amounts on deposit in the Rebate Fund pursuant to the Trust Agreement and, provided, however, that the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and the 202[__] Project Account shall secure only the Certificates), including all Base Rental payments received by the Trustee from the City pursuant to the Project Lease, all amounts on hand from time to time in the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund, and any additional property that may from time to time be subjected to the lien of the Trust Agreement by the City or anyone on its behalf, subject only to the provisions of the Trust Agreement, the Property Lease and the Project Lease. 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 scheduled principal and interest represented by the Certificates.

Parity Obligations

The Certificates are being delivered as Additional Certificates under the Trust Agreement and will be secured by Base Rental payments relating to the Leased Property on a parity basis with the Prior Parity Certificates described under "CERTIFICATE PAYMENT SCHEDULE," and any Additional Certificates that may hereafter be issued pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Trust Agreement and the Project Lease. On October 11, 2019, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $156,600,000 ($______ remains unissued under this authorization). On December 20, 2019, the City further authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $83,600,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). On November 6, 2020, the City also authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $157,000,000 ($________ remains unissued under this authorization). On July 27, 2021, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $67,500,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). The City may decide not to execute and deliver the Additional Certificates remaining under these authorizations. The City may also authorize the execution and delivery of other Additional Certificates in the future. *[To be revised as necessary.]*

Covenant to Budget and Right to Re-let

The City has covenanted in the Project Lease to take such action as may be necessary to include all Rental Payments 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.

If the City breaches its covenant in the Project Lease to include all Rental Payments in the applicable annual budget and the City fails to remedy such breach with all reasonable dispatch within 60 days after written notice from the Trustee, or if such breach cannot be remedied within such 60-day period, the City fails to institute corrective action within such 60 day period and diligently pursue such action to completion, the Trustee may either re-let the Leased Property for the account of the City or may retain the Project Lease and hold the City liable for all Rental Payments on an annual basis. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Project Lease or the Trust Agreement, in no event will the Trustee have any right to accelerate the payment of any Base Rental under the Project Lease, and the remedy to re-let the Leased Property is subject to applicable laws regarding the use of the Leased Property, including but not limited to applicable laws relating to the use of property financed with general obligation bonds or federal or State grants. See "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Limited Recourse on Default; Re-letting of the Leased Property."

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: "ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 202__." 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 agrees in the Project Lease that 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 Project Lease provides that 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, and without abatement, subject only to the provisions of the Project Lease regarding rental abatement. See "– Abatement of Base Rental Payments" and "CERTAIN RISK FACTORS – Abatement."

The Base Rental payments are payable by the City on [March 25] and [September 25] of each year during the term of the Project Lease, commencing with respect to the Certificates on [_________], 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. 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 and Right to Re-let" above.

Additional Rental. Additional Rental payments due from the City to the Trustee under the Project Lease include, among other things, all taxes and insurance premiums, all fees, costs and expenses of the Trustee in connection with the Trust Agreement not otherwise paid or provided for out of the proceeds of the sale of the Certificates, deposits required to be made to the Rebate Fund, if any, all other fees, costs and expenses of the Trustee incurred from time to time in administering the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement, and amounts required to replace, maintain and repair the Leased Property pursuant to the Project Lease.

Abatement of Base Rental Payments

Rental Payments will be subject to abatement 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 202[__] 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, excluding amounts described in clauses (i), (ii) and (iii) above, 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 will commence with such damage, destruction, condemnation or discovery of such title defect and end with the restoration of the Leased Property or portion thereof to tenantable condition or correction of the title defect, as applicable. 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 [April] 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 with third party providers in an amount not less than the aggregate Base Rental payable by the City pursuant to the Property Lease for a period of at least 24 months. Pursuant to the Project Lease, rental interruption insurance is required to insure only against loss of rental income from the Leased Property caused 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 the City's all risk property insurance on the Leased Property. The City is not required to maintain earthquake or flood insurance (or rental interruption insurance relating to such coverage) under the Project Lease except as described under "– Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property" below, and the City does not currently have earthquake or flood insurance on the Leased Property. 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 and other certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement. 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 thereof, or to prepay certificates of participation outstanding under the Trust Agreement such that resulting Rental Payments are sufficient to pay all amounts due under the Project Lease and the Trust Agreement with respect to such certificates of participation 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 "– Substitution, Release and Addition of Leased Property" below. In addition, the Trust Agreement establishes a 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund and requires the Trustee to use any moneys on deposit in said account of the Reserve Fund to make payments of principal and interest represented by the Certificates. See "– Reserve Fund; 202[__] Reserve Account," below.

Reserve Fund; 202[__] Reserve Account

The Trust Agreement established a Reserve Fund held by the Trustee, and within the Reserve Fund, there will be created a 202[__] Reserve Account to be held with the Trustee. The 202[__] Reserve Account will only be available to support payments with respect to the Certificates, and not the Prior Parity Certificates or any Additional Certificates. Simultaneously with the delivery of the Certificates, the City will cause to be deposited into the 202[__] Reserve Account a portion of the proceeds of the Certificates, which amount will be at least equal to the Reserve Requirement with respect to the Certificates. The Reserve Requirement for the Certificates, as designated in the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement, is $[_________]. See APPENDIX C – "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – DEFINITIONS OF CERTAIN TERMS" for the definition of "Reserve Requirement."

Under the Trust Agreement, the 202[__] Reserve Account is required to be maintained by the Trustee until the Base Rental relating to the Certificates 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 for the Certificates may, at the City's option, be paid from the 202[__] Reserve Account.

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 202[__] Reserve Account, provided that (i) such substitution shall 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 shall notify each Rating Agency prior to making any such substitution), and (ii) the Trustee shall 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 shall be for the term of the Certificates. Amounts on deposit in the 202[__] Reserve Account for which a Credit Facility has been substituted shall 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 shall transfer from the 202[__] Reserve Account for credit to the Base Rental Fund an amount sufficient to make up such deficiency (provided that such amounts will only be available for the Certificates and not the Prior Parity Certificates or any Additional Certificates). In the event of any such transfer, the Trustee shall immediately provide written notice to the City of the amount and the date of such transfer.

Any moneys in the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund in excess of the Reserve Requirement on each [April] 1 and [October] 1, commencing [_________], and at such other time or times as directed by the City, shall 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 City has established a Reserve Account for the 2012A Certificates (the "2012A Reserve Account") and the 2021A Certificates (the "2021A Reserve Account"); however, such 2012A Reserve Account and 2021A Reserve Account are not available for the payment of Base Rental payments due with respect to the Certificates. The Trust Agreement allows a Reserve Account to be established for Additional Certificates. See "– Additional Certificates" below.

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 and the other certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement 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 of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates, insurance or condemnation proceeds or other legally available funds are sufficient to prepay: (i) all Outstanding certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates, and to pay all other amounts due under the Project Lease and under the Trust Agreement or (ii) any portion of the Certificates and other certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement 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 of participation to remain Outstanding under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates, 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. 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 reason of the 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 carried by the City; (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 of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates (to the extent commercially available), 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; (iii) to the extent commercially available, earthquake insurance in an amount equal to the lesser of the Outstanding principal amount of the certificates of participation executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement, including the Certificates; 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 cost on the open market from reputable insurance companies; (iv) 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 (v) 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 (such amount may be adjusted annually 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) and (iii) 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 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 CLTA or ALTA policy of title insurance (with no survey required) with respect to the [_______], which policy, when combined with the policy or policies of title insurance issued in connection with the issuance and delivery of the Prior Parity Certificates (and the property associated with the Pavilion building, the North Residence building, the South Residence building and the San Bruno Complex (County Jail No. 3)), will be in an aggregate amount at least equal to the initial aggregate principal amount of the Certificates and the then-outstanding aggregate principal amounts of the Prior Parity Certificates, inclusive, and 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 such outstanding Prior Parity Certificates. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – The Project Lease – Insurance" and "– [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease."]

The City is not required to maintain earthquake or flood insurance (or rental interruption insurance relating to such coverage) under the Project Lease except as provided above, and the City [does not] currently have earthquake or flood insurance on the Leased Property or any portion thereof.

THE CITY MAY SELF-INSURE AGAINST ANY OF THE RISKS REQUIRED TO BE INSURED AGAINST IN THE LEASE, EXCEPT FOR RENTAL INTERRUPTION INSURANCE AND TITLE INSURANCE. The City expects to self-insure for all exposures for which the Project Lease permits self-insurance.

Eminent Domain

If 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, the Project Lease will terminate as of the later of the day possession is taken and the date of entry of the interlocutory judgment and in either case, after payment of any Additional Rental owed under the Project Lease. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City may, at its option, but is not obligated to apply the proceeds relating to the condemnation to the replacement of the condemned Leased Property, and in the event there has been an abatement of Rental Payments pursuant to the Project Lease, then Rental Payments will again begin to accrue with respect thereto upon replacement of the Leased Property. 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 the rental abatement provisions of the Project Lease.

The City will, within 90 days of the conclusion of the eminent domain proceeding, notify the Trustee in writing of whether the Leased Property will be replaced or the Certificates, and other certificates of participation issued pursuant to the Trust Agreement and then Outstanding, will be prepaid in part. The proceedings of any condemnation award will as soon as possible be deposited with the Trustee and, to the extent necessary, will be applied to prepay Certificates and such other Outstanding certificates of participation or applied to the cost of replacement of the Leased Property. See APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – Trust Agreement – Eminent Domain" and "–The Project Lease – Eminent Domain."

Substitution, Release, and Addition of Leased Property

If no Event of Default has occurred and is continuing under the Project Lease, 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. See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED

PROPERTY – The Leased Property" and APPENDIX C: "SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS – The Project Lease – Addition, Release and Substitution."

Additional Certificates

On October 11, 2019, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $156,600,000 ($______ remains unissued under this authorization). On December 20, 2019, the City further authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $83,600,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). On November 6, 2020, the City also authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $157,000,000 ($________ remains unissued under this authorization). On July 27, 2021, the City authorized the execution and delivery of Additional Certificates to be executed and delivered under the Trust Agreement to finance various projects of the City in an aggregate principal amount of up to $67,500,000 ($_______ remains unissued under this authorization). The City may decide not to execute and deliver the Additional Certificates remaining under these authorizations. The City may also authorize the execution and delivery of other Additional Certificates in the future. *[To be revised as necessary.]*

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

CERTAIN RISK FACTORS

The following risk factors should be considered, along with all other information in this Official Statement, by potential investors 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.

[The COVID-19 pandemic is a significant development that has materially adversely affected the City's economy and certain aspects of the City's financial condition. Many aspects of the City's finances and operations and the local economy have been and may continue to be materially adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Public Health Emergency – COVID-19" and also "– Public Health Emergencies" below.]

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 Base Rental Fund and in the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve 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. 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 – Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds," "– Voter-Approved Lease Revenue Bonds," "– Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Certificates of Participation," and "– Overlapping Debt." See also APPENDIX B: "ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 202__."

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. Under certain circumstances, the City's obligation to make Base Rental payments and Additional 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. See "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Abatement of Base Rental Payments."

Under the Project Lease, 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 [April] 1, 20[__]. 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 SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property" and "– Replacement, Maintenance and Repairs" for additional provisions governing damage to the Leased Property.

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.

In the event of abatement or default, the amounts on deposit in the 202[__] Reserve Account may be significantly less than the amount of Base Rental due at the time of abatement or default. If moneys are drawn from the 202[__] Reserve Account to make Base Rental payments during a period of rental abatement, moneys remaining in the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund after such payments are likely to be less than the Reserve Requirement. The City is not required by the Project Lease or the Trust Agreement, and cannot be compelled, to replenish the 202[__] Reserve Account of the Reserve Fund to the Reserve Requirement.

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 202[__] 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.

Limited Recourse on Default; Re-letting of the Leased Property

The Project Lease and the Trust Agreement provide that, if there is a default by the City, the Trustee may, subject to applicable laws regarding use of such property, take possession of and re-let the Leased Property for the account of the City. The Leased Property is unique and re-letting might prove to be difficult or impossible. The remedy to re-let the Leased Property is subject to applicable laws regarding the use of the Leased Property, including but not limited to applicable laws relating to the use of property financed with general obligation bonds or federal or State grants. Portions of Laguna Honda Hospital have been improved with the proceeds of voter-approved general obligation bonds, and it is unclear whether any re-letting would be permitted to result in use of the Laguna Honda Hospital Portion of the Leased Property that is inconsistent with the public hospital purposes for which those bonds were approved. Further, certain improvements to Laguna Honda Hospital were funded by federal fund grants, which might impact the remedy of re-letting, as further described below. See "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Covenant to Budget and Right to Re-let." The amounts received from any such re-letting may be insufficient to pay the scheduled principal and interest represented by the Certificates when due and the City is not required by the Project Lease or the Trust Agreement, and cannot be compelled, to replenish the 202[__] Reserve Account to the Reserve Requirement. In addition, the Trust Agreement provides that no remedies such as re-letting 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, shall proceed), without any further notice: (i) to re-enter the Leased Property and eject all parties in possession therefrom and, without terminating the Project Lease, re-let the Leased Property as the agent and for the account of the City upon such terms and conditions as the Trustee may deem advisable, or (ii) in lieu of the above, so long as the Trustee does not terminate the Project Lease or the City's possession of the Leased Property, 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.

The construction and renovation of Laguna Honda Hospital was financed, in part, by federal grant funds awarded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the Public Health Service Act. As a result of such funding, Laguna Honda Hospital is subject to the recovery provisions of the Public Health Service Act, which may limit the remedy of re-letting the Laguna Honda Hospital Portion of the Leased Property under the Project Lease.

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 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 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 any Base Rental payments under the Project Lease. Certificate owners would have to sue for payment of unpaid Base Rental in each rental period as and when it becomes due. 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 Leased Property, after such substitution, have an annual fair rental value at least equal to the maximum annual amount of the Base Rental payments becoming due in the then-current Project Lease Year or in any subsequent Project Lease Year, 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.

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 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 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 – Enforcement of Remedies" herein.

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), as amended (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 rights of the Owners of the Certificates may be materially and adversely affected as follows: (i) the application of the automatic stay provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, which, until relief is granted, would prevent collection of payments from the City or the commencement of any judicial or other action for the purpose of recovering or collecting a claim against the City and could prevent the Trustee from making payments from funds in its possession; (ii) the avoidance of preferential transfers occurring during the relevant period prior to the filing of a bankruptcy petition; (iii) the existence of unsecured or secured debt which may have a priority of payment superior to that of Owners of the Certificates; and (iv) the possibility of the adoption of a plan (an "Adjustment Plan") for the adjustment of the City's various obligations over the objections of the Trustee or all of the Owners of the Certificates and without their consent, which Adjustment Plan may restructure, delay, compromise or reduce the amount of any claim of the Owners of the Certificates if the Bankruptcy Court finds that such Adjustment Plan is "fair and equitable" and in the best interests of creditors. The Adjustment Plans approved by the Bankruptcy Courts in connection with the bankruptcies of the cities of Vallejo, San Bernardino and Stockton resulted in significant reductions in the amounts payable by the cities under lease revenue obligations that were substantially identical or similar to the Certificates. The City can provide no assurances about the outcome of the bankruptcy cases of other California municipalities or the nature of any Adjustment Plan if it were to file for bankruptcy. The City is not currently considering filing for protection under the Bankruptcy Code.

In addition, if the Project Lease was determined to constitute a "true lease" by the bankruptcy court (rather than a financing lease providing for the extension of credit), the City could choose to reject the Project Lease despite any provision therein that makes the bankruptcy or insolvency of the City an event of default thereunder. If the City rejects the Project Lease, the Trustee, on behalf of the Owners of the Certificates, would have a pre-petition unsecured claim that may be substantially limited in amount, and this claim would be treated in such a manner under an Adjustment Plan over the objections of the Trustee or Owners of the Certificates. Moreover, such rejection would terminate the Project Lease and the City's obligations to make payments thereunder. The City may also be permitted to assign the Project Lease (or the Property Lease) to a third party, regardless of the terms of the transaction documents. 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.

City Financial Challenges

The following discussion highlights certain challenges facing the City and is not meant to be an exhaustive discussion of challenges facing the City (see also, for example, "Seismic Risks" and "Climate Change, Risk of Sea Level Rise and Flooding Damage" below). While the City had strong economic and financial performance during the recovery from the great recession and despite significant City initiatives to improve public transportation systems, expand access to healthcare and modernize parks and libraries, the City faces several financial challenges and risks described below. **In particular, the City faced and may in the future face significant adverse financial and budgetary challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic.** See "– Public Health Emergencies" below and APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Public Health Emergency – COVID-19" and "– Public Health Emergencies" below.

Significant capital investments are proposed in the City's adopted 10-year capital plan. The City's most recent adopted 10-year capital plan sets forth $38.0 billion of capital needs for all City departments. However, identified funding resources are below those necessary to maintain and enhance the City's physical infrastructure. As a result, over $7.5 billion in capital needs and enhancements are deferred from the capital plan's 10-year horizon.

In addition, the City faces long-term challenges with respect to the management of pension and post-employment retirement obligations. The City has taken major steps to address long-term unfunded liabilities for employee pension and other post-employment benefits, including retiree health obligations, yet significant liabilities remain. In recent years, the City and voters have adopted changes that should mitigate these unfunded liabilities over time, including adoption of lower-cost benefit tiers, increases to employee and employer contribution requirements, and establishment of a trust fund to set-aside funding for future retiree health costs. The financial benefit from these changes will phase in over time, however, leaving ongoing financial challenges for the City in the shorter term. Further, the size of these liabilities is based on a number of assumptions, including but not limited to assumed investment returns and actuarial assumptions. It is possible that actual results will differ materially from current assumptions, and such changes in investment returns or other actuarial assumptions could increase budgetary pressures on the City.

Further, while the City has adopted a number of measures to better position its operating budget for future economic downturns, these measures may not be sufficient, and there remain numerous risks relating to increased costs and decreased revenues in future years. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO – ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Budgetary Risks."

There is no assurance that other challenges not discussed in this Official Statement may not become material to investors in the future. For more information, see APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES" and in APPENDIX B: "ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 202__."

Seismic Risks

General. The City is located in a seismically active region. The obligation of the City to make payments of Base Rental may be abated, in whole or in part, if the Leased Property or any improvements thereon are damaged or destroyed by natural hazards such as earthquake or flood. The City is not obligated under the Project Lease to maintain earthquake or flood insurance except as described under "SECURITY AND SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR THE CERTIFICATES – Insurance with Respect to the Leased Property," and the City does not currently have earthquake or flood insurance on the Leased Property. There can be no assurance that the Leased Property would not be damaged in whole or in part by seismic activity.

Active earthquake faults underlie both the City and the surrounding Bay Area, including the San Andreas Fault, which passes within about three miles 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, as well as a number of other significant faults in the region. Significant seismic events include the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, centered about 60 miles south of the City, which registered 6.9 on the Richter scale of earthquake intensity. That earthquake caused fires, building collapses, and structural damage to buildings and highways in the City and surrounding areas. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the only east-west vehicle access into the City, was closed for a month for repairs, and several highways in the City were permanently closed and eventually removed. On August 24, 2014, the San Francisco Bay Area experienced a 6.0 earthquake centered near Napa along the West Napa Fault. The City did not suffer any material damage as a result of this earthquake.

California Earthquake Probabilities Study. In March 2015, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (a collaborative effort of the U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.), the California Geological Survey, and the Southern California Earthquake Center) reported that there is a 72% chance that one or more earthquakes of magnitude 6.7 (the magnitude of the 1994 Northridge earthquake) or larger will occur in the San Francisco Bay Area before the year 2045. In addition, the U.S.G.S. released a report in April 2017 entitled The HayWired Earthquake Scenario, which estimates that property damage and direct business disruption losses from a magnitude 7.0 earthquake on the Hayward Fault would be more than $82 billion (in 2016 dollars). Most of the losses are expected to be attributable to shaking damage, liquefaction, and landslides (in that order). Eighty percent of shaking damage is expected to be caused by the magnitude 7.0 mainshock, with the rest of the damage resulting from aftershocks occurring over a 2-year period thereafter. Such earthquakes could be very destructive. In addition to the potential damage to City-owned buildings and facilities (on which the City does not generally carry earthquake insurance), due to the importance of San Francisco as a tourist destination and regional hub of commercial, retail and entertainment activity, a major earthquake anywhere in the Bay Area may cause significant temporary and possibly long-term harm to the City's economy, tax receipts, infrastructure and residential and business real property values.

Earthquake Safety Implementation Plan (ESIP). ESIP began in early 2012, evolving out of the key recommendations of the Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPSS), a 10-year-long study evaluating the seismic vulnerabilities the City faces. The CAPSS Study prepared by the Applied Technology Council looked at the impact to all of San Francisco's buildings and recommended a 30-year plan for action. As a result of this plan, the City has mandated the retrofit of nearly 5,000 soft-story buildings housing over 111,000 residents by September 2021 (the original deadline of September 2020 was extended to this date in light of the COVID-19 pandemic). Approximately 86% of the buildings in the program have received a certificate of completion. Future tasks will address the seismic vulnerability of older nonductile concrete buildings, which are at high risk of severe damage or collapse in an earthquake.

Vulnerability Study of the Northern Waterfront Seawall. In early 2016, the Port Commission of the City (the "Port Commission") commissioned an earthquake vulnerability study of the Northern Waterfront Seawall. The three-mile Seawall was constructed over 100 years ago and sits on reclaimed land, rendering it vulnerable to seismic risk. The Seawall provides flood and wave protection to downtown San Francisco, and stabilizes hundreds of acres of filled land. Preliminary findings of the study indicate that a strong earthquake may cause most of the Seawall to settle and move outward toward the Bay, which would significantly increase earthquake damage and disruption along the waterfront. The Port Commission estimates that seismic retrofitting of the Seawall could cost as much as $3 billion, with another $2 billion or more needed to prepare the Seawall for rising sea levels. The study estimates that approximately $1.6 billion in Port assets and $2.1 billion of rents, business income, and wages are at risk from major damage to the Seawall. See "Climate Change, Risk of Sea Level Rise and Flooding Damage" below. In November 2018, voters of the City approved Proposition A, authorizing the issuance of up to $425 million in general obligation bonds for repair and improvement projects on the Seawall. See also APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Capital Financing and Bonds – Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds."

Tall Buildings Safety Strategy Report and Executive Directive. The City commissioned a first in the nation "Tall Buildings Study" by the Applied Technology Council to consider the impact of earthquakes on buildings taller than 240 feet. The final report following the study, released in January 2019, evaluates best practices for geotechnical engineering, seismic risks, standards for post-earthquake structural evaluations, barriers to re-occupancy, and costs and benefits of higher performance goals for new construction. The study estimates that for a tall building designed to current seismic standards, it might take two to six months to mobilize for and repair damage from a major earthquake, depending on the building location, geologic conditions, and the structural and foundation systems. The report identifies and summarizes sixteen recommendations for reducing seismic risk prior to earthquakes for new and existing buildings, reducing seismic risk following earthquakes, and improving the City's understanding of its tall building seismic risk.

On January 24, 2019, Mayor London N. Breed issued an executive directive instructing City departments to work with community stakeholders, develop regulations to address geotechnical and engineering issues, clarify emergency response and safety inspection roles, and establish a Disaster Recovery Task Force for citywide recovery planning, including a comprehensive recovery plan for the financial district and surrounding neighborhoods by the end of the year. All of these tasks are currently underway. In November 2019, an exercise was conducted to test post-earthquake building safety inspection protocol and logistics. San Francisco was the first jurisdiction to test this Statewide program. The City's Disaster Recovery Taskforce had its kickoff meeting in February 2020 to evaluate plans for development of a Disaster Recovery Framework and Downtown Resilience Plan, following several months of groundwork by a consultant team. In consultation with the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California, Administrative Bulletin AB-111 – "Guidelines for Preparation of Geotechnical and Earthquake Ground Motion Reports for Foundation Design and Construction of Tall Buildings" was adopted on June 15, 2020, which presented requirements and guidelines for developing geotechnical site investigations and preparing geotechnical reports for the foundation design and construction of tall buildings in the City.

The City obtains and maintains commercial insurance only in certain limited circumstances, including when required by bond or lease financing transactions and for other limited purposes. The City does not maintain commercial earthquake coverage, with certain minor exceptions. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Legal Matters and Risk Management."

SB 1953 Compliance. Senate Bill 1953 ("SB 1953") is an amendment to the 1973 Hospital Facilities Seismic Safety Act ("HFSSA") that requires all acute care hospitals in California, including Laguna Honda Hospital, to comply with certain seismic safety standards within a certain time frame. SB 1953 generally requires that by 2020, all hospital buildings must remain standing during a major earthquake so that patients can be evacuated safely, and by 2030, all hospital buildings must remain standing and functioning during a major earthquake. The City deems the Leased Property consisting of Laguna Honda Hospital compliant with SB 1953. See "PLAN OF FINANCE AND THE LEASED PROPERTY" above.

Climate Change, Risk of Sea Level Rise and Flooding Damage

Numerous scientific studies on global climate change show that, among other effects on the global ecosystem, sea levels will rise, extreme temperatures will become more common, and extreme weather events will become more frequent as a result of increasing global temperatures attributable to atmospheric pollution.

The *Fourth National Climate Assessment*, published by the U.S. Global Change Research Program in November 2018 ("NCA4"), finds that more frequent and intense extreme weather and climate-related events, as well as changes in average climate conditions, are expected to continue to damage infrastructure, ecosystems and social systems over the next 25 to 100 years. NCA4 states that rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property and regional economies and industries that depend on natural resources and favorable climate conditions. Disruptions could include more frequent and longer-lasting power outages, fuel shortages and service disruptions. NCA4 states that the continued increase in the frequency and extent of high-tide flooding due to sea level rise threatens coastal public infrastructure. NCA4 also states that expected increases in the severity and frequency of heavy precipitation events will affect inland infrastructure, including access to roads, the viability of bridges and the safety of pipelines.

Sea levels will continue to rise in the future due to the increasing temperature of the oceans causing thermal expansion and growing ocean volume from glaciers and ice caps melting into the ocean. Between 1854 and 2016, sea level rose about nine inches according to the tidal gauge at Fort Point, a location underneath the Golden Gate Bridge. Weather and tidal patterns, including 100-year or more storms and king tides, may exacerbate the effects of climate related sea level rise. Coastal areas like the City are at risk of substantial flood damage over time, affecting private development and public infrastructure, including roads, utilities, emergency services, schools, and parks. As a result, the City could lose considerable tax revenues and many residents, businesses, and governmental operations along the waterfront could be displaced, and the City could be required to mitigate these effects at a potentially material cost.

Adapting to sea level rise is a key component of the City's policies. The City and its enterprise departments have been preparing for future sea level rise for many years and have issued a number of public reports. For example, in March 2016, the City released a report entitled "Sea Level Rise Action Plan," identifying geographic zones at risk of sea level rise and providing a framework for adaptation strategies to confront these risks. That study shows an upper range of end-of-century projections for permanent sea level rise, including the effects of temporary flooding due to a 100-year storm, of up to 108 inches above the 2015 average high tide. To implement this Plan, the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, co-chaired by the Planning Department and Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, joined the Port, the Public Utilities Commission and other public agencies in moving several initiatives forward. This included a Citywide Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Consequences Assessment to identify and evaluate sea level rise impacts across the City and in various neighborhoods that was released in February 2020.

In April 2017, the Working Group of the California Ocean Protection Council Science Advisory Team (in collaboration with several state agencies, including the California Natural Resource Agency, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and the California Energy Commission) published a report, that was formally adopted in March 2018, entitled "Rising Seas in California: An Update on Sea Level Rise Science" (the "Sea Level Rise Report") to provide a new synthesis of the state of science regarding sea level rise. The Sea Level Rise Report provides the basis for State guidance to state and local agencies for incorporating sea level rise into design, planning, permitting, construction, investment and other decisions. Among many findings, the Sea Level Rise Report indicates that the effects of sea level rise are already being felt in coastal California with more extensive coastal flooding during storms, exacerbated tidal flooding, and increased coastal erosion. In addition, the report notes that the rate of ice sheet loss from Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets poses a particular risk of sea level rise for the California coastline. The City has incorporated the projections from the 2018 report into its Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise Guidance into ongoing Capital Planning. The Guidance requires that City projects over $5 million consider mitigation and/or adaptation measures.

In March 2020, a consortium of State and local agencies, led by the Bay Area Conservation and Development Commission, released a detailed study entitled, "Adapting to Rising Tides Bay Area: Regional Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Adaptation Study," on how sea level rise could alter the Bay Area. The study states that a 48-inch increase in the bay's water level in coming decades could cause more than 100,000 Bay Area jobs to be relocated, nearly 30,000 lower-income residents to be displaced, and 68,000 acres of ecologically valuable shoreline habitat to be lost. The study further argues that without a far-sighted, nine-county response, the region's economic and transportation systems could be undermined along with the environment. Runways at SFO could largely be under water.

The City has already incorporated site specific adaption plans in the conditions of approval for certain large waterfront development projects, such as the Candlestick/Hunters Point Shipyard, Treasure Island, Pier

70 and Mission Rock projects. Also, the City has started the process of planning to fortify the Port's Seawall from sea level rise, including an initial investment of about $8 million during fiscal year 2017-18 and consideration of financing options. The City expects short-term upgrades to cost over $500 million and long-term upgrades to cost more than $5 billion. In November 2018, voters of the City approved Proposition A, authorizing the issuance of up to $425 million in general obligation bonds for repair and improvement projects on the Seawall. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Capital Financing and Bonds – Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds."

Portions of the San Francisco Bay Area, including the City, are built on fill that was placed over saturated silty clay known as "Bay Mud." This Bay Mud is soft and compressible, and the consolidation of the Bay Mud under the weight of the existing fill is ongoing. A report issued in March 2018 by researchers at UC Berkeley and the University of Arizona suggests that flooding risk from climate change could be exacerbated in the San Francisco Bay Area due to the sinking or settling of the ground surface, known as subsidence. The study claims that the risk of subsidence is more significant for certain parts of the City built on fill.

Projections of the effects of global climate change on the City are complex and depend on many factors that are outside the City's control. The various scientific studies that forecast climate change and its adverse effects, including sea level rise and flooding risk, are based on assumptions contained in such studies, but actual events may vary materially. Also, the scientific understanding of climate change and its effects continues to evolve. Accordingly, the City is unable to forecast when sea level rise or other adverse effects of climate change (e.g., the occurrence and frequency of 100-year storm events and king tides) will occur. In particular, the City cannot predict the timing or precise magnitude of adverse economic effects, including, without limitation, material adverse effects on the business operations or financial condition of the City and the local economy during the term of the Certificates. While the effects of climate change may be mitigated by the City's past and future investment in adaptation strategies, the City can give no assurance about the net effects of those strategies and whether the City will be required to take additional adaptive mitigation measures. If necessary, such additional measures could require significant capital resources.

In September 2017, the City filed a lawsuit against the five largest investor-owned oil companies seeking to have the companies pay into an equitable abatement fund to help fund investment in sea level rise adaptation infrastructure. In July 2018, the United States District Court, Northern District of California denied the plaintiffs' motion for remand to state court, and then dismissed the lawsuit. The City appealed these decisions to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which in May 2020 vacated the District Court's order that found the case arose under federal law, remanding the case back to the Northern District to determine if there were any other grounds for federal jurisdiction. In June 2021, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review the Ninth Circuit's decision, and the case awaits a ruling from the Ninth Circuit on the oil companies' appeal in a similar lawsuit, which may result in a remand to State court, where the City's lawsuit was originally filed. While the City believes that its claims are meritorious, the City can give no assurance regarding whether it will be successful and obtain the requested relief from the courts, or contributions to the abatement fund from the defendant oil companies.

Cybersecurity

The City, like many other large public and private entities, relies on a large and complex technology environment to conduct its operations, and faces multiple cybersecurity threats including, but not limited to, hacking, viruses, malware and other attacks on its computing and other digital networks and systems (collectively, "Systems Technology"). As a recipient and provider of personal, private, or sensitive information, the City has been the subject of cybersecurity incidents which have resulted in or could have resulted in adverse consequences to the City's Systems Technology and required a response action to mitigate the consequences. For example, in November 2016, the SFMTA was subject to a ransomware attack which disrupted some of the SFMTA's internal computer systems. Although the attack neither interrupted Muni train services nor compromised customer privacy or transaction information, SFMTA took the precaution of turning off the ticket machines and fare gates in the Muni Metro subway stations from Friday, November 25 until the morning of Sunday, November 27.

Cybersecurity incidents could result from unintentional events, or from deliberate attacks by unauthorized entities or individuals attempting to gain access to the City's Systems Technology for the purposes of misappropriating assets or information or causing operational disruption and damage. To mitigate the risk of business operations impact and/or damage from cybersecurity incidents or cyber-attacks, the City invests in multiple forms of cybersecurity and operational safeguards. In November 2016, the City adopted a City-wide Cyber Security Policy ("Cyber Policy") to support, maintain, and secure critical infrastructure and data systems. The objectives of the Cyber Policy include the protection of critical infrastructure and information, manage risk, improve cyber security event detection and remediation, and facilitate cyber awareness across all City departments. The City's Department of Technology has established a cybersecurity team to work across all City departments to implement the Cyber Policy. The City's Cyber Policy is reviewed periodically.

The City has also appointed a City Chief Information Security Officer ("CCISO"), who is directly responsible for understanding the business and related cybersecurity needs of the City's 54 departments. The CCISO is responsible for identifying, evaluating, responding, and reporting on information security risks in a manner that meets compliance and regulatory requirements, and aligns with and supports the risk posture of the City.

While City cybersecurity and operational safeguards are periodically tested, no assurances can be given by the City that such measures will ensure against other cybersecurity threats and attacks. Cybersecurity breaches could damage the City's Systems Technology and cause material disruption to the City's operations and the provision of City services. The costs of remedying any such damage or protecting against future attacks could be substantial. Further, cybersecurity breaches could expose the City to material litigation and other legal risks, which could cause the City to incur material costs related to such legal claims or proceedings.

Public Health Emergencies

In recent years, public health authorities have warned of threats posed by outbreaks of disease and other public health threats. On February 11, 2020 the World Health Organization ("WHO") announced the official name for the outbreak of COVID-19, an upper respiratory tract illness. COVID-19 has since spread across the globe. The spread of COVID-19 and actions to contain its spread have had significant adverse health and financial impacts throughout the world, including the City. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Public Health Emergency – COVID-19."

The COVID-19 outbreak is ongoing, and its duration and severity and economic effects are uncertain in many respects. Uncertain too are any additional actions that may be taken by federal and State governmental authorities to contain or mitigate the effects of the outbreak. The COVID-19 pandemic has had and may continue to have material adverse impacts on the City's economy and certain aspects of the City's financial condition. Further, there could be future COVID-19 outbreaks or other public health emergencies that could have material adverse effects on the City's operations and finances.

Other Events

Seismic events, wildfires, drought, tsunamis, other natural or man-made events, civil unrest or public safety matters may adversely impact persons and property within San Francisco, damage City infrastructure and adversely impact the City's ability to provide municipal services.

In September 2010, a PG&E high pressure natural gas transmission pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, with catastrophic results. PG&E owns, operates and maintains numerous gas transmission and distribution pipelines throughout the City.

In August 2013, a massive wildfire in Tuolumne County and the Stanislaus National Forest burned over 257,135 acres (the "Rim Fire"), which area included portions of the City's Hetch Hetchy Project.

The Hetch Hetchy Project is comprised of dams (including O'Shaughnessy Dam), reservoirs (including Hetch Hetchy Reservoir which supplies 85% of San Francisco's drinking water), hydroelectric generation and transmission facilities and water transmission facilities. Hetch Hetchy facilities affected by the Rim Fire included two power generating stations and the southern edge of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. There was no impact to drinking water quality. The City's hydroelectric power generation system was interrupted by the fire, forcing the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to spend approximately $1.6 million buying power on the open market and using existing banked energy with PG&E. The Rim Fire inflicted approximately $40 million in damage to parts of the City's water and power infrastructure located in the region. Certain portions of the Hetch Hetchy Project are old and deteriorating, and outages at critical points of the project could disrupt water delivery to significant portions of the region and/or cause significant costs and liabilities to the City.

Many areas of northern California have suffered from wildfires in more recent years, including the Tubbs fire which burned across several counties north of the Bay Area in October 2017 (part of a series of fires covering approximately 245,000 acres and causing 44 deaths and approximately $14 billion in damage), the Camp fire which burned across Butte County, California in November 2018 (covering almost 240 square miles and resulting numerous deaths and over $16 billion in property damage) and Kincade Fire which burned across Sonoma County, California in late 2019 (covering over 77,000 acres). Spurred by findings that these fires were caused, in part, by faulty powerlines owned by PG&E, the power company subsequently adopted mitigation strategies which results in pre-emptive distribution circuit and high power transmission line shut offs during periods of extreme fire danger (i.e. high winds, high temperatures and low humidity) to portions of the Bay Area, including the City. In 2019 and 2020, parts of the City experienced several black out days as a result of PG&E's wildfire prevention strategy. Future shut offs are expected to continue and it is uncertain what effects future PG&E shut offs will have on the local economy.

In August and September of 2020, California experienced numerous significant wildfires. In addition to their direct impact on health and safety and property damage in California, the smoke from these wildfires has impacted the quality of life in the Bay Area and the City and may have short-term and future impacts on commercial and tourist activity in the City, as well as the desirability of the City and the Bay Area as places to live, potentially negatively affecting real estate trends and values.

With certain exceptions, the City believes that it is more economical to manage its risks internally and administer, adjust, settle, defend, and pay claims from budgeted resources (i.e., "self-insurance"). The City obtains and maintains commercial insurance in certain circumstances, including when required by bond or lease financing transactions and for other limited purposes. The City does not maintain commercial earthquake coverage, with certain minor exceptions. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Legal Matters and Risk Management."

In addition to these factors, high housing costs and cost of living in the Bay Area may adversely impact the quality of life of City residents and tourism, and may adversely impact the City's finances and operations.

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 the aggregate Base Rental payable by the City pursuant to the Project Lease for a period of at least 24 months, adjusted on or prior to [________] 1 of each year to reflect scheduled Base Rental payments due for the next succeeding 24 months. 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 Project Lease allows the City to self-insure against any or all risks, except rental interruption and title defects, through an alternative risk management program such as its risk management retention program. The City expects to self-insure for all exposures for which the Project Lease permits self-insurance. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – LEGAL MATTERS AND RISK MANAGEMENT – Risk Retention Program."

State Law Limitations on Appropriations

Article XIIIB of the State Constitution limits the amount that local governments can appropriate annually (the "Gann Limit"). Should the City exceed the Gann Limit, the City would be required to seek voter approval to exceed such limit, shift spending to capital or other exempt expenditure types, or issue tax rebates. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – Budgetary Risks – Impact of Recent Voter-Initiated and Approved Revenue Measures on Local Finances" and "– Constitutional and Statutory Limitations on Taxes and Expenditures – Article XIIIB of the California Constitution."

Changes in Law

No assurance can be given that the State or the City electorate will not at some future time adopt initiatives or that the State Legislature or the City's Board of Supervisors will not enact legislation that will amend the laws or the Constitution of the State or the Charter, respectively, in a manner that could 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 XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution."

The General Fund of the City, which is the source of payment of Base Rental, 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.

State of California Financial Condition

The City receives a significant portion of its funding from the State. Changes in the revenues received by the State can affect the amount of funding, if any, to be received from the State by the City and other counties in the State. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – BUDGETARY RISKS – Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances."

The City cannot predict the extent of the budgetary problems the State may encounter in this or in any future fiscal years, nor is it clear what measures could be taken by the State to balance its budget, as required by law. In addition, the City cannot predict the outcome of any elections impacting fiscal matters, the 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.

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. Changes to or termination or replacement of the Affordable Care Act, for example, could increase costs to the City, and the City's financial condition may also be impacted by the withholding of federal grants or other funds flowing to "sanctuary jurisdictions." The City cannot predict the outcome of future federal administrative actions, legislation or budget deliberations and the impact that such budgets will have on the City's finances and operations. See APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – BUDGETARY RISKS – Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances." See also APPENDIX A: "CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES – GENERAL FUND REVENUES – Other City Tax Revenues" and "– INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS."

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 Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP and Curls Bartling P.C., Co-Special Counsel, under existing law: (i) 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, as amended (the "Code"), and is not an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax and (ii) interest evidenced by the Certificates is exempt from State of California personal income taxes. Co-Special Counsel expresses no opinion as to any other tax consequences regarding the Certificates.

The opinion on federal tax matters will be based on and will assume the accuracy of certain representations and certifications, and continuing compliance with certain covenants, of the City contained in the transcript of proceedings that are intended to evidence and assure the foregoing, including that the Certificates are and will remain obligations for which the interest evidenced thereby is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes. Co-Special Counsel will not independently verify the accuracy of the City's representations and certifications or the City's continuing compliance with its covenants.

The opinion of Co-Special Counsel is based on current legal authority and covers certain matters not directly addressed by such authority. It represents Co-Special Counsel's legal judgment as to the exclusion of interest evidenced by the Certificates from gross income for federal income tax purposes but is not a guaranty of that conclusion. The opinion is not binding on the Internal Revenue Service (the "IRS") or any court. Co-Special Counsel expresses no opinion about (i) the effect of future changes in the Code and the applicable regulations under the Code or (ii) the interpretation and the enforcement of the Code or those regulations by the IRS.

The Code prescribes a number of qualifications and conditions for the interest on state and local government obligations to be and to remain excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes, some of which require future or continued compliance after issuance of the obligations. Noncompliance with these requirements by the City may cause loss of such status and result in the interest evidenced by the Certificates being included in gross income for federal income tax purposes retroactively to the date of issuance of the Certificates. The City has covenanted to take the actions required of it for the interest evidenced by the Certificates to be and to remain excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes, and not to take any actions that would adversely affect that exclusion. After the date of issuance of the Certificates, Co-Special Counsel will not undertake to determine (or to so inform any person) whether any actions taken or not taken, or any events occurring or not occurring, or any other matters coming to Co-Special Counsel's attention, may adversely affect the exclusion from gross income for federal income tax purposes of interest evidenced by the Certificates or the market value of the Certificates.

Interest evidenced by the Certificates may be subject to a federal branch profits tax imposed on certain foreign corporations doing business in the United States and to a federal tax imposed on excess net passive income of certain S corporations. Under the Code, the exclusion of interest from gross income for federal income tax purposes may have certain adverse federal income tax consequences on items of income, deduction or credit for certain taxpayers, including financial institutions, certain insurance companies, recipients of Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits, those that are deemed to incur or continue indebtedness to acquire or carry tax-exempt obligations, and individuals otherwise eligible for the earned income tax credit. The applicability and extent of these and other tax consequences will depend upon the particular tax status or other tax items of the owner of the Certificates. Co-Special Counsel will express no opinion regarding those consequences.

Payments of interest on tax-exempt obligations, including the Certificates, are generally subject to IRS Form 1099-INT information reporting requirements. If a Certificate owner is subject to backup withholding under those requirements, then payments of interest will also be subject to backup withholding. Those requirements do not affect the exclusion of such interest from gross income for federal income tax purposes.

Co-Special Counsel's engagement with respect to the Certificates ends with the issuance of the Certificates, and, unless separately engaged, Co-Special Counsel is not obligated to defend the City or the owners of the Certificates regarding the tax status of interest thereon in the event of an audit examination by the IRS. The IRS has a program to audit tax-exempt obligations to determine whether the interest thereon is includible in gross income for federal income tax purposes. If the IRS does audit the Certificates, under current IRS procedures, the IRS will treat the City as the taxpayer and the beneficial owners of the Certificates will have only limited rights, if any, to obtain and participate in judicial review of such audit. Any action of the IRS, including but not limited to selection of the Certificates for audit, or the course or result of such audit, or an audit of other obligations presenting similar tax issues, may affect the market value of the Certificates.

Prospective purchasers of the Certificates upon their original issuance at prices other than the respective prices indicated on the cover of this Official Statement, and prospective purchasers of the Certificates at other than their original issuance, should consult their own tax advisors regarding other tax considerations such as the consequences of market discount, as to all of which Co-Special Counsel expresses no opinion.

Risk of Future Legislative Changes and/or Court Decisions

Legislation affecting tax-exempt obligations is regularly considered by the United States Congress and may also be considered by the State legislature. Court proceedings may also be filed, the outcome of which could modify the tax treatment of obligations such as the Certificates. There can be no assurance that legislation enacted or proposed, or actions by a court, after the date of issuance of the Certificates will not have an adverse effect on the tax status of interest evidenced by the Certificates or the market value or marketability of the Certificates. These adverse effects could result, for example, from changes to federal or state income tax rates, changes in the structure of federal or state income taxes (including replacement with another type of tax), or repeal (or reduction in the benefit) of the exclusion of interest evidenced by the Certificates from gross income for federal or state income tax purposes for all or certain taxpayers.

For example, federal tax legislation that was enacted on December 22, 2017 reduced corporate tax rates, modified individual tax rates, eliminated many deductions, repealed the corporate alternative minimum tax, and eliminated the tax-exempt advance refunding of tax-exempt bonds and tax-advantaged bonds, among other things. Additionally, investors in the Certificates should be aware that future legislative actions might increase, reduce or otherwise change (including retroactively) the financial benefits and the treatment of all or a portion of the interest evidenced by the Certificates for federal income tax purposes for all or certain taxpayers. In all such events, the market value of the Certificates may be affected and the ability of holders to sell their Certificates in the secondary market may be reduced.

Investors should consult their own financial and tax advisors to analyze the importance of these risks.

Original Issue Discount and Original Issue Premium

Certain of the Certificates ("Discount Certificates") may be offered and sold to the public at an original issue discount ("OID"). OID is the excess of the stated redemption price at maturity (the principal amount) over the "issue price" of a Discount Certificate. The issue price of a Discount Certificate is the initial offering price to the public (other than to bond houses, brokers or similar persons acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers) at which a substantial amount of the Discount Certificates of the same maturity is sold pursuant to that offering. For federal income tax purposes, OID accrues to the owner of a Discount Certificate over the period to maturity based on the constant yield method, compounded semiannually (or over a shorter permitted compounding interval selected by the owner). The portion of OID that accrues during the period of ownership of a Discount Certificate (i) is interest excluded from the owner's gross income for federal income tax purposes to the same extent, and subject to the same considerations discussed above, as other interest evidenced by the Certificates, and (ii) is added to the owner's tax basis for purposes of determining gain or loss on the maturity, redemption, sale or other disposition of that Discount Certificate. A purchaser of a Discount Certificate in the initial public offering at the issue price (described above) for that Discount Certificate who holds that Discount Certificate to maturity will realize no gain or loss upon the retirement of that Discount Certificate.

Certain of the Certificates ("Premium Certificates") may be offered and sold to the public at a price in excess of their stated redemption price at maturity (the principal amount). That excess constitutes bond premium. For federal income tax purposes, bond premium is amortized over the period to maturity of a Premium Certificate, based on the yield to maturity of that Premium Certificate (or, in the case of a Premium Certificate callable prior to its stated maturity, the amortization period and yield may be required to be determined on the basis of an earlier call date that results in the lowest yield on that Premium Certificate), compounded semiannually. No portion of that bond premium is deductible by the owner of a Premium Certificate. For purposes of determining the owner's gain or loss on the sale, redemption (including redemption at maturity) or other disposition of a Premium Certificate, the owner's tax basis in the Premium Certificate is reduced by the amount of bond premium that is amortized during the period of ownership. As a result, an owner may realize taxable gain for federal income tax purposes from the sale or other disposition of a Premium Certificate for an amount equal to or less than the amount paid by the owner for that Premium Certificate. A purchaser of a Premium Certificate in the initial public offering who holds that Premium Certificate to maturity (or, in the case of a callable Premium Certificate, to its earlier call date that results in the lowest yield on that Premium Certificate) will realize no gain or loss upon the retirement of that Premium Certificate.

Owners of Discount and Premium Certificates should consult their own tax advisors as to the determination for federal income tax purposes of the existence of OID or bond premium, the determination for federal income tax purposes of the amount of OID or bond premium properly accruable or amortizable in any period with respect to the Discount or Premium Certificates, other federal tax consequences in respect of OID and bond premium, and the treatment of OID and bond premium for purposes of state and local taxes on, or based on, income.

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 Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP, San Francisco, California and Curls

Bartling P.C., Oakland, 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 purchasers 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 them 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 their date.

Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by the City Attorney and by Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California and Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth, A Professional Corporation, Newport Beach, California, Co-Disclosure Counsel.

Co-Disclosure Counsel have advised the City with respect to applicable securities laws and participated with responsible City officials and staff in conferences and meetings where information contained in this Official Statement was reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Co-Disclosure Counsel are not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the statements or information presented in this Official Statement and have 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, each Co-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 the attention of such 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 the 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 Co-Disclosure Counsel's having acted in the role of co-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

KNN Public Finance, LLC has served as Municipal Advisor to the City with respect to the sale of the Certificates. The Municipal Advisor has assisted the City in the City's review and preparation of this Official Statement and in other matters relating to the planning, structuring, and sale of the Certificates. The Municipal Advisor has 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 Municipal Advisor, Co-Special Counsel and Co-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 [202__-

2___], which is due not later than [March 2__, 202__], and to provide notices of the occurrence of certain enumerated events. The Annual Report will be filed by the City with the Electronic Municipal Market Access system ("EMMA") of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. 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").

On March 6, 2018, Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's") upgraded certain of the City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation lease-backed obligations to "Aa1" from "Aa2." The City timely filed notice of the upgrade with EMMA, but inadvertently did not link the notice to all relevant CUSIP numbers. The City has taken action to link such information to the applicable CUSIP numbers.

The Annual Report for fiscal year 2016-17, which was timely prepared, provided investors a link to the City's 2016-17 audited financial statements ("2016-17 Audited Financial Statements") on the City's website. However, the 2016-17 Audited Financial Statements were not posted on EMMA. The City subsequently filed the 2016-17 Audited Financial Statements and a notice of such late filing on EMMA.

As of May 6, 2021, the City was a party to certain continuing disclosure undertakings relating to municipal securities which require the City to file notice filings on EMMA within ten days in the event of the incurrence of financial obligations and certain other events, if material. On May 6, 2021, the City extended for two years certain liquidity facilities relating to series 1 and 1-T and series 2 and 2-T of its commercial paper program. On July 1, 2021, the City filed on EMMA an event notice relating to these extensions.

The City may, from time to time, but is not obligated to, post its Annual Comprehensive Financial Report and other financial information on the City's investor information website located at https://sfcontroller.org/continuing-secondary-market-disclosure.

ABSENCE OF LITIGATION

No litigation is pending or threatened concerning the validity of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Project Lease, the Property 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.

VALIDATION ACTION

No validation action has been pursued or is expected to be pursued with respect to the validity of the [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, the [Nth] Supplement to Property Lease, or the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement.

The City filed a complaint on September 15, 2008, pursuant to State Code of Civil Procedure Sections 860 through 870.5 in the Superior Court for the State in and for the City to validate the Original Project Lease, the Original Property Lease, the Original Trust Agreement and certain other matters. On January 15, 2009, a judgment was rendered finding the Original Project Lease, the Original Property Lease and the Original Trust Agreement to be valid, legal and binding obligations of the City in accordance with their terms and in conformity with all applicable provisions of law, including Article XVI, Section 18 of the State Constitution.

State Code of Civil Procedure Section 870(a) provides that such a judgment, if no appeal is taken, or if taken and the judgment affirmed, shall thereupon become and thereafter be forever binding and conclusive, as to all matters therein adjudicated or which could have been adjudicated against the City and against all other persons. State Code of Civil Procedure Section 870(b) provides that no appeal shall be allowed from such a judgment unless a notice of appeal is filed within 30 days after the entry of judgment. No notice of appeal was filed.

RATINGS

Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's"), S&P Global Ratings ("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.moodys.com; S&P, at www.spglobal.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, or other actions of a rating agency related to its rating, 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. See "CONTINUING DISCLOSURE" herein.

SALE OF THE CERTIFICATES

The Certificates are scheduled to be sold at competitive bid on [________], as provided in the Official Notice of Sale, dated [________] (the "Official Notice of Sale"). The Official Notice of Sale provides that all Certificates would be purchased if any were purchased, the obligation to make such purchase being subject to certain terms and conditions set forth in the Official Notice of Sale, the approval of certain legal matters by Co-Special Counsel and certain other conditions. The purchaser of the Certificates will represent to the City that the Certificates have been reoffered to the public at the price or yield to be stated on the inside cover page hereof.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

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 contains forecasts, projections, estimates and other forward-looking statements that are based on current expectations. The words “expects,” “forecasts,” “projects,” “intends,” “anticipates,” “estimates,” “assumes” and analogous expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. Such forecasts, projections and estimates are not intended as representations of fact or guarantees of results. Any such forward-looking statements inherently are subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results or performance to differ materially from those that have been forecast, estimated or projected. This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract or agreement between the City and the initial 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 A

The Resolution provides that the Bonds are payable from and secured by a voter-approved dedicated property tax levy on all taxable property in the City, and the City is empowered under the law to set such tax rate for the Bonds at the level needed to generate sufficient tax revenues to pay the debt service on the Bonds. Under the Resolution, the City is not obligated to pay the debt service on the Bonds from any other sources. This Appendix A provides information on the City's overall operations and finances with an emphasis on its General Fund and therefore includes information on revenues and other funds that are not pledged to the Bonds under the Resolution and are not available to pay debt service on the Bonds. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS" in the forepart of this Official Statement.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES

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

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

Information concerning the City's finances that does not materially impact the availability of moneys deposited in the General Fund including San Francisco International Airport ("SFO" or the "Airport"), Public Utilities Commission ("PUC"), and other enterprise funds, or the expenditure of moneys from the General Fund, is generally not included or, if included, is not described in detail in this Appendix A.

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

APPENDIX A
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY – COVID-19

On February 11, 2020 the World Health Organization ("WHO") announced the official name for the outbreak of a new disease ("COVID-19") caused by a strain of novel coronavirus, an upper respiratory tract illness which has since been declared a pandemic and spread across the globe.

From time to time since the onset of the pandemic, all counties in the Bay Area (including the City) have implemented and revised restrictions on mass gatherings and widespread closings or other limitations of the operations of government, commercial, educational, and other institutions. While significant portions of the population of the State of California (including the City) have been vaccinated, COVID-19 variants have resulted in increased infection rates and the imposition of certain restrictions on commercial and other activities.

The COVID-19 pandemic has materially adversely impacted the City's economy and certain aspects of the City's financial condition. Existing and potential impacts to the City associated with the COVID-19 outbreak include, but are not limited to, increasing costs and challenges to the City's public health system, reductions in tourism and disruption of the regional and local economy, widespread business closures, and significantly higher levels of unemployment, with corresponding decreases in City revenues, particularly business, sales, transient occupancy (hotel), and parking taxes.

The economic impact of COVID-19 has materially reduced the City's tax revenues. These decreases occurred in nearly every category of revenue except intergovernmental revenue and property taxes; most significantly, the City experienced the greatest decline in its "other local taxes," which includes hotel and sales taxes. See "PROPERTY TAXATION – "Tax Levy and Collection" for additional detail.

Although City operations have stabilized and certain revenues have significantly recovered, a resurgence of the pandemic may affect the City's ability to sustain regular operations at current levels, and may materially adversely impact the financial condition of the General Fund.

The Original Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 was approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 27, 2021 and by the Mayor on July 29, 2021. The 2021-22 and 2022-23 Original Budget assumed $378.3 million of COVID-19 response costs in the two-year budget. Actual costs ultimately depend on the duration and severity of the pandemic. New costs are partially offset by the re-assignment of City employees and may be offset by FEMA reimbursement for eligible costs. As described herein, the City received significant federal relief, which mitigated the adverse financial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As described herein, the City regularly prepares reports on its current financial condition. The most recent of these reports, the Five Year Financial Plan, as updated by the March Joint Report, and the Six-Month Report (all as defined herein) are described in "CITY BUDGET - Five-Year Financial Plan and March Update".

CITY GOVERNMENT

City Charter

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

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

Unique among California cities, San Francisco as a charter city and county provides the services of both a city and a county. Public services include police, fire and public safety; public health, mental health and other social services; courts, jails, and juvenile justice; public works, streets, and transportation, including a port and airport; construction and maintenance of all public buildings and facilities; water, sewer, and power services; parks and recreation; libraries and cultural facilities and events; zoning and planning, and many others. Employment costs are relatively fixed by labor and retirement agreements, and account for slightly less than 50% of all City expenditures. In addition, voters have approved Charter amendments that impose certain spending mandates and tax revenue set-asides, which dictate expenditure or service levels for certain programs, and allocate specific revenues or specific proportions thereof to other programs, including transportation services, children's services and public education, and libraries.

Under its original charter, the City committed to a policy of municipal ownership of utilities. The Municipal Railway, when acquired from a private operator in 1912, was the first such city-owned public transit system in the nation. In 1914, the City obtained its municipal water system, including the Hetch Hetchy watershed near Yosemite. In 1927, the City dedicated Mills Field Municipal Airport at a site in what is now San Mateo County 14 miles south of downtown San Francisco, which would grow to become today's San Francisco International Airport. In 1969, the City acquired the Port of San Francisco (the "Port") in trust from the State. Substantial expansions and improvements have been made to these enterprises since their original acquisition. SFO, the Port, the PUC (which includes the Water Enterprise, the Wastewater Enterprise and the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Project), the Municipal Transportation Agency ("MTA") (which operates the San Francisco Municipal Railway or "Muni" and the Department of Parking and Traffic ("DPT"), including 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 enterprise fund departments, including San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and the MTA, annually receive significant General Fund transfers.

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

Mayor

Mayor London Breed is the 45th Mayor of San Francisco and the first African-American woman to serve in such capacity in the City's history. Mayor Breed was elected at the June 4, 2018 special election to serve until January 2020, fulfilling the remaining term of the late Mayor Edwin Lee. In November 2019, Mayor Breed was elected to serve her first full term. Prior to her election, Mayor Breed served as Acting Mayor, leading the City following the sudden passing of Mayor Lee. Mayor Breed previously served as a member of the Board of Supervisors for six years, including the last three years as President of the Board.

Board of Supervisors

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

At the election on November 3, 2020, voters voted on Supervisor seats with terms expiring in 2025. Incumbents Aaron Peskin (District 3), Dean Preston (District 5), Hillary Ronen (District 9) and Ahsha Safaí (District 11) retained their seats for another four years, while new Supervisors Connie Chan and Myrna Melgar joined the Board for District 1 and District 7, respectively.

TABLE A-1

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Board of Supervisors

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

*On April 19, 2022, Supervisor Matt Haney was elected to the California Assembly in a special election to represent California's 17th Assembly District. As a result, Supervisor Haney (District 6) is expected to resign as a member of the Board of Supervisors.
In accordance with the Charter, Mayor Breed will appoint a successor for District 6 seat, who shall serve until the November 8, 2022 election, at which time the voters will elect a supervisor for a new four year term.

Other Elected and Appointed City Officers

The City Attorney represents the City in all legal proceedings in which the City has an interest. On September 29, 2021, Mayor London N. Breed appointed Assemblymember David Chiu to serve as the San Francisco City Attorney. Mr. Chiu replaced the prior City Attorney, Dennis Herrera, who became the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission on November 1, 2021. Prior to his appointment as City Attorney, Mr. Chiu represented the 17th Assembly District since 2014 and has authored a wide range of bills on issues relating to housing, homelessness, transportation, education, environment, health, public safety, and civil rights. Before entering public office, Chiu served as a civil rights attorney with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area, a criminal prosecutor with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, Democratic Counsel to the United States Senate Constitution Subcommittee, and a law clerk for Judge James R. Browning of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Mr. Chiu received his undergraduate, master's, and law degrees from Harvard University. Mr. Chiu is the first Asian American City Attorney of San Francisco. In accordance with the Charter, an election for City Attorney will be conducted in June 2022.

The Assessor-Recorder administers the property tax assessment system of the City. On February 8, 2021, Joaquín Torres, formerly the Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, was sworn in as the new Assessor-Recorder. The position of Assessor-Recorder is a citywide elected position. Mr. Torres will have to run in the election currently scheduled for June 2022 to complete the current term. Mr. Torres filled a vacancy left by the former Assessor-Recorder, Carmen Chu, who now serves as the City Administrator.

The Treasurer is responsible for the deposit and investment of all City moneys, and also acts as Tax Collector for the City. José Cisneros was re-elected to a four-year term as Treasurer of the City in November 2019. 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.

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. 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. Mr. Rosenfield was reappointed by then-Mayor Mark Farrell to a new ten-year term as Controller in Spring 2018, and his nomination was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors on May 1, 2018. 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 during that period, 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 as a project manager in the Controller's Office.

The City Administrator has overall responsibility for the management and implementation of policies, rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the voters. The City

Administrator oversees the General Services Agency consisting of 25 departments, divisions, and programs that include the Public Works Department, Department of Technology, Office of Contract Administration/Purchasing, Real Estate, County Clerk, Fleet Management, Convention Facilities, Animal Care and Control, Medical Examiner, and Treasure Island. F Carmen Chu was sworn in as the City Administrator on February 2, 2021. Prior to becoming the City Administrator, Ms. Chu had served as the City's Assessor-Recorder since 2013. Before becoming Assessor-Recorder, Ms. Chu was elected in November 2008 and November 2010 to the Board of Supervisors, representing the Sunset/Parkside District 4 after being appointed by then-Mayor Gavin Newsom in September 2007.

CITY BUDGET

Overview

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

The fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23 Original Budget was approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 27, 2021 and signed by Mayor Breed on July 29, 2021. The Original Budget for fiscal year 2021-22 appropriated annual revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves of $13.2 billion, of which the City's General Fund accounts for $6.4 billion. The Original Budget for fiscal year 2022-23 appropriates revenues, fund balance, transfers and reserves of $12.8 billion, of which $6.3 billion represents the General Fund budget. See "CITY BUDGET – Budget for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23" for further details on the budget. Table A-2 shows Final Revised Budget revenues and appropriations for the City's General Fund for fiscal years 2018-19 through 2020-21, and Original Budgets for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23. See "PROPERTY TAXATION –Tax Levy and Collection, "OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES" and "CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES" herein.

Economic and tax revenue losses associated with the COVID-19 pandemic were stark and immediate. Although the City experienced significant recovery, there can be no assurances that further outbreaks or governmental actions related to the pandemic will not result in further material adverse impacts to the City's economy and financial condition. See "CITY BUDGET - Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23," and "GENERAL FUND REVENUES" for a discussion of current projections of the magnitude of the financial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the City. See "BUDGETARY RISKS" for a discussion of factors that may affect the revenue and expenditure levels assumed in the budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23.

TABLE A-2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Budgeted General Fund Revenues and Appropriations for
Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2022-23
(000s)

	2018-19 Final Revised Budget	2019-20 Final Revised Budget[6]	2020-21 Final Revised Budget [6]	2021-22 Original Budget [8]	2022-23 Original Budget [8]
Prior-Year Budgetary Fund Balance & Reserves	$2,342,082	$2,817,270	$2,816,902	$778,545	$313,961
Budgeted Revenues					
Property Taxes[1]	$2,142,727	$1,956,008	$2,161,945	$2,115,600	$2,211,700
Business Taxes	879,414	1,050,392	798,057	957,140	1,065,350
Other Local Taxes[2]	1,053,390	1,144,376	657,990	777,750	1,076,092
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	30,794	30,361	22,977	27,944	27,997
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	3,131	3,131	2,389	4,035	3,088
Interest and Investment Earnings	20,323	69,579	20,732	36,247	38,307
Rents and Concessions	14,896	15,270	11,166	11,728	13,120
Grants and Subventions	1,072,205	1,234,987	1,591,756	1,216,765	1,130,154
Charges for Services	263,340	246,003	254,990	255,111	256,048
Other	29,712	31,712	59,773	24,238	24,256
Total Budgeted Revenues	$5,509,932	$5,781,819	$5,581,775	$5,426,557	$5,846,112
Bond Proceeds & Repayment of Loans[3]	$87	-	-	-	-
Expenditure Appropriations					
Public Protection	$1,390,266	$1,493,240	$1,505,780	$1,507,122	$1,549,264
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	214,928	216,824	218,986	236,525	199,350
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	1,120,892	1,270,530	1,605,573	1,418,406	1,342,466
Community Health	967,113	1,065,051	1,158,599	1,056,459	1,063,063
Culture and Recreation	154,056	161,274	147,334	220,866	186,718
General Administration & Finance	290,274	332,296	332,997	497,915	414,607
General City Responsibilities[4]	172,028	137,851	126,993	243,733	238,766
Total Expenditure Appropriations	$4,309,557	$4,677,066	$5,096,262	$5,181,026	$4,994,234
Budgetary reserves and designations, net	-	$34,721	$42,454	$6,129	$5,854
Transfers In	$239,056	$190,642	$417,009	$158,329	$162,941
Transfers Out[5]	(1,468,068)	(1,157,312)	(1,164,927)	(1,176,277)	(1,322,938)
Net Transfers In/Out	($1,229,012)	($966,670)	($747,918)	($1,017,948)	($1,159,997)
Budgeted Excess (Deficiency) of Sources Over (Under) Uses	$2,313,531	2,920,632	2,512,044	-	-
Variance of Actual vs. Budget	503,738	(139,127)	291,491	-	-
Total Actual Budgetary Fund Balance[6]	$2,817,269	$2,781,505	2,803,535	-	-

[1] The City's final budget for FY 2018-19 property tax included $414.7 million of "Excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF)" revenue, representing 2 years of Excess ERAF. In FY 2019-20, the City budgeted $185.0 million of "Excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund" (ERAF) revenue. The Budget appropriates Excess ERAF property tax funds in fiscal years 2020-21, 2021-22 , and 2022-23 for ongoing purposes. Please see "Property Tax" sections for more information about Excess ERAF.

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

[3] Represents interest that debt service has earned while held by fiscal agent and is returned to the City.

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

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

[6] Fiscal year 2018-19 through fiscal year 2020-21 Final Revised Budget reflects prior year *actual* budgetary fund balance.

[7] FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 Final Revised Budgets are based on FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 ACFR, respectively. Does not reflect material adverse impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the General Fund. See reserve discussion under "CITY BUDGET" section.

[8] FY 2021-22 and 2022-23 amounts represent the final adopted Budget, July 29, 2021.

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

Budget Process

The following paragraphs contain a description of the City's customary budget process. The City's fiscal year commences on July 1 and ends on June 30. The City's budget process for each fiscal year begins in the middle of the preceding fiscal year as departments prepare their budgets and seek any required approvals from the applicable City board or commission. Departmental budgets are consolidated by the City Controller, and then transmitted to the Mayor no later than the first working day of March. By the first working day of May, the Mayor is required to submit a proposed budget to the Board of Supervisors for certain specified departments, based on criteria set forth in the Administrative Code. On or before the first working day of June, the Mayor is required to submit a proposed budget, including all departments, to the Board of Supervisors.

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

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

The Budget and Appropriation Ordinance becomes effective with or without the Mayor's signature after 10 days; however, the Mayor has line-item veto authority over specific items in the budget. Additionally, in the event the Mayor were to disapprove the entire Budget and Appropriation Ordinance, the Charter directs the Mayor to promptly return the ordinance to the Board of Supervisors, accompanied by a statement indicating the reasons for disapproval and any recommendations which the Mayor may have. Any Budget and Appropriation Ordinance so disapproved by the Mayor shall become effective only if, subsequent to its return, it is passed by a two- thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors.

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

Multi-Year Budgeting and Planning

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

1. Fixed two-year budgets are approved by the Board of Supervisors. For fiscal year 2021-22, four departments had fixed budgets from the prior two-year planning cycle (fiscal years 2020-21 and 2021-22): MTA, PUC, SFO, and the Port. The fiscal year 2021-22 budget was significantly revised in the most recent two-year planning cycle (fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23), given significant changes caused by the pandemic. All other departments prepare balanced, rolling two-year budgets for Board approval.

2. Five-year financial plan and update, which forecasts revenues and expenses and summarizes expected public service levels and funding requirements for that period. A five-year financial plan, including a forecast of expenditures and revenues and proposed actions to balance them in light of strategic goals, was issued by the Mayor, the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors and Controller's Office on January 15, 2021, for fiscal year 2021-22 through fiscal year 2025-26. The Five-Year Financial Plan was updated on March 31, 2021, January 12, 2022, and March 31, 2022. See "Five Year Financial Plan" section below.

3. The Controller's Office proposes to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors financial policies addressing reserves, use of volatile revenues, debt and financial measures in the case of disaster recovery and the City is required to adopt budgets consistent with these policies once approved. The Controller's Office may recommend additional financial policies or amendments to existing policies no later than October 1. Key financial policies that have been enacted include:

   - Non-Recurring Revenue Policy - This policy limits the Mayor's and Board's ability to use for operating expenses the following nonrecurring revenues: extraordinary year-end General Fund balance, the General Fund share of revenues from prepayments provided under long- term leases, concessions, or contracts, otherwise unrestricted revenues from legal judgments and settlements, and other unrestricted revenues from the sale of land or other fixed assets. Under the policy, these nonrecurring revenues may only be used for nonrecurring expenditures that do not create liability for or expectation of substantial ongoing costs, including but not limited to: discretionary funding of reserves, acquisition of capital equipment, capital projects included in the City's capital plans, development of affordable housing, and discretionary payment of pension, debt or other long-term obligations. The Mayor and the Board approved legislation to temporarily suspend this policy. See " Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23" section for more details.

   - Rainy Day and Budget Stabilization Reserve Policies – These reserves were established to support the City's budget in years when revenues decline. These and other reserves are discussed in detail below. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires deposits into the Rainy Day Reserve if total General Fund revenues for a fiscal year exceed total General Fund revenues for the prior fiscal year by more than five percent. Similarly, if budget year revenues exceed current year revenues by more than five percent, the budget must allocate deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve. The Budget Stabilization Reserve augments the Rainy Day Reserve and is funded through the dedication of 75% of certain volatile revenues. Given the City's projected revenue levels in fiscal years 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23, the City is eligible to withdraw from these reserves and is not required to make any deposits. The fiscal year 2020-21 Original Budget withdrew the maximum permissible amount from the City's Rainy Day and Budget Stabilization Reserves, but the original fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23 budgets provided for the withdrawal of *de minimis* amounts, preserving the remaining balance of the reserves. These and other reserves are discussed under Rainy Day Reserve and Budget Stabilization Reserve, as well as in the "Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23" section.

4. The City is required to submit labor agreements to the Board of Supervisors by May 15, so the fiscal impact of the agreements can be incorporated in the Mayor's proposed June 1 budget. All labor agreements are closed for fiscal years 2020-21 and 2021-22. The City is currently negotiating successor agreements with its miscellaneous employee organizations for fiscal years 2022-23 and 2023-24.

Role of Controller in Budgetary Analysis and Projections

As Chief Fiscal Officer and City Services Auditor, the City Controller monitors spending for all officers, departments and employees charged with receipt, collection or disbursement of City funds. Under the Charter, no obligation to expend City funds can be incurred without a prior certification by the Controller that sufficient revenues are or will be available to meet such obligation as it becomes due in the then- current fiscal year, which ends June 30. The Controller monitors revenues throughout the fiscal year, and if actual revenues are less than estimated, the City Controller may freeze department appropriations or place departments on spending "allotments" which will constrain department expenditures until estimated revenues are realized. If revenues are in excess of what was estimated, or budget surpluses are created, the Controller can certify these surplus funds as a source for supplemental appropriations that may be adopted throughout the year upon approval of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The City's actual expenditures are often different from the estimated expenditures in the Original Budget due to supplemental appropriations, continuing appropriations of prior years, and unexpended current-year funds. If the Controller estimates revenue shortfalls that exceed applicable reserves and any other allowances for revenue shortfalls in the adopted City budget, upon receipt of such estimates, the Mayor is to inform the Board of Supervisors of actions to address this shortfall. The Board of Supervisors may adopt an ordinance to reflect the Mayor's proposal or alternative proposals in order to balance the budget.

In addition to the five-year planning responsibilities discussed above, Charter Section 3.105 directs the Controller to issue periodic or special financial reports during the fiscal year. Each year, the Controller issues six-month and nine-month budget status reports to apprise the City's policymakers of the current budgetary status, including projected year-end revenues, expenditures and fund balances. The Controller issued the first of these reports, the fiscal year 2021-22 Six Month Report (the "Six Month Report") on February 15, 2022 and will issue the Nine Month Report ("Nine Month Report") in May 2022. The City Charter also directs the Controller to annually report on the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates in the Mayor's Proposed Budget in the Revenue Letter, which will be issued on June 2022.

General Fund Results: Audited Financial Statements

The City issued the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (which includes the City's audited financial statements) for fiscal year 2020-21 on February 2, 2022. As of June 30, 2021, the General Fund fund balance available for appropriation in subsequent years was $902.0 million (see Table A-4), which represents an $5.8 million increase in available fund balance from the $896.2 million available as of June 30, 2020. This increase resulted primarily from greater-than-budgeted property tax revenue and real property transfer taxes, mostly offset by under-performance in business and other local tax revenues in fiscal year 2020-21.

The General Fund fund balance as of June 30, 2021 was $2.7 billion (shown in Tables A-3 and A-4) using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”), derived from revenues of $5.7 billion. The City prepares its budget on a modified accrual basis, which is also referred to as “budget basis” in the ACFR. Accruals for incurred liabilities, such as claims and judgments, workers’ compensation, accrued vacation and sick leave pay are funded only as payments are required to be made. Table A-3 focuses on a specific portion of the City’s balance sheet; General Fund fund balances are shown on both a budget basis and a GAAP basis with comparative financial information for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2017 through June 30, 2021.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-3

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Summary of General Fund Fund Balances
Fiscal Years 2016-17 through 2020-21
(000s)

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Restricted for rainy day (Economic Stabilization account)[1]	$78,336	$89,309	$229,069	$229,069	$114,539
Restricted for rainy day (One-time Spending account)[2]	47,353	54,668	95,908	-	-
Committed for budget stabilization (citywide)[2]	323,204	369,958	396,760	362,607	320,637
Committed for Recreation & Parks savings reserve	4,403	1,740	803	803	-
Assigned, not available for appropriation					
Assigned for encumbrances	$244,158	$345,596	$351,446	$394,912	$407,137
Assigned for appropriation carryforward	434,223	423,835	496,846	630,759	753,776
Assigned for budget savings incentive program (Citywide)	67,450	73,650	86,979	-	-
Assigned for salaries and benefits [3]	23,051	23,931	28,965	25,371	5,088
Assigned for Self-Insurance [4]					42,454
Assigned for Hotel Tax Loss Contingency					6,000
Total Fund Balance Not Available for Appropriation	$1,222,178	$1,382,687	$1,686,776	$1,643,521	$1,649,631
Assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation					
Assigned for litigation & contingencies[3]	$136,080	$235,925	$186,913	$160,314	$173,591
Assigned for subsequent year's budget	183,326	188,562	210,638	370,405	173,989
Unassigned for General Reserve [5]	95,156	106,878	130,894	78,498	78,333
Unassigned - Budgeted for use second budget year	288,185	223,251	285,152	84	-
Unassigned - Contingency for second budget year	60,000	160,000	308,000	510,400	-
Unassigned - COVID-19 Response and Economic Contingency Reserve [6]		-	-	-	113,500
Unassigned - Federal & State Emergency Revenue Reserve [6]	-	-	-	-	100,000
Unassigned - Fiscal Cliff Reserve [6]	-	-	-	-	293,900
Unassigned - Business Tax Stabilization Reserve	-	-	-	-	149,000
Unassigned - Gross Receipts Prepayment Reserve	-	-	-	-	26,000
Unassigned - Other Reserve	-	-	-	-	13,807
Unassigned - Available for future appropriation	14,409	44,779	8,897	18,283	31,784
Total Fund Balance Available for Appropriation	$777,156	$959,395	$1,130,494	$1,137,984	$1,153,904
Total Fund Balance, Budget Basis	$1,999,334	$2,342,082	$2,817,270	$2,781,505	$2,803,535
Budget Basis to GAAP Basis Reconciliation					
Total Fund Balance - Budget Basis	$1,999,334	$2,342,082	$2,817,270	$2,781,505	$2,803,535
Unrealized gain or loss on investments	(1,197)	(20,602)	16,275	36,626	3,978
Nonspendable fund balance	525	1,512	1,259	1,274	2,714
Cumulative Excess Property Tax Revenues Recognized on Budget Basis	(38,469)	(25,495)	(23,793)	(20,655)	(31,745)
Cumulative Excess Health, Human Service, Franchise Tax and other Revenues on Budget Basis	(83,757)	(68,958)	(87,794)	(139,590)	(120,569)
Inventories	-	-	-	33,212	17,925
Pre-paid lease revenue	(5,733)	(6,598)	(6,194)	(6,450)	(5,734)
Total Fund Balance, GAAP Basis	$1,870,703	$2,221,941	$2,717,023	$2,685,922	$2,670,104

[1] Additional information in Rainy Day Reserves section of Appendix A, following this table.

[2] Additional information in Budget Stabilization Reserve section of Appendix A, following this table.

[3] Additional information in Salaries, Benefits and Litigation Reserves section of Appendix A, following this table.
The increase in FY18 was largely due to a small number of claims filed against the City with large known or potential settlement stipulations.

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

[5] Additional information in General Reserves section of Appendix A, following this table.

[6] Additional information in the COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve section of Appendix A, following this table.

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

In addition to the reconciliation of GAAP versus budget-basis fund balance, Table A-3 shows the City's various reserve balances as designations of fund balance. Key reserves are described further as follows:

Rainy Day Reserve

The City maintains a Rainy Day Reserve, as shown on the first and second line of Table A-3 above. Charter Section 9.113.5 requires that if total General Fund revenues for the current year exceed total General Fund revenues for the prior year by more than five percent, then the City must deposit anticipated General Fund revenues in excess of that five percent growth into three accounts within the Rainy Day Reserve (see below) and for other lawful governmental purposes. Similarly, if budgeted revenues exceed current year revenues by more than five percent, the budget must allocate deposits to the Rainy Day Reserve. Effective January 1, 2015, Proposition C, passed by the voters in November 2014, divided the existing Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Account into a City Rainy Day Reserve ("City Reserve") and a School Rainy Day Reserve ("School Reserve") for SFUSD, with each reserve account receiving 50% of the existing balance at the time. Deposits to the reserve are allocated as follows:

- 37.5 percent of the excess revenues to the City Reserve;
- 12.5 percent of the excess revenues to the School Reserve (not shown in Table A-3 because it is not part of the General Fund, it is reserved for SFUSD);
- 25 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.

The fiscal year 2020-21 ending balance of the Rainy Day Economic Stabilization City Reserve was $114.5 million, after a budgeted $114.5 million withdrawal, as shown in Table A-3. The Original Budget withdraws minimal amounts of Rainy Day Reserve in fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23, preserving the balance of $114.5 million in those years.

The combined balances of the Rainy Day Reserve's Economic Stabilization account and the Budget Stabilization Reserve are subject to a cap of 10% of actual total General Fund revenues as stated in the City's most recent independent annual audit. Amounts in excess of that cap in any year will be placed in the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve, which is eligible to be allocated to capital and other one-time expenditures. Monies in the City Reserve are available to provide budgetary support in years when General Fund revenues are projected to decrease from prior-year levels (or, in the case of a multi-year downturn, the highest of any previous year's total General Fund revenues). Monies in the Rainy Day One-Time Reserve are available for capital and other one-time spending initiatives.

Budget Stabilization Reserve

The City maintains a Budget Stabilization Reserve, as shown on the third line of Table A-3 above. The Budget Stabilization Reserve augments the Rainy Day Reserve and is funded through the dedication of 75% of certain volatile revenues, including Real Property Transfer Tax ("RPTT") receipts in excess of the rolling five-year annual average (adjusting for the effect of any rate increases approved by voters), funds from the sale of assets, and year-end unassigned General Fund balances beyond the amount assumed as a source in the subsequent year's budget.

The combined value of the Budget Stabilization Reserve and the Budget Stabilization One Time Reserve is $320.6 million at the end of fiscal year 2020-21, with an ending balance of $265.8 million in the Budget Stabilization Reserve and $54.8 million in the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve.

The Budget Stabilization Reserve has the same withdrawal requirements as the Rainy Day Reserve. Withdrawals are structured to occur over a period of three years: in the first year of a downturn, a maximum of 30% of the combined value of the Rainy Day Reserve and Budget Stabilization Reserve could be drawn; in the second year, the maximum withdrawal is 50%; and, in the third year, the entire remaining balance may be drawn. No deposits are required in years when the City is eligible to withdraw.

In fiscal year 2020-21, the City withdrew $41.9 million from the Budget Stabilization Reserve. The Original Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 and Six-Month Report for fiscal year 2021-22 makes no withdrawal from this reserve, maintaining the fiscal year 2020-21 ending balance.

Salaries, Benefits and Litigation Reserves

The City maintains two reserves to offset potential expenses, which are available to City departments through a Controller's Office review and approval process. These are shown with note 4 in the "assigned, not available for appropriation," and "assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation" sections of Table A-3 above. These include the Salaries and Benefit Reserve (beginning balance of $47.4 million as of fiscal year 2021-22) and the Litigation Reserve. The Litigation Reserve and Public Health Management Reserve (beginning balance of $173.6 million in fiscal year 2021-22) are combined for reporting purposes. The purpose of the latter is to manage patient revenue volatility in the Department of Public Health.

General Reserve

The City maintains a General Reserve, shown as "Unassigned for General Reserve" in the "assigned and unassigned, available for appropriation" section of Table A-3 above. The General Reserve is to be used for current-year fiscal pressures not anticipated during the budget process. The policy, originally adopted on April 13, 2010, set the General Reserve equal to 1% of budgeted regular General Fund revenues in fiscal year 2012-13 and increasing by 0.25% each year thereafter until reaching 2% of General Fund revenues in fiscal year 2016-17. On December 16, 2014, the Board of Supervisors adopted financial policies to further increase the City's General Reserve from 2% to 3% of General Fund revenues between fiscal year 2017-18 and fiscal year 2020-21 while reducing the required deposit to 1.5% of General Fund revenues in years when the City appropriates a withdrawal from the Rainy Day reserve. The intent of this policy change was to increase reserves available during a multi-year downturn. In fiscal year 2020-21, the City withdrew from the Rainy Day Reserve and reset its General Fund Reserve deposit requirement to 1.5% of General Fund revenues. As a result, the fiscal year 2020-21 ending balance of the General Reserve is $78.5 million. The Original Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 includes deposits of $3.1 million and $5.8 million, respectively. See CITY BUDGET – "Five-Year Financial Plan" and "Other Budget Updates" for a summary of the most recent projections.

COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve

The fiscal year 2020-21 Original Budget consolidated the balances of several City reserves into a single COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve of $507.4 million in fiscal year 2019-20, as shown as part of "Unassigned Contingency for Second Budget Year" line in Table A-3. The COVID Response and Economic

Loss Reserve was available to offset revenue losses or to assist otherwise with balancing of future fiscal year budgets. The Controller noted that the $507.4 million total balance would be sufficient to offset some, but not all, of the budget risks identified in future years.

The Original Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 draws down $113.5 million of the COVID Response and Economic Loss Reserve to support the costs of the City's continuing COVID-19 response. The remaining balance is split into two new reserves, $100.0 million for a "Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve," and $293.9 million for a "Fiscal Cliff Reserve." The Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve was created for the purpose of managing revenue shortfalls related to reimbursement disallowances from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and other state and federal agencies. The Fiscal Cliff Reserve was created for the purpose of managing projected budget shortfalls following the spend down of federal and state stimulus funds and other one-time sources used to balance the fiscal year 2021-22 and fiscal year 2022-23 budget.

Operating Cash Reserve

Not shown in Table A-3, under the City Charter, the Treasurer, upon recommendation of the City Controller, is authorized to transfer legally available moneys to the City's operating cash reserve from any unencumbered funds then held in the City's pooled investment fund (which contains cash for all pool participants, including city departments and external agencies such as San Francisco Unified School District and City College). The operating cash reserve is available to cover cash flow deficits in various City funds, including the City's General Fund. From time to time, the Treasurer has transferred unencumbered moneys in the pooled investment fund to the operating cash reserve to cover temporary cash flow deficits in the General Fund and other City funds. Any such transfers must be repaid within the same fiscal year in which the transfer was made, together with interest at the rate earned on the pooled funds at the time the funds were used. See "INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS – Investment Policy" herein.

Table A-4, entitled "Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Balances," is extracted from information in the City's published Annual Comprehensive Financial Report. Audited financial statements can be obtained from the City Controller's websitewhttps://sfcontroller.org/annual-comprehensive-financial-report-acfr. Information from the City Controller's website is not incorporated herein by reference. Excluded from this Statement of General Fund Revenues and Expenditures in Table A-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. See CITY BUDGET – "Five-Year Financial Plan" for a summary of the most recent projections.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-4

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in General Fund Fund Balances[1]
Fiscal Years 2016-17 through 2020-21
(000s)

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Revenues:					
Property Taxes[2]	$1,478,671	$1,673,950	$2,248,004	$2,075,002	$2,332,864
Business Taxes	700,536	897,076	917,811	822,154	722,642
Other Local Taxes[3]	1,203,587	1,093,769	1,215,306	996,180	709,018
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	29,336	28,803	27,960	25,318	12,332
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	2,734	7,966	4,740	3,705	4,508
Interest and Investment Income	14,439	16,245	88,523	65,459	(1,605)
Rents and Concessions	15,352	14,533	14,460	9,816	5,111
Intergovernmental	932,576	983,809	1,069,349	1,183,341	1,607,803
Charges for Services	220,877	248,926	257,814	229,759	230,048
Other	38,679	24,478	46,254	62,218	46,434
Total Revenues	$4,636,787	$4,989,555	$5,890,221	$5,472,952	$5,669,155
Expenditures:					
Public Protection	$1,257,948	$1,312,582	$1,382,031	$1,479,195	$1,498,514
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	166,285	223,830	202,988	203,350	204,973
Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development	956,478	999,048	1,071,309	1,252,865	1,562,982
Community Health	600,067	706,322	809,120	909,261	1,056,590
Culture and Recreation	139,368	142,215	152,250	155,164	145,405
General Administration & Finance	238,064	244,773	267,997	304,073	314,298
General City Responsibilities	121,444	110,812	144,808	129,941	113,913
Total Expenditures	$3,479,654	$3,739,582	$4,030,503	$4,433,849	$4,896,675
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures	$1,157,133	$1,249,973	$1,859,718	$1,039,103	$772,480
Other Financing Sources (Uses):					
Transfers In	$140,272	$112,228	$104,338	$87,618	$343,498
Transfers Out	(857,629)	(1,010,785)	(1,468,971)	(1,157,822)	(1,166,855)
Other Financing Sources	1,765	-	-	-	-
Other Financing Uses	-	(178)	(3)	-	(338)
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	($715,592)	($898,735)	($1,364,636)	($1,070,204)	($823,695)
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues and Other Sources Over Expenditures and Other Uses	$441,541	$351,238	$495,082	($31,101)	($51,215)
Total Fund Balance at Beginning of Year	$1,429,162	$1,870,703	$2,221,941	$2,717,023	$2,685,922
Cummulative effect of accounting change					35,397
Total Fund Balance at End of Year -- GAAP Basis	$1,870,703	$2,221,941	$2,717,023	$2,685,922	$2,670,104
Assigned for Subsequent Year's Appropriations and Unassigned Fund Balance, Year End					
-- GAAP Basis	$273,827	$286,143	$326,582	$395,776	$179,077
-- Budget Basis	$545,920	$616,592	$812,687	$896,172	$901,980

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

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

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

Five-Year Financial Plan and March Update

The Five-Year Financial Plan ("Plan") is required under Proposition A, a charter amendment approved by voters in November 2009. The Charter requires the City to forecast expenditures and revenues for the next five fiscal years, propose actions to balance revenues and expenditures during each year of the Plan, and discuss strategic goals and corresponding resources for City departments. Proposition A required that a Plan be adopted every two years. Charter Section 9.119 requires that by March 1 of each odd-numbered year, the Mayor submit a Plan to the Board. The City's Administrative Code requires that by March 1 of each even-numbered year, the Mayor, Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst, and Controller submit an updated estimate for the remaining four years of the most recently adopted Plan.

On January 12,2022, the Mayor, Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, and the Controller's Office issued the Plan for fiscal years 2022-23 through 2025-26 ("Joint Report"), which projected cumulative annual surplus of $26.2 million and $81.9 million for fiscal years 2022-23 and 2023-24, respectively, and shortfalls of $38.6 million and $148.9 million, for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively. This report was updated on March 31, 2022 (the "March Joint Report") with a lower surplus in the first two years of the report, and increased deficits in the later years. The March Joint Report projects a cumulative annual surplus of $14.7 million and $60.0 million for fiscal years 2022-23 and 2023-24, respectively, and shortfalls of $44.2 million and $156.2 million for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively. For the upcoming two-year budget, fiscal years 2022-23 and 2023-24, this represents a decline of $33.4 million.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Joint Report (Five Year Plan)
Fiscal Years 2022-23 through 2025-26
Projections as of March 31, 2022
($ Millions)

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Sources - Increase / (Decrease):	$111.2	$365.7	$549.6	$743.1
Uses:				
Baselines & Reserves	($160.4)	($237.6)	($324.0)	($387.5)
Salaries & Benefits	(78.5)	(106.3)	(144.4)	(262.5)
Citywide Operating Budget Costs	124.0	62.4	(59.1)	(135.4)
Departmental Costs	18.4	(24.4)	(66.3)	(113.9)
Total Uses - (Increase) / Decrease:	($96.5)	($305.8)	($593.8)	($899.3)
Projected Cumulative Surplus / (Shortfall):	$14.7	$60.0	($44.2)	($156.2)

On net, the March Joint Report presents modest changes to the January 2022 forecast. Key assumptions in the March Joint Report compared to the January report are:

- Modest additional growth in General Fund sources over the forecast period due to current year activity, improvements in property tax, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) reimbursements, and interest income, partially offset by weakness in business, hotel, and transfer taxes. Significantly:
    - The property tax forecast has been updated to account for the risk from pandemic-induced changes in normal operations, and therefore values of, San Francisco real estate. Projections assume that only those properties that received Proposition 8 temporary reductions in value in 2021 will be considered for reductions in subsequent

years. For all other properties, the forecast assumes reduction only if an appeal has been filed with the Assessment Appeals Board, rather than for classes of properties as a whole. As a result, the direct property tax forecast is increased, as is the excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) forecast.

  - The City's business tax revenues are determined in part by the share of a business' workforce that physically works within the City. As such, the number of workers who telecommute can dramatically affect revenue. The Joint Report assumed the average office worker would telecommute 15% of the time. In recent weeks, more companies have announced specifics for their long-term telecommuting plans, with many companies returning to the office in March and April 2022. Reflecting these plans, the March projection increases its projection of long-term telecommuting from 15% to 33%, beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2022-23. Considering current levels of available office space and the potential for more efficient use of existing space, the projection also increases the economic growth assumption from 4% to 5% in fiscal year 2022-23 and from 3% to 4% in all other years of the projection.

  - Hotel tax is anticipated to recover to pre-pandemic levels during calendar year 2026. It is projected to grow slightly faster than prior forecast in fiscal year 2022-23, because of pent-up demand from domestic leisure travelers. However, uncertainty related to the return of international, business, and convention-related travel results in slightly lower projections for fiscal years 2023-24, 2024-25, and 2025-26. Revenue per available room, an industry metric highly correlated with hotel tax revenue, is projected to be $146 million, $183 million, $218 million, and $237 million in fiscal years 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25, and 2025-26, respectively.

  - Transfers in commercial real estate are expected to stagnate in the next fiscal year as buyers wait for prices to drop and sellers hold during an unfavorable market. This forecast anticipates fiscal year 2022-23 transfer activity to be largely the same as fiscal year 2021-22, adjusting for two historic transfers that generated nearly $100 million of transfer tax. In fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25, transfer tax is expected to increase, recovering to its long-run average of $456.2 million by fiscal year 2024-25.

  - FEMA reimbursements are expected to increase by $45.9 million during the plan period, fiscal years 2022-23 through 2025-26, versus the January update, largely due to FEMA's extension of eligible costs through June 30, 2022**.**

- Increases to contributions to Charter-mandated baselines and deposits, largely due to the City's requirement to replenish General Reserve funds in the budget year, when they are used in the current year.

- Increases to salary and benefits costs. The projection updates the employer contribution rate to the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS), which increased from 19.91% in the January projections to 21.35% in the March Joint Report. Health costs for active members are lower compared to prior projections reflecting updated medical enrollments as of March 2022. Health costs for retired City employees are expected to increase at a higher rate than compared to the January projection.

The March Joint Report notes key factors that could materially impact the City's financial condition, including the following:

- **Labor negotiations:** This projection continues to assume approved wage increases in collective bargaining agreements for public safety through the end of fiscal year 2022-23, and applies inflation increases on open contracts in all other years based on the same CPI rates used in the January Joint Report. Other than these costs, this report does not assume any contract changes due to active labor negotiations. Wage or benefit changes above or below these assumptions would have a significant impact the projection.

- **Recession risk:** Since the January forecast, economists have become increasingly concerned about the potential for a recession in the next twelve months. The war in Ukraine has increased prices of gasoline, metals, and other raw materials. These increases, along with the excess demand in the labor market, are increasing pressure on the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates to tamp down inflation. Aggressive rate hikes would increase the risk of recession.

- **Retirement contribution rate:** Projections assume the SFERS adopted 7.2% rate of return in fiscal year 2021-22, however, returns through February 28, 2022, were 2.31%. Global markets remain volatile due to continued uncertainty about tighter monetary policy, inflation, and the effect of the war in Ukraine. Final results below the 7.2% assumption will result in higher retirement contribution costs during the forecast period.

- **COVID-19 pandemic and public health response:** As noted in the Joint Report, the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on both the local economy and the demands on the City's public health system continue to be areas of great uncertainty. The projection only assumes modest expenses to address COVID-19 that were budgeted in the previous two-year budget process. Any increase in the level of public health response without subsequent additional revenue would impact this forecast.

- **State and federal budget impacts:** In recent years, federal funding has been a significant source of revenue in this forecast. Other than some improvements in FEMA revenue based on current year claims, this forecast does not project any major changes in federal revenue allocations. Further, the Governor will likely introduce changes to the fiscal year 2022-23 State budget in the upcoming May Revise, which will be further amended by the State legislature; this projection does not assume significant new State budget proposals at this time, aside from modest education funding formula changes noted in the "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – Property Taxation" section above.

- **Pending or proposed new programs or legislation:** Legislative or voter-approved increases to existing baselines, set-asides, or other new spending increases without commensurate revenue increases from new funding sources will impact the projections included in March Joint Report.

Original Budget for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23

On June 1, 2021, the Mayor submitted a proposed, balanced budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 to the Board of Supervisors. On July 27, 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted an amended final budget, and the Mayor approved this budget on July 29, 2021.

The Original Budget totals $13.2 billion for fiscal year 2021-22 and $12.8 billion for fiscal year 2022-23. The General Fund portion is $6.4 billion in fiscal year 2021-22 and $6.3 billion in fiscal year 2022-23. There are 32,180 funded full-time positions in fiscal year 2021-22 and 32,153 in fiscal year 2022-23, representing a year-over-year increase of 402 and a year-over-year decrease of 27 positions, respectively.

On June 8, 2021, the Controller's Office published the Revenue Letter, fulfilling a Charter requirement to comment on the revenue estimates assumed in the Mayor's proposed budget. The Revenue Letter found tax revenue assumptions to be reasonable, but cautioned revenues are highly dependent on the course of economic reopening, will require frequent monitoring, and are subject to updates as conditions change.

Other Budget Updates: Fiscal Year 2021-22 Six-Month Budget Status Report

The Controller's Office provides periodic budget status updates to the City's policy makers during each fiscal year, as required by Section 3.105 of the City Charter. Most recently, the Six-Month budget status report (the "Six-Month Report") was released on February 15, 2022.

The Six-Month Report indicates a projected General Fund net surplus of $96.2 million in fiscal year 2021-22, which is a $32.7 million improvement from the $63.4 million surplus projected in the January Joint Report.

TABLE A-5

Six Month Report
Fiscal Year 2021-22 Projected General Fund Variances to Prior Projection ($ million)*

Changes from Prior Projection	
Citywide Revenue	(15.4)
Baseline Offsets	8.8
Departmental Revenues and Expenditures	46.7
Mid-Year Appropriations	(7.4)
Surplus / (Shortfall)	**$32.7**

*Note – Prior projections refer to the January Joint Report

The following is a discussion of certain elements of the revised fiscal year 2021-22 projections in the Six-Month Report:

- A net $15.4 million reduction in citywide revenues is primarily due to appropriation of $48.2 million of FEMA revenue for COVID-related costs, partially offset by higher levels of transfer taxes realized compared to previous projections, and higher projected airport concession revenues. Other sources are generally unchanged, however, economically sensitive revenues, such as business and hotel taxes, remain subject to high levels of uncertainty given the course of the pandemic and reopening efforts.

- A $46.7 million increase in departments' General Fund net operating surplus is projected due to hospital and State sales tax subvention revenues above budget, expenditure savings at the Human Services Agency, and emergency response and public safety department cost overages.

- Projections reflect the myriad effects of high levels of staff vacancies that are both shorter and longer term in nature. Record numbers of staff were out of the workplace due to isolation and quarantine requirements during the Omicron surge that began in December 2021 and peaked in January 2022, resulting in the costly use of overtime, temporary, and contract employees to staff critical health and safety functions. These absences exacerbated overall staffing shortfalls that have built over the course of the pandemic, which began in early 2020 when hiring efforts halted due to fiscal uncertainty and the focus on emergency response and have grown due to the tight labor market and shift of human resources staff time toward implementation of health and safety measures (e.g., contact tracing, vaccine mandates, leaves). The fiscal effects of vacancies include high levels of permanent salary savings, offset in certain departments by increased overtime and other costs in some departments and reductions in fee for service revenue in others. These costs include high levels of worker's compensation expenditures, which are projected to exceed budget by $11.4 million in the current year.

- Estimated emergency response costs are reflected in these projections. These include $115.2 million appropriated year to date for COVID response costs, $7.4 million appropriated for the Tenderloin Drug Overdose Emergency, and $10.1 million of above budgeted emergency response costs at the Department of Public Health. Projections also assume the Board of Supervisors approves the use of $32.3 million of state Project RoomKey revenue for the Shelter in Place (SIP) hotel program as proposed by the Human Services Agency. While these sources are projected to be adequate to fund the program through the end of the current fiscal year, it is not yet known whether additional funds will be needed for damage repair costs as the City exits hotels used for shelter during the public health emergency.

Projections do not reflect the likely staff costs driven by the recent allowance of additional COVID-19 paid sick leave provided by the City in January 2022. These hours were set to expire on March 4, 2022 but may be extended to conform to the timelines in AB 84, the State requirement that large employers provide additional paid sick leave, which was signed by the Governor on February 9, 2022. Effective February 19, 2022, COVID-19 paid sick leave was extended through September 30, 2022. Based on payroll data for the prior leave policy, the cost of the extension for public safety departments alone is estimated to be between $11.6 million and $18.6 million, depending on rates of usage and backfill.

Periodic budget status updates are provided by the Controller in accordance with reporting requirements of the Charter. The level of uncertainty regarding City revenues and expenditures remains extraordinarily high, driven by the economic and financial impacts of the public health emergency. The City can give no assurances that the COVID-19 pandemic will not result in further adverse impacts on the City's financial condition (including continuing reductions in revenues and/or increases in expenses).

BUDGETARY RISKS

Threat of Extended Recession

Increased inflation, geopolitical events and other factors (including actions by the Federal Reserve to unwind COVID-19 era stimulus measures and a short term rate increasing bias) have resulted in significantly increased expectations in the financial markets that a recession may be imminent. Economists have become increasingly concerned about the potential for a recession in the next twelve months. A recession could adversely impact the City's economy, and the financial condition of the General Fund. During the “Great Recession” that occurred nationally from December 2007 to June 2009 (according to the U.S. National Bureau of Economic Research), California real GDP growth slowed for five consecutive quarters from the third quarter of 2008 to the third quarter of 2009 and did not return to pre-recession level of output until three years later in the third quarter of 2012. The unemployment rate rose steadily from 4.9% in the fourth quarter of 2006 to peak at 12.3 percent in the fourth quarter of 2010 and did not return to the pre-recession level until the second quarter of 2017.

Commuting Pattern Changes

A sudden and sharp increase in telecommuting creates revenue risk. Approximately half of workers in major tax-paying sectors such as professional services, financial services, and information live outside of San Francisco. Extended periods of working at-home during the pandemic may affect how much of any business’s payroll expense and gross receipts could be apportionable to the City. Some of the City’s largest private employers instructed their employees to telecommute whenever possible, as evidenced by BART ridership declining to a low of almost 90% below its pre-COVID-19 baseline ridership. As of February 2022, BART ridership was 20.5% of pre-pandemic levels. Businesses owe payroll tax only on their employees physically working within the City. For certain categories of businesses, the gross receipts tax is also dependent on their San Francisco payroll. Thus, the sharp rise in telecommuting has resulted in reduced business taxes and, if the significant increase in telecommuting becomes permanent, could negatively impact the City for the foreseeable future. Although some City residents who previously commuted out of the City are now telecommuting from within the City, many of these residents work for employers who do not have a nexus in the City, and thus are not subject to business taxes.

COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic is ongoing, and the City will likely incur significant additional costs, depending on the ultimate duration and severity of the pandemic. The City can give no assurance of the duration or severity of the COVID-19 pandemic, and there is no assurance that its effects will not impose more significant financial and operating effects on the City before mitigation measures are successfully implemented. For additional information see “PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY – COVID-19.”

Bankruptcy Filing by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)

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

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

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

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

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

Impact of Recent Voter-Initiated and Approved Revenue Measures on Local Finances

On August 28, 2017, the California Supreme Court in California *Cannabis Coalition v. City of Upland* (August 28, 2017, No. S234148) ("Upland Decision") interpreted Article XIIIC, Section 2(b) of the State Constitution, which requires local government proposals imposing general taxes to be submitted to the voters at a general election (i.e., an election at which members of the governing body stand for election). The court concluded such provision did not to apply to tax measures submitted through the citizen initiative process. Under the Upland Decision, citizens exercising their right of initiative may now call for general or special taxes on the ballot at a special election (i.e. an election where members of the governing body are not standing for election). The court did not, however, resolve whether a special tax submitted by voter initiative needs only simple majority voter approval, and not the super-majority (i.e. two-thirds) voter approval required of special taxes placed on the ballot by a governing body. On June 5, 2018 voters of the City passed by majority vote two special taxes submitted through the citizen initiative process: a Commercial Rent Tax for Childcare and Early Education ("June Proposition C") and a Parcel Tax for the San Francisco Unified School District ("Proposition G" and, together with June Proposition C, the "June Propositions C and G"). In addition, on November 6, 2018 voters passed by a majority vote a special tax submitted through the citizen initiative process: a Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax ("November

Proposition C"), a gross receipts tax on larger companies in the City to fund affordable housing, mental health, and other homeless services.

The Upland Decision was subsequently affirmed by the California Supreme Court when it declined to review lower court challenges by plaintiffs in two other San Francisco Cases: *City of County of San Francisco v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of Proposition C,* 51 Cal. App. 5th703 (2020) (Court of Appeal rejected a taxpayer challenge to validity of June Proposition C) and *City of County of San Francisco v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of Proposition G* (July 26, 2021, A16059)) (Court of Appeal rejected a taxpayer challenge to validity of Proposition G). In so doing, the Upland Decision was affirmed as binding authority for the proposition that special taxes submitted through a citizen's initiative process only need pass by a majority vote, and not the supermajority requirement of Article XIIIC, Section 2(b) of the State Constitution.

Impact of the State of California Budget on Local Finances

Revenues from the State represent approximately 13% of the General Fund revenues appropriated in the Final Adopted Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23, and thus changes in State revenues could have a material impact on the City's finances. In a typical year, the Governor releases two primary proposed budget documents: 1) the Governor's Proposed Budget required to be submitted in January; and 2) the "May Revise" to the Governor's Proposed Budget. The Governor's Proposed Budget is then considered and typically revised by the State Legislature. Following that process, the State Legislature adopts, and the Governor signs, the State budget. City policy makers review and estimate the impact of both the Governor's Proposed and May Revise Budgets prior to the City adopting its own budget.

On January 13, 2022, the Governor released the State of California's Proposed Budget for fiscal year 2022-23. The State estimates that there is a surplus of $29 billion to allocate in the fiscal year 2022-23 budget process. The Governor proposes spending approximately 60 percent of discretionary resources, or $17.3 billion, on a one-time or temporary basis for a variety of programmatic expansions, $6.2 billion to reduce revenues, and $2 billion for other on-going spending increases. Additionally, the Governor's Proposed Budget allocates nearly $13 billion in spending for schools and community colleges. The implications of the Governor's Proposed Budget to the City have yet to be identified.

Impact of Federal Government on Local Finances

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

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

Under the CARES Act, the United States Treasury department distributed $150 billion to state and local governments within 30 days of enactment under a population-based formula. The statute limits the use of funds to COVID-19 expense reimbursement rather than to offset anticipated State tax revenue losses. The City received a direct allocation of $153.8 million from this Coronavirus Relief Fund, which was used to cover COVID-19-related medical, public health, economic support, and other emergency response costs. In addition, the State has allocated $20.7 million of its allocation to the City for the same purposes. These funds were spent in fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21.The federal government also provides significant funding for COVID-19 expenses through FEMA.

On March 11, 2021, President Biden signed H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 ("ARPA"). The bill includes $350 billion in state and local government fiscal aid to augment allocations provided in the CARES Act Coronavirus Relief Fund ("CRF"), through which San Francisco is to directly receive $624.8 million. Distributions will occur in two tranches, one each in 2021 and 2022, and are required to be spent by December 31, 2024. Allowable uses include COVID-19 response or mitigation of the negative economic impacts of it, such as assistance to households, small businesses, nonprofits, and aid to impacted industries. A critical improvement versus CRF funds is that ARPA funds may be used for the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue. San Francisco will likely benefit from other subventions and grants authorized in the bill. This funding is assumed in the Original Budget for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23.

Laguna Hospital Potential Loss of Federal Funding

On April 14, 2022, the City received notice from Centers of Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS"), an agency responsible for administering federal health care programs, within the Department of Human Services, that CMS was terminating the contract for Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements for patients at the City's Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center (the "Laguna Honda Hospital"). The Laguna Honda Hospital is a skilled nursing facility owned and operated by the City that serves over 700 patients the majority of whom are low income or extremely low income patients. Out of the approximately $308.6 million Fiscal Year 2021-22 budget for operating the Laguna Honda Hospital, approximately $202.73 million is paid from reimbursements from CMS. The remaining portion of the budget is paid from the City's General Fund. CMS will continue reimbursements for 30 days from April 14, 2022. The notice from CMS does not affect the Laguna Honda Hospital's license to operate from the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH"). The notice from CMS relates to a series of self-reported incidents and follow up surveys from CDPH that have not in the view of CDPH been adequately addressed to date. The Laguna Honda Hospital has undertaken to address the concerns raised by CDPH and will a seek recertification of its eligibility to receive reimbursements from CMS during the 30 day period while reimbursements are still being made by CMS. The City can make no assurance regarding the outcome of any recertification process with CMS. Temporary or permanent loss of reimbursements from CMS would have a material adverse impact on the Laguna Honda Hospital's finances and operations, including its ability to deliver health care services to residents of the City, if such loss of reimbursement funds are not offset by additional funding from the City's General Fund or other available sources.

THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY

Effect of the Dissolution Act

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

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

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

Because of the existence of enforceable obligations, the Successor Agency is authorized to continue to implement, through the issuance of tax allocation bonds, certain major redevelopment projects that were previously administered by the Former Agency. The Successor Agency exercises land use, development and design approval authority for the developed projects. The Successor Agency, in addition to other various City agencies and entities, also issues community facilities district ("CFD") bonds from time to time to facilitate development in the major approved development projects in accordance with the terms of such enforceable obligations See also, Table A-33: "Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations."

CITY INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICTS

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

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

GENERAL FUND REVENUES

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

PROPERTY TAXATION

Property Taxation System – General

The City receives approximately one-third of its total General Fund operating revenues from local property taxes. Property tax revenues result from the application of the appropriate tax rate to the 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 30, the 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 XIIIA of the State Constitution (and mandated by statute), tax surcharges needed to repay voter-approved general obligation bonds, and tax surcharges imposed by overlapping jurisdictions that have been authorized to levy taxes on property located in the City. Typically, the Board of Supervisors approves the schedule of tax rates each year by resolution no later than the last working day of September. The Treasurer and Tax Collector prepares and mails tax bills to taxpayers and collects the taxes on behalf of the City and other overlapping taxing agencies that levy taxes on taxable property located in the City. The Treasurer holds and invests City tax funds, including taxes collected for payment of general obligation bonds, and is charged with payment of principal and interest on such bonds when due. The State Board of Equalization assesses certain special classes of property, as described below. See "Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property" below.

Assessed Valuations, Tax Rates and Tax Delinquencies

Table A-6 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. It is possible that the COVID-19 pandemic will result in a reduction in property values in the City, and such reduction could be material.

The total tax rate shown in Table A-6 includes taxes assessed on behalf of the City as well as the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), County Office of Education (SFCOE), San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), all of which are legal entities separate from the City. See also, Table A-33: "Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations." In addition to *ad valorem* taxes, voter-approved special assessment taxes or direct charges may also appear on a property tax bill.

Additionally, although no additional rate is levied, a portion of property taxes collected within the City is allocated to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), the successor agency to the

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Property tax revenues attributable to the growth in assessed value of taxable property (known as “tax increment”) within the adopted redevelopment project areas may be utilized by OCII to pay for outstanding and enforceable obligations and a portion of administrative costs of the agency, reducing tax revenues from those parcels located within project areas to the City and other local taxing agencies, including SFUSD and SFCCD. Taxes collected for payment of debt service on general obligation bonds are not affected or diverted. OCII received $128.8 million of property tax increment in fiscal year 2020-21 for recognized obligations, diverting about $71.6 million that would have otherwise been apportioned to the City’s General Fund.

The percent collected of property tax (current year levies excluding supplemental) was 99.00% for fiscal year 2020-21.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-6

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Assessed Valuation of Taxable Property
Fiscal Years 2008-09 through 2021-22
($000s)

Fiscal Year	Net Assessed [1] Valuation (NAV)	% Change from Prior Year	Total Tax Rate per $100 [2]	Total Tax Levy [3]	Total Tax Collected [3]	% Collected June 30
2008-09	141,274,628	8.7%	1.163	1,702,533	1,661,717	97.6%
2009-10	150,233,436	6.3%	1.159	1,808,505	1,764,100	97.5%
2010-11	157,865,981	5.1%	1.164	1,888,048	1,849,460	98.0%
2011-12	158,649,888	0.5%	1.172	1,918,680	1,883,666	98.2%
2012-13	165,043,120	4.0%	1.169	1,997,645	1,970,662	98.6%
2013-14	172,489,208	4.5%	1.188	2,138,245	2,113,284	98.8%
2014-15	181,809,981	5.4%	1.174	2,139,050	2,113,968	98.8%
2015-16	194,392,572	6.9%	1.183	2,290,280	2,268,876	99.1%
2016-17	211,532,524	8.8%	1.179	2,492,789	2,471,486	99.1%
2017-18	234,074,597	10.7%	1.172	2,732,615	2,709,048	99.1%
2018-19	259,329,479	10.8%	1.163	2,999,794	2,977,664	99.3%
2019-20	281,073,307	8.4%	1.180	3,509,022	3,475,682	99.0%
2020-21	299,686,811	6.6%	1.198	3,823,246	3,785,038	99.0%
2021-22	311,997,808 [4]	4.1%	1.182	3,687,814	N/A	N/A

1 Net Assessed Valuation (NAV) is Total Assessed Value for Secured and Unsecured Rolls, less Non-reimbursable Exemptions and Homeowner Exemptions.

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

3 The Total Tax Levy and Total Tax Collected through fiscal year 2020-21 is based on year-end current year secured and unsecured levies as adjusted through roll corrections, excluding supplemental assessments, as reported to the State of California (available on the website of the California SCO). Total Tax Levy for fiscal year 2021-22 is based upon initial assessed valuations times the secured property tax rate to provide an estimate.

4 Based on initial assessed valuations for fiscal year 2021-22

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

SCO source noted in (3): http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Tax-Info/TaxDelinq/sanfrancisco.pdf

At the start of fiscal year 2021-22, the total net assessed valuation of taxable property within the City was approximately $312.0 billion. Of this total, $295.2 billion (94.6%) represents secured valuations and $16.8 billion (5.4%) represents unsecured valuations. See “Tax Levy and Collection” below, for a further discussion of secured and unsecured property valuations.

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

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

The City typically experiences increases in assessment appeals activity during economic downturns and decreases in assessment appeals as the economy rebounds. During the severe economic downturn of fiscal years 2009-10 and 2010-11, partial reductions of up to approximately 30% of the assessed valuations appealed were 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, SFCOE, SFCCD, BAAQMD, and BART share proportionately in any refunds paid as a result of successful appeals. To mitigate the financial risk of potential assessment appeal refunds, the City funds appeal reserves for its share of estimated property tax revenues for each fiscal year. In the period following the Great Recession, assessment appeals increased significantly. In fiscal year 2010-11, the Assessor granted 18,841 temporary reductions in residential property assessed value worth a total of $2.35 billion, compared to 18,110 temporary reductions with a value of $1.96 billion granted in fiscal year 2009-10. As described further below, the number of new assessment appeals filed as of December 31, 2021, which represents approximately 1.0% of all parcels in San Francisco, increased by approximately 11% from the number of new assessment appeals filed during the same period the prior year.

It is possible that global and national recessions and economic dislocation will result in declines in real estate values in the City, and such declines could be material.

Appeals activity is reviewed each year and incorporated into the current and subsequent years' budget projections of property tax revenues. Refunds of prior years' property taxes from the discretionary General Fund appeals reserve fund for fiscal years 2013-14 through 2020-21 are listed in Table A-7 below.

TABLE A-7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Reduction of Prior Years' Property Tax Revenues
General Fund
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2020-21
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Amount Reduced
2013-14	25,756
2014-15	16,304
2015-16	16,199
2016-17	33,397
2017-18	24,401
2018-19	30,071
2019-20	17,900
2020-21*	10,729

Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.
*Amount Reduced in fiscal years prior to 2020-21 reflects only the prior year Teetered amounts. For FY 2020-21 and forward, the Total Reductions reflects both Teetered and non-Teetered property tax amounts.

A property's annual assessed value is determined as of January 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which taxes are billed and paid. Under California's Proposition 13, a property's annual assessed value is the lesser of (1) its base year value (fair market value as of the date of change in ownership or completion of new construction), factored for inflation at no more than two percent per year; or (2) its fair market value as of January 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which property taxes are billed and paid. If a property's fair market value falls below its factored base year value, the reduced value is enrolled on a temporary basis (for one year) and is commonly referred to as a "Proposition 8" reduction, after the 1978 initiative. However, if a property's base year value is reduced, then that reduced value carries forward for factoring purposes until the next change in ownership or completion of new construction.

Assessors in California have authority to use Proposition 8 criteria to apply reductions in valuation to classes of properties affected by any factors affecting value, including but not limited to negative economic conditions. By the start of the fiscal year 2021-22, the Assessor had granted 8,273 temporary decline-in-value reductions resulting in an assessed value reduction of $1.19 billion, citywide, and subsequently granted an additional $1.1 billion of temporary Proposition 8 roll corrections, for a total reduction of nearly $2.3 billion, to date. The largest number of these reductions, totaling 5,815, were for condominiums which were the only residential housing type observed to have lost value as a class due to the pandemic for lien date 2021. For comparison, in fiscal year 2020-21, the Assessor granted 2,797 decline-in-value reductions resulting in a total assessed value reduction of $377.88 million.

In addition, qualifying taxpayers seek adjustment of their property assessed values on a variety of factors. Requests for changes can be motivated by real estate market conditions or other factors.

A qualifying taxpayer can seek assessed value adjustments from the Assessment Appeals Board ("AAB") or from the Assessor or both. For regular, annual secured property tax assessments, the period for property owners to file an appeal is between July 2nd and September 15th. If September 15th falls on a Saturday or Sunday, applications filed or postmarked the next business day are considered timely. The AAB generally is required to determine the outcome of appeals within two (2) years of each appeal's filing date. The AAB can increase, decrease, or not change an assessment. If the appeal results in a change in value, the new assessed value will be used to determine the property taxes for the year that was appealed. Subsequently, each year, the Assessor examines the property to see if the market value has risen back to the Proposition 13 base year value, or higher.

In addition, in relatively limited circumstances the Assessor and a property owner may and do stipulate to a corrected assessed value for property. If an appeal is pending, the AAB can reject such a stipulation and instead require a hearing, although this is exceedingly rare.

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 that are based on historical results as to appeals.

As of December 31, 2021, the total number of open appeals before the AAB was 3,746 and there were 2,412 new applications filed in fiscal year 2021-22. The difference between the current assessed value and the taxpayer's opinion of values for all the open applications is $49.5 billion. Assuming the City did not contest any taxpayer appeals and the AAB upheld all the taxpayer's requests, a negative potential total property tax impact of about $586.5 million would result. The General Fund's portion of that potential $586.5 million would be approximately $275.7 million. This describes the worst-case scenario in terms of potential negative revenue impacts for the purposes of illustration based on information as of December 31, 2021. In practice, the City has contested most taxpayer appeals. As such, actual reductions have historically been much lower than values asserted by property owners in appeals and a large number of appeals are eventually withdrawn. Of the 1,008 appeals closed during fiscal year 2021-22 as of December 31, 2021, 676, or 67.1% of appeals, were withdrawn. Even though the percentage rate of withdrawal declined from the same time last year, during most of the same period in the prior year, hearings were ceased.

Nearly all the appeal applications filed during fiscal year 2020-21 challenge the assessed value of property for fiscal year 2020-21. However, because the assessed value of secured property for fiscal year 2020-21 is determined by the Assessor as of the January 1, 2020, lien date, which predated the COVID-19 pandemic and its related economic effects, the City does not expect a material reduction in assessed values resulting from fiscal year 2020-21 appeal applications. However, there have been an increase in the number of appeals for fiscal year 2021-22. Additionally, under Proposition 8, adopted by California voters in 1978, the Assessor's Office could on it is own initiative reduce the assessed value of properties with market values that fall below their values assessed in accordance with Proposition 13. Following a Proposition 8 reduction, the assessed value continues to match the market value until the market value again exceeds the maximum assessed value calculated under Proposition 13.

Tax Levy and Collection

As the local tax-levying agency under State law, the City levies property taxes on all taxable property within the City's boundaries for the benefit of all overlapping local agencies, including SFUSD, SFCCD, the BAAQMD and BART. The total tax levy for all taxing entities to begin fiscal year 2020-21 was $3.3 billion, not including supplemental, escape and special assessments that may be assessed during the year. Of total property tax revenues (including supplemental and escape property taxes), the City budgeted to receive $2.0 billion in the General Fund and $235.1 million in special revenue funds designated for children's programs, libraries and open space. SFUSD and SFCCD were estimated to receive approximately $199.8 million and $37.4 million, respectively, and the local ERAF was estimated to receive $401.1 million (before adjusting for the vehicle license fees ("VLF") backfill shift). The Successor Agency was estimated to receive approximately $171.3 million. The remaining portion will be allocated to various other governmental bodies, various special funds, and general obligation bond debt service funds, and other taxing entities. Taxes levied to pay debt service for general obligation bonds issued by the City, SFUSD, SFCCD and BART may only be applied for that purpose. The City's General Fund is allocated about 47.1% of total property tax revenue before adjusting for the VLF backfill shift and excess ERAF.

General Fund property tax revenues in fiscal year 2020-21 were $2.2 billion, representing an increase of $205.9 million (10.5%) over fiscal year 2019-20 actual revenue. The majority of the increase was from excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) revenue growth of $131.6 million, due to guidance released to all counties by the State Controller's Office in February 2021 confirming the methodology for considering school district-sponsored charter schools in ERAF calculations, as well as guidance specific to San Francisco that recognized the City's pre-dissolution practice of limiting the property tax increment distributions to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. The remainder of the increase resulted from year-over-year secured roll growth of 7.5%, which also increases Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fee allocations. Tables A-2 and A-4 set forth a history of budgeted and actual property tax revenues.

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

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

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

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

In October 1993, the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that adopted the Alternative Method of Tax Apportionment (the "Teeter Plan"). This resolution changed the method by which the City apportions property taxes among itself and other taxing agencies. Additionally, the Teeter Plan was extended to include the allocation and distribution of special taxes levied for City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) in June 2017 (effective fiscal year 2017-18) and for the Bay Restoration Authority Parcel Tax, SFUSD School Facilities Special Tax, SFUSD School Parcel Tax, and City College Parcel Tax in October 2017 (effective fiscal year 2018-19). The Teeter Plan method authorizes the City Controller to allocate to the City's taxing agencies 100% of the secured property taxes billed but not yet collected. In return, as the delinquent property taxes and associated penalties and interest are collected, the City's General Fund retains such amounts. Prior to adoption of the Teeter Plan, the City could only allocate secured property taxes actually collected (property taxes billed minus delinquent taxes). Delinquent taxes, penalties and interest were allocated to the City and other taxing agencies only when they were collected. The City has funded payment of accrued and current delinquencies through authorized internal borrowing. The City also maintains a Tax Loss Reserve for the Teeter Plan as shown on Table A-8. The Tax Loss Reserve sets aside 1% of the total of all taxes and assessments levied for which the Teeter Plan is the applicable distribution method. The purpose of the Tax Loss Reserve is to cover losses that may occur. The amount has grown in recent years as the assessed values on the secured roll has grown.

TABLE A-8

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Teeter Plan
Tax Loss Reserve Fund Balance
Fiscal Years 2013-14 through 2020-21
(000s)

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

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

Assessed valuations of the aggregate ten largest assessment parcels in the City for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021 are shown in Table A-9. The City cannot determine from its assessment records whether individual persons, corporations or other organizations are liable for tax payments with respect to multiple properties held in various names that in aggregate may be larger than is suggested by the Office of the Assessor-Recorder.

TABLE A-9

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Top 10 Parcels Total Assessed Value
July 1, 2021

Assessee [1]	Location	Parcel Number	Type	Total Assessed Value 2	% Basis of Levy [3]
SUTTER BAY HOSPITALS [4]	1101 - 1133 VAN NESS AVE	0695 007	HOSPITAL	$2,674,258,101	0.856%
TRANSBAY TOWER LLC	415 MISSION ST	3720 009	OFFICE	$1,803,015,744	0.577%
GSW ARENA LLC	1 WARRIORS WAY	8722 021	ENTERTAINMENT COMP	$1,470,357,868	0.470%
HWA 555 OWNERS LLC	555 CALIFORNIA ST	0259 026	OFFICE	$1,070,539,722	0.342%
ELM PROPERTY VENTURE LLC	101 CALIFORNIA ST	0263 011	OFFICE	$1,035,700,281	0.331%
PARK TOWER OWNER LLC	250 HOWARD ST	3718 040	OFFICE	$1,012,003,901	0.324%
PPF PARAMOUNT ONE MARKET PLAZA OWNER LP	1 MARKET ST	3713 007	OFFICE	$877,380,832	0.281%
KRE EXCHANGE OWNER LLC	1800 OWENS ST	8727 008	OFFICE	$801,576,851	0.256%
SHR ST FRANCIS LLC	301 - 345 POWELL ST	0307 001	HOTEL	$772,514,515	0.247%
SUTTER BAY HOSPITALS DBA CA PACIFIC MED [4]	3615 CESAR CHAVEZ ST/555 SAN JOSE	6575 005	HOSPITAL	$744,697,554	0.238%
				$12,262,045,369	**3.923%**

[1] Certain parcels fall within RDA project areas.
[2] Represents the Total Assessed Valuation (TAV) as of the Basis of Levy, which excludes assessments processed during the fiscal year. TAV includes land & improvements, personal property, and fixtures. Values reflect information as of January 1, 2021.
[3] The Basis of Levy is total assessed value less exemptions for which the state does not reimburse counties (e.g. those that apply to nonprofit organizations).
[4] Nonprofit organization that is exempt from property taxes.
Source: Office of the Assessor-Recorder, City and County of San Francisco

Taxation of State-Assessed Utility Property

A portion of the City's total net assessed valuation consists of utility property subject to assessment by the State Board of Equalization. State-assessed property, or "unitary property," is property of a utility system with components located in many taxing jurisdictions assessed as part of a "going concern" rather than as individual parcels of real or personal property. Unitary and certain other State-assessed property values are allocated to the counties by the State Board of Equalization, taxed at special 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 2021-22 valuation of property assessed by the State Board of Equalization is $3.9 billion.

OTHER CITY TAX REVENUES

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

The following section contains a brief description of other major City-imposed taxes as well as taxes that are collected by the State and shared with the City. The City's General Fund is also supported by other sources of revenue, including charges for services, fines and penalties, and transfers-in, which are not discussed below.

See Table A-10 below for a summary of revenue source as a percentage of total General Fund revenue based on audited financials for fiscal year 2020-21 and the Original Budget for fiscal year 2021-22.

TABLE A-10

Revenues	FY 2020-21		FY 2021-22 Original Budget	
Property Taxes	$2,332,864	*41.2%*	$2,115,600	*39.0%*
Business Taxes	722,642	*12.7%*	957,140	*17.6%*
Other Local Taxes	709,018	*12.5%*	777,750	*14.3%*
Licenses, Permits and Franchises	12,332	*0.2%*	27,944	*0.5%*
Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties	4,508	*0.1%*	4,035	*0.1%*
Interest and Investment Income	(1,605)	*0.0%*	36,247	*0.7%*
Rents and Concessions	5,111	*0.1%*	11,728	*0.2%*
Intergovernmental	1,607,803	*28.4%*	1,216,765	*22.4%*
Charges for Services	230,048	*4.1%*	255,111	*4.7%*
Other	46,434	*0.8%*	24,238	*0.4%*
Total Revenues	$5,669,155	*100.0%*	$5,426,557	*100.0%*

Business Taxes

Through tax year 2014, businesses in the City were subject to payroll expense and business registration taxes. Proposition E approved by the voters in the November 2012 election changed business registration tax rates and introduced a gross receipts tax which phased in over a five-year period beginning January 1, 2014, replacing the then existing 1.5% tax on business payrolls over the same period. Overall, the ordinance increased the number and types of businesses in the City that pay business tax and registration fees from approximately 7,500 to 15,000. In November 2020, voters passed Proposition F, which eliminated the payroll tax and modified gross receipt tax rates. Most gross receipt tax rates increased by 40% for tax year 2021 over the prior year with much smaller increases through 2024. In some industries that were particularly hurt during the pandemic, such as retail trade and food services, tax rates were lowered for businesses with less than $25 million in gross receipts through 2022. The measure also reduced business registration fees for businesses with less than $1 million in gross receipts and raised the small business exemption for gross receipts taxes to $2 million.

Business tax revenue in fiscal year 2020-21 was $724.1 million for all funds, representing a decrease of $100.5 million (12.2%) from fiscal year 2019-20. The fiscal year 2021-22 Six-Month Projection is $878.4 million, an increase of $154.3 million (21.3%) from fiscal year 2020-21. The fiscal year 2022-23 Original Budget is $1.06 billion, an increase of $187.0 million (21.2%) from the fiscal year 2021-22 projection.

Revenues from business tax and registration fees have generally followed economic conditions in the City, primarily employment and wage growth. The COVID-19 emergency significantly adversely affected employment and wage growth, and the City's economic condition is still in distress relative to pre-pandemic levels. The unemployment rate in the City peaked at 13.7% in April 2020 and declined steadily since then, reaching 3.0% in February 2022, still higher than at any point pre-pandemic since 2017. Just prior to the start of the pandemic, there were approximately 570,000 employed residents in the City. After falling to a low of about 480,000 in April 2020, the number of employed residents has risen to about 550,000, which is still approximately 20,000 fewer than the pre-pandemic level.

Remote work occurring outside the City creates fiscal risk because, for certain categories of businesses, the gross receipts tax is dependent on their San Francisco payroll, and the firms only need to calculate their San Francisco payroll expense for employees that physically work within the City's geographic boundaries. Approximately half of the workers in major tax-paying sectors such as Professional Services, Financial Services, and Information live outside of San Francisco. Some of the City's largest employers in these sectors have indicated that employees may be able to work from home permanently or with a hybrid schedule after COVID restrictions have been lifted. For example, although its offices are reopening, Twitter has announced plans to let employees work from home indefinitely and Google has announced that it expects most employees to work in the office three days per week. Although some San Francisco residents who previously commuted out of the City are now telecommuting from within the City, many of these residents work for employers who do not have a nexus in the City, and thus are not subject to business taxes. The budget (for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23) assumed that in office-using sectors, workers telecommuted near full-time at the start of the fiscal year and would gradually fall to 25% by the end of fiscal year 2022-23. Tax return data for 2020, however, indicate that businesses did not reduce their San Francisco payroll as much as expected, partly because there was less telecommuting than expected and partly because workers who previously worked outside the City now worked from home within the City. Because the telecommuting decline was lower than expected in tax year 2020, the City has seen a smaller increase in payroll than expected as workers returned to the office.

TABLE A-11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Business Tax Revenues - All Funds [1]
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
(000s)

Fiscal Year[2]	Revenue	Change	Change %
2017-18	$ 899,142	$ 196,811	28.0%
2018-19	919,552	20,410	2.3%
2019-20	824,670	(94,882)	-10.3%
2020-21	724,140	(100,530)	-12.2%
2021-22 *projected*[3]	880,900	156,760	21.6%
2022-23 *budgeted*[4]	1,067,850	186,950	21.2%

[1] Figures exclude Homelessness Gross Receipts and Commercial Rent Taxes that are allocated to special revenue funds.

[2] Figures for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2020-21 are actuals. Includes portion of Payroll Tax allocated to special revenue funds for the Community Challenge Grant program and Business Registration Tax.

[3] Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projections from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.

[4] Figures for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 reflect the Final Budget, July 29, 2021.

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

Transient Occupancy Tax (Hotel Tax)

Pursuant to the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulation Code, a 14.0% transient occupancy tax is imposed on occupants of hotel rooms and is remitted by hotel operators to the City monthly. A quarterly tax-filing requirement is also imposed. Hotel tax revenue in fiscal year 2020-21 ended at $42.2 million (all funds), a decrease of $239.4 million (85.0%) from fiscal year 2019-20. The fiscal year 2021-22 Six Month projection is $132.7 million, an increase of $90.5 million (214.4%) from fiscal year 2020-21. The fiscal year 2022-23 Original Budget is $268.6 million, an increase of $135.9 million (102.5%) from fiscal year 2021-22. Table A-12 includes hotel tax in all funds. Slightly less than 90% of the City's hotel tax is allocated to the General Fund, with 10.7% allocated to arts and cultural organizations and approximately $5 million for debt service on hotel tax revenue bonds.

The projected fiscal year 2021-22 revenue decline is due to the unprecedented drop off in hotel occupancy and rates in fiscal year 2020-21, resulting in a much lower hotel tax level from which the City must recover. Global travel restrictions, the cancellation of conventions, and overall course of the pandemic were among the factors which led to closure of a large portion of the City's hotels, and hotel tax was significantly depressed in fiscal year 2020-21. The City's five-year forecast anticipates hotel tax will return to pre-pandemic levels by fiscal year 2025-26, with pent-up demand for leisure travel initially driving growth in fiscal year 2021-22 and the resumption of large group events at full capacity contributing to additional rapid growth in fiscal year 2022-23.

San Francisco's hotel tax is derived from hotel stays from individual business travelers, group events such as conferences and meetings, and leisure tourists. These visitors primarily travel to the City by air. In April 2020, at the height of the first peak of the COVID pandemic, enplanements at SFO decreased by 97% compared to prior year. While air travel has grown since April 2020, the recovery in San Francisco has lagged other metropolitan areas, with fiscal year 2020-21 average enplanements 78.9% below fiscal year 2019-20 enplanements. More recently, FY 2021-22 year-to-date average enplaments are still 45.4% below FY 2018-19 enplanements. San Francisco International Airport's (SFO) geographic location lends itself to being the "gateway" to Asia, and a hub for international travel, which is anticipated to lag domestic travel. The budget assumes the recovery in hotel tax begins with visits to the City from domestic leisure tourists, with the return of business travelers, group events, and international visitors following, given the time needed to plan large gathering and reestablish policies for in-person business meetings. Conventions drive up hotel room rates through compression pricing, which is important to the full recovery of the City's hotel tax base.

Revenue per Available Room (RevPAR), a measurement of hotel tax revenue growth, is a function of occupancy and average daily room rates (ADR). Despite some slowdown in the growth in the hospitality industry after the 9/11 attacks in 2001 and the global financial crisis in 2008, average annual RevPAR has generally grown at a steady rate from fiscal year 2000-01 to fiscal year 2018-19. In fiscal year 2018-19, RevPAR reached all-time high of $263.90. In the first eight months of fiscal year 2019-20, RevPAR declined to $224.50. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, associated flight bans, and shelter in place orders, RevPAR reached an historic all-time low of $14.40 in April 2020. RevPAR has fluctuated throughout the course of fiscal year 2021-21, bringing the annual average up to $37.60 as of March 2021. In April 2021, with a successful local rollout of COVID vaccines and loosened restriction, RevPAR increased to $51.30. February 2022 month-to-date RevPAR was $68.33, and more recent days indicate that RevPAR is trending up rapidly. The budget assumes annual average RevPAR will increase significantly in the next two fiscal years – $46.44 and $134.21 in fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23 respectively. However, RevPAR is not expected to recover to pre-pandemic levels until fiscal year 2025-26.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-12

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Transient Occupancy Tax Revenues - All Funds[1]
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
(000s)

Fiscal Year[2]	Tax Rate	Revenue	Change	
2017-18	14.0%	$ 385,550	$ 10,259	2.7%
2018-19	14.0%	414,343	28,792	7.5%
2019-20	14.0%	281,615	(132,728)	-32.0%
2020-21	14.0%	42,195	(239,420)	-85.0%
2021-22 *projected* [3]	14.0%	132,654	90,459	214.4%
2022-23 *budgeted* [4]	14.0%	268,577	135,923	102.5%

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

[2] Figures for fiscal year 2017-18 through 2020-21 are actuals.

[3] Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projection from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.

[4] Figure for fiscal year 2022-23 reflects the Final Budget from July 29, 2021.

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

Real Property Transfer Tax

Real property transfer tax (RPTT) is imposed on all real estate transfers recorded in the City. Transfer tax revenue is more susceptible to economic and real estate cycles than most other City revenue sources. After the passage of Proposition W on November 8, 2016, transfer tax rates were $5.00 per $1,000 of the sale price of the property being transferred for properties valued at $250,000 or less; $6.80 per $1,000 for properties valued more than $250,000 and less than $999,999; $7.50 per $1,000 for properties valued at $1.0 million to $5.0 million; $22.50 per $1,000 for properties valued more than $5.0 million and less than $10.0 million; $27.50 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $10.0 million and less than $25.0 million; and $30.00 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $25.0 million. After the passage of Proposition I in November 2020, transfer tax rates were doubled for the two highest tiers, to $55.00 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $10.0 million and less than $25.0 million and $60.00 per $1,000 for properties valued at more than $25.0 million.

RPTT revenue for fiscal year 2020-21 ended at $344.7 million, a $10.1 million (3.0%) increase from fiscal year 2019-20 revenue. The fiscal year 2021-22 Six Month projection is $459.0 million, an increase of $114.3 million (33.2%) from fiscal year 2020-21. The fiscal year 2022-23 Original Budget is $373.9 million, a reduction of $85.0 million (18.5%) from the fiscal year 2021-22 projection. The entirety of RPTT revenue is recorded in the General Fund.

Despite a decrease in the number of large transactions since fiscal year 2018-19, the total dollar value of transfer tax is increasing primarily due to the Proposition I rate change and to a handful of large, once-in-a-generation transfers in the first six months of this year. The effect of Proposition I in fiscal year 2021-22, which took effect in January 2021, is estimated to be $154.8 million in fiscal year 2021-22, an increase of $40.7 million since the City's January Joint Report.

As the City's most volatile revenue source, RPTT collections can see large year-over-year changes that have exceeded 70% in some instances. The main factors creating volatility are sales of high-value properties, availability of financing, and the relative attractiveness of San Francisco real estate compared to global investment options, all of which track closely with economic cycles, as well as voter-approved rate changes, which occurred in 2008, 2010, 2016, and 2020. The volatility of RPTT is attributable mainly to the sales of high-value (largely commercial) properties over $25 million. In fiscal year 2008-09, transactions above $25 million would have generated only $10.6 million under the current rates compared to the peak in fiscal year 2016-17, when these transactions generated $295.8 million. Since the end of the recession in fiscal year 2009-10, these large transactions made up on average 58.0% of total revenue but only 0.6% of the transaction count. This means that revenue is determined by a small handful of transactions. In the two recessions prior to COVID, the taxes collected on large transactions fell dramatically.

TABLE A-13

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Real Property Transfer Tax Receipts - All Funds
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
(000s)

Fiscal Year[1]	Revenue	Change	
2017-18	280,416	(130,145)	-31.7%
2018-19	364,044	83,628	29.8%
2019-20	334,535	(29,509)	-8.1%
2020-21	344,683	10,148	3.0%
2021-22 projected [2]	458,956	114,273	33.2%
2022-23 *budgeted* [3]	373,910	(85,046)	-18.5%

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2017-18 through 2020-21 are actuals

[2] Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projection from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.

[3] Figure for fiscal year 2022-23 reflects the Final Budget from July 29, 2021.

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

Sales and Use Tax

The sales tax rate on retail transactions in the City is 8.6250%, of which 1.00% represents the City's local share ("Bradley-Burns" portion). The State collects the City's local sales tax on retail transactions along with State and special district sales taxes, and then remits the local sales tax collections to the City.

The components of San Francisco's 8.6250% sales tax rate are shown in Table A-14. In addition to the 1% portion of local sales tax, the State subvenes portions of sales tax back to counties through 2011 realignment (1.0625%), 1991 realignment (0.5%), and public safety sales tax (0.5%). The subventions are discussed in more detail after the local tax section.

TABLE A-14

San Francisco's Sales & Use Tax Rate

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

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

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

Local sales tax (the 1% portion) revenue in fiscal year 2020-21was $146.9 million, $33.3 million (18.5%) less than fiscal year 2019-20. The fiscal year 2021-22 Six Month projection is $174.8 million, an increase of $27.9 million (19.0%) from fiscal year 2020-21. The fiscal year 2022-23 Original Budget is $174.9 million, unchanged from fiscal year 2021-22 projections. The entirety of sales tax revenue is recorded in the General Fund.

Historically, sales tax revenues have been highly correlated to growth in tourism, business activity and population. This revenue is significantly affected by changes in the economy and spending patterns. In recent years, online retailers have contributed significantly to sales tax receipts, offsetting sustained declines in point of sale purchases.

The improvement from prior projections is a result of pandemic recovery and continued re-opening of the economy, and particularly notable in general consumer goods and restaurants and hospitality. Reduced restrictions on indoor dining and a return of visitors for work and travel resulted in large gains as compared to fiscal year 2020-21. Consumer spending in apparel, electronics, jewelry, and home furnishings have grown year over year. Sales tax from vehicle purchases is strong due to high demand along with inventory constraints, and tax from fuel sales has risen with higher prices and consumption. Despite rapid growth in fiscal year 2021-22, sales tax revenues are not projected to reach pre-pandemic levels until fiscal year 2025-26.

TABLE A-15

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Sales and Use Tax Revenues
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
General Fund
(000s)

Fiscal Year[1]	Tax Rate	City Share	Revenue	Change	
2017-18	8.50%	1.00%	$ 192,946	$ 3,473	1.8%
2018-19	8.50%	1.00%	213,625	20,679	10.7%
2019-20	8.50%	1.00%	180,184	(33,441)	-15.7%
2020-21	8.50%	1.00%	146,863	(33,321)	-18.5%
2021-22 *Projected*[2]	8.625%	1.00%	174,784	27,921	19.0%
2022-23 *budgeted*[3]	8.625%	1.00%	174,880	96	0.1%

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2017-18 through fiscal year 2020-21 are actuals. Figures for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 reflect the Final Budget, July 29, 2021.

[2] Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projection from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.

[3] Figure for fiscal year 2022-23 reflects the Final Budget from July 29, 2021.

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

Other Local Taxes

The City imposes a number of other general purpose taxes:

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

- Access Line Tax ("ALT") – A charge of $3.73 on every telecommunications line, $28.02 on every trunk line, and $504.40 on every high capacity line in the City. The ALT replaced the Emergency Response Fee ("ERF") in 2009. The tax is collected from telephone communications service subscribers by the telephone service supplier.

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

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

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

- Cannabis Tax – A gross receipts tax of 1% to 5% on marijuana business and permits the City to tax businesses that do not have a physical presence in the City. This measure was adopted by voters in November 2018 (Prop D). The tax was originally slated to go into effect on January 1, 2021, but the Board has delayed the imposition of the tax by one year twice. The cannabis tax will now take effect beginning January 1, 2023.

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

- Tax on Executive Pay – In November 2020, voters adopted Proposition L, a new tax on businesses in the City, where compensation of the businesses' highest-paid managerial employee compared to the median compensation paid to the businesses' employees based in the City exceeds a ratio of 100:1. The measure took effect on January 1, 2022 for tax year 2022, so revenues will not be received until fiscal year 2022-23. Revenue from this tax is expected to be highly volatile due to the narrow base of expected payers, annual fluctuations in the value and form of executive compensation, and tax-avoidance risk associated with tax increases. Estimates based on prior years' activity may not be predictive of future revenues.

Table A-16 reflects the City's actual tax receipts for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2020-21, projected amounts for fiscal year 2021-22 and Original Budget for fiscal year 2022-23.

As with the larger tax revenues described above, the City anticipates these sources will be impacted by the course of the COVID-19 pandemic and pace of economic recovery. Consistent with the Five-Year Plan from January 2022, the Six Month Report for fiscal year 2021-22 assumes growth in the City's revenue is largely driven by improvements in property tax, and sales tax-based State subventions, partially offset by weakness in business and hotel room tax, a pattern that continues into fiscal year 2022-23. See "CITY BUDGET - Five-Year Financial Plan" AND "Other Budget Updates" for a summary of the most recent projections.

TABLE A-16

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Other Local Taxes
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
General Fund
(000s)

Tax	2017-18 Actuals	2018-19 Actuals	2019-20 Actuals	2020-21 Actuals	2021-22 Project[1]	2022-23 Budget[2]
Utility Users Tax	$94,460	$93,918	$94,231	$81,367	$84,442	$83,700
Access Line Tax	51,255	48,058	49,570	44,700	50,160	51,260
Parking Tax	83,484	86,020	69,461	47,555	55,900	68,800
Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax	7,912	16,098	13,182	10,435	11,597	14,000
Stadium Admissions Tax	1,120	1,215	2,730	182	3,600	5,400
Cannabis Tax	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,800
Franchise Tax	16,869	15,640	16,028	14,898	14,250	13,950
Tax on Executive Pay	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60,000

[1] Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projection from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.
[2] Figure for 2022-23 reflect the Final Budget, July 29, 2021.

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

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES

State Subventions Based on Taxes

San Francisco receives allocations of State sales tax and Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenue for 1991 Health and Welfare Realignment, 2011 Public Safety Realignment, and Prop 172 Public Safety Sales Tax. These subventions fund programs that are substantially supported by the General Fund. See "GENERAL FUND REVENUES – Other City Tax Revenues - Sales and Use Tax" above.

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

- Public Safety Realignment (AB 109), enacted in early 2011, transfers responsibility for supervising certain kinds of felony offenders and state prison parolees from state prisons and parole agents to county jails and probation officers.

- State Proposition 172, passed by California voters in November 1993, provided for the continuation of a one-half percent sales tax for public safety expenditures. This revenue is a function of the City's proportionate share of Statewide sales activity. These revenues are allocated to counties by the State separately from the local one-percent sales tax discussed above. Disbursements are made to counties based on the county ratio, which is the county's percent share of total statewide sales taxes in the most recent calendar year.

Table A-17 reflects the City's actual receipts for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2020-21, Six Month Budget and Status Report projection for fiscal year 2021-22 and Original Budget for fiscal year 2022-23. State-wide sales tax has performed better than local sales tax and is expected to recover faster than the City's sales tax; therefore, formula-driven subventions are expected to grow faster than local sales tax. The State of California temporarily backfilled county realignment revenues in fiscal year 2020-21. The value of this backfill to the City is $28.0 million.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-17

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Selected State Subventions - All Funds
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
($millions)

Tax	2017-18 Actuals	2018-19 Actuals	2019-20 Actuals	2020-21 Actuals	2021-22 Projected[1]	2022-23 Final Budget[2]
Health and Welfare Realignment						
General Fund	$197.9	$217.6	$219.6	$188.9	$266.3	$240.6
Hospital Fund	57.3	58.5	54.1	48.1	69.1	54.3
Total - Health and Welfare	**$255.2**	**$276.1**	**$273.7**	**$237.1**	**$335.4**	**$294.9**
Backfill Realignment[3]						
General Fund				$22.1		
Non General Fund				6.0		
Total - Backfill Realignment				**$28.0**		
Public Safety Realignment (General Fund)	$37.4	$39.4	$41.1	$38.4	$58.8	$54.3
Public Safety Sales Tax (Prop 172) (General Fund)	$104.8	$107.6	$103.9	$105.0	$91.5	$80.4

1 Figure for fiscal year 2021-22 reflects projection from the Six-Month Budget and Status Report, February 15, 2022.

2 Figure for fiscal year 2022-23 reflect the Final Budget from July 29, 2021.

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

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

CITY GENERAL FUND PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

General Fund Expenditures by Major Service Area

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

TABLE A-18

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Expenditures by Major Service Area
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
(000s)

Major Service Areas	2017-18 Final Budget	2018-19 Final Budget	2019-20 Final Budget	2020-21 Final Budget	2021-22 Original Budget[1]	2022-23 Original Budget[1]
Public Protection	$1,316,870	$1,390,266	$1,493,240	$1,505,780	$1,507,122	$1,549,264
Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development	1,047,458	1,120,892	1,270,530	218,986	1,418,406	1,342,466
Community Health	832,663	967,113	1,065,051	1,605,573	1,056,459	1,063,063
General Administration & Finance	259,916	290,274	332,296	1,158,599	497,915	414,607
Culture & Recreation	142,081	154,056	161,274	147,334	220,866	186,718
General City Responsibilities	114,219	172,028	137,851	332,997	243,733	238,766
Public Works, Transportation & Commerce	238,564	214,928	216,824	126,993	236,525	199,350
Total[2]	$3,951,771	$4,309,557	$4,677,066	$5,096,262	$5,181,026	$4,994,234

[1] Figures for fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23 from the Final Budget, July 29, 2021.

[3] Total may not add due to rounding.

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

Public Protection primarily includes the Police Department, the Fire Department and the Sheriff's Office. Human Welfare & Neighborhood Development includes the Department of Human Services' aid assistance, aid payments, and City grant programs. Community Health includes the Public Health Department, which also operates San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital.

For budgetary purposes, enterprise funds (which are not shown on the table above) are characterized as either self-supported funds or General Fund-supported funds. General Fund-supported funds include the Convention Facility Fund, the Cultural and Recreation Film Fund, the Gas Tax Fund, the Golf Fund, the General Hospital Fund, and the Laguna Honda Hospital Fund. These funds are supported by transfers from the General Fund to the extent their dedicated revenue streams are insufficient to support the desired level of services.

Voter-Mandated Spending Requirements

The Charter requires funding for voter-mandated spending requirements, which are also referred to as "baselines," "set-asides," or "mandates". The chart below identifies the required and budgeted levels of funding for key mandates. The spending requirements are formula-driven, variously based on projected aggregate General Fund discretionary revenue, property tax revenues, total budgeted spending, staffing levels, or population growth. Table A-19 reflects fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23 spending requirements in the Original Budget. These mandates are generally budgeted as transfers out of the General Fund or allocations of property tax revenue.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-19

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Baselines & Set-Asides
FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23
($millions)

	2021-22 Original Budget[1]	2022-23 Original Budget[1]
Projected General Fund Aggregate Discretionary Revenue (ADR)	***$3,847.5***	***$4,355.2***
Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)		
MTA - Municipal Railway Baseline: 6.686% ADR	$268.9	$307.7
MTA - Parking & Traffic Baseline: 2.507% ADR	96.5	109.2
MTA - Population Adjustment	57.6	59.8
MTA - 80% Parking Tax In-Lieu	44.7	55.0
Subtotal - MTA	**$467.7**	**$531.7**
Library Preservation Fund		
Library - Baseline: 2.286% ADR	$87.9	$99.6
Library - Property Tax: $0.025 per $100 Net Assessed Valuation (NAV)	68.9	71.9
Subtotal - Library	**$156.9**	**$171.5**
Children's Services		
Children's Services Baseline - Requirement: 4.830% ADR	*$185.8*	*$210.3*
Children's Services Baseline - Eligible Items Budgeted	223.1	210.4
Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Requirement: 0.580% ADR	*22.3*	*25.3*
Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Eligible Items Budgeted	36.2	36.2
Public Education Services Baseline: 0.290% ADR	10.4	11.2
Children and Youth Fund Property Tax Set-Aside: $0.0375-0.4 per $100 NAV	110.3	115.1
Public Education Enrichment Fund: 3.057% ADR	*117.6*	*133.1*
1/3 Annual Contribution to Preschool for All	39.2	44.4
2/3 Annual Contribution to SF Unified School District	78.4	88.8
Subtotal - Children's Services	**$497.6**	**$506.0**
Recreation and Parks		
Open Space Property Tax Set-Aside: $0.025 per $100 NAV	$68.9	$71.9
Recreation & Parks Baseline - Requirement	79.2	82.2
Recreation & Parks Baseline - Budgeted	93.5	85.9
Subtotal - Recreation and Parks	**$162.4**	**$157.8**
Other		
Housing Trust Fund Requirement	$42.4	$45.2
Housing Trust Fund Budget	60.0	45.2
Dignity Fund	53.1	56.1
Street Tree Maintenance Fund: 0.5154% ADR	19.8	22.4
Municipal Symphony Baseline: $0.00125 per $100 NAV	3.7	3.9
City Services Auditor: 0.2% of Citywide Budget	23.4	22.3
Subtotal - Other	**$160.1**	**$149.9**
Recently Adopted Expenditure Requirements		
Our City, Our Home Baseline Requirement (Nov 2018 Prop C)	*215.0*	*215.0*
Our City, Our Home Budget, Estimated	324.0	337.2
Early Care and Education Baseline Requirement (June 2018 Prop C)	*85.1*	*96.3*
Early Care and Education Budget	91.3	96.5
Total Baselines and Set-Asides	**$1,860.0**	**$1,950.6**

[1] Figures for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 reflect the Final Budget from July 29, 2021.

EMPLOYMENT COSTS; POST-EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS

The cost of salaries and benefits for City employees represents slightly less than half of the City's expenditures, totaling $6.0 billion and $6.2 billion in fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 in the Original Budget. For the General Fund, the combined salary and benefits original budget is $2.8 billion and $2.9 billion in fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 in the Original Budget.

This section discusses the organization of City workers into bargaining units, the status of employment contracts, and City expenditures on employee-related costs including salaries, wages, medical benefits, retirement benefits and the City's retirement system, and post-employment health and medical benefits. Employees of SF Unified School District ("SFUSD"), SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court, called Trial Court below, are not City employees.

Labor Relations

The City's Original Budget for fiscal year 2021-22 included 38,551 full-time and part-time budgeted and funded City positions. City workers are represented by 36 different labor unions. The largest unions in the City are the Service Employees International Union, Local 1021 ("SEIU"), the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21 ("IFPTE"), and the unions representing police, fire, deputy sheriffs, and transit workers.

Wages, hours and working conditions of City employees are determined by collective bargaining pursuant to State law (the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, California Government Code Sections 3500-3511) and the City Charter. San Francisco is unusual among California's cities and counties in that nearly all of its employees, including managerial and executive-level employees, are represented by labor organizations.

Further, the City Charter requires binding arbitration to resolve negotiations in the event of impasse. If impasse is reached, the parties are required to convene a tripartite arbitration panel, chaired by an impartial third-party arbitrator, which sets the disputed terms of the new agreement. The award of the arbitration panel is final and binding. This process applies to all City employees except Nurses and a small group of unrepresented employees. Wages, hours and working conditions of nurses are not subject to interest arbitration but are subject to Charter-mandated economic limits. Since 1976, no City employees have participated in a union-authorized strike, which is prohibited by the Charter.

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

In May 2019, the City negotiated three-year agreements (for fiscal years 2019-20 through 2021-22) with 27 labor unions. This includes the largest unions in the City such as SEIU, IFPTE, Laborers Internationals, Local 261, Consolidated Crafts Coalition, and Municipal Executive Association ("MEA"). For the fiscal year 2019-20, the parties agreed to wage increases of 3% on July 1, 2019 and 1% on December 28, 2019. For fiscal year 2020-21, the parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2020 and 0.5% on December 26, 2020, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2020-21 increase by six months if the City's deficit for fiscal year 2020-21, as projected in the 2020 March Joint Report, exceeded $200 million. Because the 2020 March Joint Report projected a deficit for fiscal year 2020-21 in excess of $200 million, the scheduled wage increases as described above for July 1, 2020 and December 26, 2020 were each delayed by approximately six months.

Also, in May 2019, the MTA negotiated three-year agreements (for fiscal years 2019-20 through 2021-22) with the unions that represent Transit Operators, Mechanics, Station Agents, Parking Control Officers and others. The parties agreed to the same wage increase schedule as the City, with the same wage deferral triggers.

For fiscal year 2021-22, the parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2021 and 0.5% on January 8, 2022, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2021-22 increase by six months if the City's deficit for fiscal year 2021-22, as projected in the 2021 March Joint Report, exceeded $200 million. The scheduled July 1, 2021 wage increase was implemented as the 2021 March Joint Report did not project a $200 million deficit. For fiscal year 2021-22, the unrepresented employee ordinance was passed approving a wage increase of 3%.

In September 2020, the City negotiated MOU extensions with labor organizations representing sworn members of Fire and Police departments. These MOUs have been extended two years to now expire on June 30, 2023. The parties agreed to the 3.00% General Wage increase previously deferred until December 26, 2020 to be deferred over fiscal year 2021-22 and fiscal year 2022-23, with full restoration of the 3% by close of business on June 30, 2023. For fiscal year 2021-22, the parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2021, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2021-22 increase by six months if the City's deficit for fiscal year 2021-22, as projected in the 2021 March Joint Report, exceeded $200 million. For fiscal year 2022-23, the parties agreed to a wage increase schedule of 3% on July 1, 2022, with a provision to delay the fiscal year 2022-23 increase by six months if the City's deficit for fiscal year 2022-23, as projected in the 2022 March Joint Report, exceeded $200 million.

In the Spring of 2022 the City commenced bargaining successor MOUs The City is required to submit labor agreements to the Board of Supervisors by May 15, so the fiscal impact of the agreements can be incorporated in the Mayor's proposed June 1 budget.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-20

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (All Funds)
Employee Organizations as of September 1 ,2021

Organization	City Budgeted Positions	Expiration Date of MOU
Automotive Machinists, Local 1414	515	30-Jun-22
Bricklayers, Local 3	6	30-Jun-22
Building Inspectors' Association	87	30-Jun-22
Carpenters, Local 22	115	30-Jun-22
Carpet, Linoleum & Soft Tile	4	30-Jun-22
Cement Masons, Local 300	43	30-Jun-22
Deputy Probation Officers' Association (DPOA)	131	30-Jun-22
Deputy Sheriffs' Association (DSA)	804	30-Jun-22
Electrical Workers, Local 6	975	30-Jun-22
Firefighters' Association, Local 798	1,951	30-Jun-23
Glaziers, Local 718	14	30-Jun-22
Hod Carriers, Local 36	4	30-Jun-22
Ironworkers, Local 377	14	30-Jun-22
Laborers, Local 261	1,180	30-Jun-22
Municipal Attorneys' Association (MAA)	481	30-Jun-22
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Fire	12	30-Jun-23
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Miscellaneous	1,557	30-Jun-22
Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) Police	16	30-Jun-23
Operating Engineers, Local 3 Miscellaneous	68	30-Jun-22
Operating Engineers, Local 3 Supervising Probation	31	30-Jun-22
Pile Drivers, Local 34	27	30-Jun-22
Plumbers, Local 38	363	30-Jun-22
Police Officers' Association (POA)	2,328	30-Jun-23
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21	6,746	30-Jun-22
Roofers, Local 40	12	30-Jun-22
SEIO, Local 1021, H-1	1	30-Jun-22
SEIU, Local 1021 Misc	13,008	30-Jun-22
SEIU, Local 1021 Nurses	1,769	30-Jun-22
SF City Workers United	133	30-Jun-22
SFDA Investigators Association	45	30-Jun-22
Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104	39	30-Jun-22
Sheriffs' Supervisory and Management Association (MSA)	118	30-Jun-22
Stationary Engineers, Local 39	695	30-Jun-22
Teamsters, Local 853	188	30-Jun-22
Teamsters, Local 856, Multi	100	30-Jun-22
Teamsters, Local 856, Supervising Nurses	132	30-Jun-22
Theatrical Stage Emp, Local 16	29	30-Jun-22
TWU, Local 200	427	30-Jun-22
TWU, Local 250-A, Auto Service Work	145	30-Jun-22
TWU, Local 250-A, Miscellaneous	110	30-Jun-22
TWU, Local 250-A, Transit Fare Inspectors	45	30-Jun-22
TWU, Local 250-A, Transit Operator	2,720	30-Jun-22
Union of American Physicians and Dentists (UAPD)	205	30-Jun-22
Unrepresented Employees	89	30-Jun-22
Other	1071	
	38,551	

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

History and Administration

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

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

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

Membership

Retirement System members include eligible employees of the City, SFUSD, SFCCD, and the San Francisco Trial Courts. The Retirement System estimates that the total active membership as of July 1, 2021 is 44,770, compared to 45,070 as of July 1, 2020. Active membership as of July 1, 2021 includes 10,066 terminated vested members and 1,060 reciprocal members. Terminated vested members are former employees who have vested rights in future benefits from SFERS. Reciprocal members are individuals who have established membership in a reciprocal pension plan such as CalPERS and may be eligible to receive a reciprocal pension from the Retirement System in the future. Monthly retirement allowances are paid to approximately 30,854 retired members and beneficiaries. Benefit recipients include retired members, vested members receiving a vesting allowance, and qualified survivors.

Table A-21 shows various member counts in the total Retirement System (City, SFUSD, SFCCD, and San Francisco Trial Courts) as of the five most recent actuarial valuation dates, July 1, 2017 through July 1, 2021. The number of retirees supported by each active member can be an important indicator of growing plan maturity and sensitivity to investment returns, assumption changes, and other changes to the System. In particular, if the ratio of retirees to active members grows, it indicates that any losses on retiree liabilities or assets are likely to place a relatively greater burden on employers and active members. The ratio for SFERS had been relatively stable but increased modestly in 2021 with the decline in number of active members.

TABLE A-21

City and County of San Francisco
Employees' Retirement System
July 1, 2017 through July 1, 2021

As of July 1st	Active Members	Vested Members	Reciprocal Members	Total Non-retired	Retirees/ Continuants		Retiree to Active Ratio
2017	33,447	7,381	1,039	41,867	29,127	*	0.871
2018	33,946	8,123	1,060	43,129	29,965	*	0.883
2019	34,202	8,911	1,044	44,157	29,490		0.862
2020	34,521	9,478	1,071	45,070	30,128		0.873
2021	33,644	10,066	1,060	44,770	30,854		0.917

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

Notes: Member counts are for the entire Retirement System and include non-City employees.
*Retiree member counts reflect combining records for members who have both a Safety and a Miscellaneous benefit.

Funding Practices

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

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

At the December 9, 2020 Retirement Board meeting, the Board adopted all recommended demographic assumptions from the experience study dated August 12, 2020. The most significant adjustment was the update to the new Society of Actuaries public plan mortality tables, Pub-2010, for both general and safety members. The Board also adopted lower price and wage inflation rates, from 2.75% to 2.50% and from 3.50% to 3.25%, respectively. The new assumptions were first effective for the July 1, 2020 actuarial valuation. At the November 10, 2021 Board meeting, the Board lowered the assumed long-term investment earnings assumption from 7.40% to 7.20% , effective for the July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation. In the short term, this decrease is expected to result in increases in City contributions. In the long term, the true cost of a pension plan is determined by actual results and not by assumptions.

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

Prospective purchasers of the City's debt obligations should carefully review and assess the assumptions regarding the performance of the Retirement System. Audited financials and actuarial reports may be found on the Retirement System's website, www.mysfers.org, under Publications. The information on such website is not incorporated herein by reference. There is a risk that actual results will differ significantly from assumptions. In addition, prospective purchasers of the City's debt obligations are cautioned that the information and assumptions speak only as of the respective dates contained in the underlying source documents and are therefore subject to change.

Employer Contribution History and Annual Valuations

Fiscal year 2020-21 City employer contributions to the Retirement System were $791.7 million, which includes $388.4 million from the General Fund. For fiscal year 2021-22, total City employer contributions to the Retirement System were budgeted at $726.8 million, which included $334.3 million from the General Fund. These budgeted amounts were based upon the fiscal year 2021-22 employer contribution rate of 24.4% (estimated to be 20.2% after the 2011 Proposition C cost-sharing provisions). The fiscal year 2022-23 employer contribution rate is 21.35% (estimated to be 18.76% after cost-sharing). The decrease reflects the first year of a five-year smoothing of the 2020-2021 asset return gain offset by the drop in assumed investment return from 7.4% to 7.2% and the July 1, 2021 supplemental COLA to all retired members and their beneficiaries. Employer contribution rates anticipate annual increases in pensionable payroll of 3.5%. As discussed under "City Budget – Five-Year Financial Plan" increases in retirement costs are projected in the City's Five Year Financial Plan.

Table A-22 shows total Retirement System liabilities, assets and percent funded for the last five actuarial valuations as well as contributions for the fiscal years 2016-17 through 2020-21. Information is shown for all employers in the Retirement System (City & County, SFUSD, SFCCD and San Francisco Trial Courts). "Actuarial Liability" reflects the actuarial accrued liability of the Retirement System measured for purposes of determining the funding contribution. "Market Value of Assets" reflects the fair market value of assets held in trust for payment of pension benefits. "Actuarial Value of Assets" refers to the plan assets with investment returns different than expected smoothed over five years to provide a more stable contribution rate. The "Market Percent Funded" column is determined by dividing the market value of assets by the actuarial accrued liability. The "Actuarial Percent Funded" column is determined by dividing the actuarial value of assets by the actuarial accrued liability. "Employee and Employer Contributions" reflects the sum of mandated employee and employer contributions received by the Retirement System in the fiscal year ended June 30 prior to the July 1 valuation date.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-22

City and County of San Francisco
Employees' Retirement System
Fiscal Years 2016-17 through 2020-21
(000s)

As of July 1st	Actuarial Liability	Market Value of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Market Percent Funded	Actuarial Percent Funded	Employee & Employer Contributions in prior FY	Employer Contribution Rates[1] in prior FY
2017	$ 25,706,090	$ 22,410,350	$ 22,185,244	87.2%	86.3%	$ 868,653	21.40%
2018	27,335,417	24,557,966	23,866,028	89.8%	87.3%	983,763	23.46%
2019	28,798,581	26,078,649	25,247,549	90.6%	87.7%	1,026,036	23.31%
2020	29,499,918	26,620,218	26,695,844	90.2%	90.5%	1,143,634	25.19%
2021	31,905,275	35,673,834	30,043,222	111.8%	94.2%	1,245,957	26.90%

[1] Employer contribution rates are shown prior to employer/employee cost-sharing provisions of 2011 Proposition C.

Employer contribution rates for fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 are 24.41% and 21.35%, respectively.

Sources: SFERS' audited year-end financial statements and required supplemental information.
SFERS' annual Actuarial Valuation Report dated July 1st. See the Retirement System's website, mysfers.org, under Publications.
The information on the website is not incorporated herein by reference.

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

As shown in the table above as of July 2021, the Market Percent Funded ratio was much higher than the Actuarial Percent Funded ratio. The Retirement System's investment portfolio had a 33.7% return during fiscal year 2020-21, the highest fiscal return in the System's history. The July 1, 2021 actuarial value of assets only reflects 20% of this high return. Returns in fiscal year 2021-22 through March 31, 2022, were 2.72%. Global markets remain volatile due to continued uncertainty about tighter monetary policy, inflation, and the effect of the war in Ukraine. Even so, the large gap between market value of assets and actuarial value of assets provides a cushion for future adverse experience. Employer contribution rates are anticipated to continue to decline in the next few years.

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

Risks to City's Retirement Plan

In its 2021 actuarial report, Cheiron identified three primary risks to the System as required by Actuarial Standards of Practice No. 51 (Assessment and Disclosure of Risk Associated with Measuring Pension Obligations and Determining Pension Plan Contributions). The material risks identified were as follows: investment risk, interest rate risk, and supplemental COLA risk. Investment risk is the potential for investment returns to be different than expected, while interest rate risk is the potential for longer-term trends to impact economic assumptions such as inflation and wage increases but particularly the discount rate. Supplemental COLA risk is the potential for the cost of future Supplemental COLAs to increase contribution rates.

Supplemental COLAs are mandated by the Charter when investment returns exceed expectations. Certain groups of retirees may not receive a supplemental COLA unless the pension plan is deemed to be fully funded on a market value basis. Due to the large fiscal year 2020-21 return, the plan was deemed to be fully funded on June 30, 2021 and all members in annuitant status received a supplemental COLA effective July 1, 2021. Supplemental COLAs are capped at 3.5% less any basic COLA. As the majority of retirees have annual basic COLAs capped at 2.0%, a Supplemental COLA when granted typically represents a 1.5% increase in benefit.

Cheiron noted stress testing the supplemental COLA provision shows that the current funding policy of amortizing new supplemental COLAs over five years manages the risk prudently.

Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") Disclosures

The Retirement System discloses accounting and financial reporting information under GASB Statement No. 67, *Financial Reporting for Pension Plans*. The City discloses accounting and financial information about the Retirement System under GASB Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*. In general, the City's funding of its pension obligations is not affected by the GASB 68 reporting of the City's pension liability. Funding requirements are specified in the City Charter and are described in "Funding Practices" above.

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

Table A-23 below shows for the five most recent fiscal years the collective Total Pension Liability, Plan Fiduciary Net Position (market value of assets), and Net Pension Liability for all employers who sponsor the Retirement System. The City's audited financial statements disclose only its own proportionate share of the Net Pension Liability and other required GASB 68 disclosures.

TABLE A-23

City and County of San Francisco
Employees' Retirement System
GASB 67/68 Disclosures
Fiscal Years 2016-17 through 2020-21
(000s)

As of June 30th	Collective Total Pension Liability (TPL)	Discount Rate	Plan Fiduciary Net Position	Plan Net Position as % of TPL	Collective Net Pension Liability (NPL)	City and County's Proportionate Share of NPL
2017	$27,403,715	7.50	$22,410,350	81.8	$4,993,365	$4,697,131
2018	28,840,673	7.50	24,557,966	85.2	4,282,707	4,030,207
2019	30,555,289	7.40	26,078,649	85.3	4,476,640	4,213,807
2020	32,031,018	7.40	26,620,218	83.1	5,410,800	5,107,271
2021	33,088,765	7.40	35,673,834	107.8	(2,585,069)	(2,446,563)

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

NPL can be quite volatile. The increase in NPL between fiscal year-ends 2018 and 2019 is attributable to the decline in discount rate from 7.5% to 7.4%, while the increase in NPL at fiscal year-end 2020 is due to lower than expected investment returns during fiscal year 2019-2020. The large decline at fiscal year-end 2021 is due to the 33.7% investment portfolio return during the year.

Asset Management

The assets of the Retirement System, (the "Fund") are invested in a broadly diversified manner across the institutional global capital markets. In addition to U.S. equities and fixed income securities, the Fund holds international equities, global sovereign and corporate debt, global public and private real estate and an array of alternative investments including private equity and venture capital limited partnerships.

Annualized investment return (net of fees and expenses) for the Retirement System for the five years ending June 30, 2020 was 7.25%. For the ten-year and twenty-year periods ending June 30, 2020, annualized investment returns were 9.39% and 6.05% respectively.

The investments, their allocation, transactions and proxy votes are regularly reviewed by the Retirement Board and monitored by an internal staff of investment professionals who in turn are advised by external consultants who are specialists in the areas of investments detailed above. A description of the Retirement System's investment policy, a description of asset allocation targets and current investments, and the Annual Report of the Retirement System are available upon request from the Retirement System by writing to the San Francisco Retirement System, 1145 Market Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, or by calling (415) 487-7000. These documents are not incorporated herein by reference.

2011 Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan

The levels of SFERS plan benefits are established under the Charter and approved directly by the voters, rather than through the collective bargaining process. Changes to retirement benefits require a voter-approved Charter amendment. The most recent amendment, Proposition C, was approved by voters in November 2011 to reduce future pension costs and introduced new benefit tiers effective for employees hired on and after January 7, 2012.

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

Impact on the Retirement System from Changes in the Economic Environment

As of June 30, 2021, the audited market value of Retirement System assets was $35.7 billion. As of January 31, 2022, the unaudited value of the System assets was $35.8 billion. These values represent, as of the date specified, the estimated value of the Retirement System's portfolio if it were liquidated on that date. The Retirement System cannot be certain of the value of certain of its portfolio assets and, accordingly, the market value of the portfolio could be lower or higher. Moreover, appraisals for classes of assets that are not publicly traded are based on estimates which typically lag changes in actual market value by three to six months. Representations of market valuations are audited at each fiscal year end as part of the annual audit of the Retirement System's financial statements.

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

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

Other Employee Retirement Benefits

As noted above, various City employees are members of CalPERS, an agent multiple-employer public employee defined benefit plan for safety members and a cost-sharing multiple-employer plan for miscellaneous members. The City makes certain payments to CalPERS in respect of such members, at rates determined by the CalPERS board. Section A8.510 of the Charter requires the City to pay the full amount required by the actuarial valuations. The actual total employer contributions to CalPERS were $45.6 million in fiscal year 2020-21. In addition to the required amounts, the City elected to pay an additional amount of $8.4 million in fiscal years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-2020 and $5.0 million in fiscal year 2021-22 in order to reduce its unfunded liability. A discussion of other post-employment benefits, including retiree medical benefits, is provided below under "Medical Benefits – Post-Employment Health Care Benefits" and "GASB 75 Reporting Requirements."

Medical Benefits

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

Medical and COBRA benefits for eligible active City employees and eligible dependents, for retired City employees and eligible dependents, and for surviving spouses and domestic partners of covered City employees (the "City Beneficiaries") are administered by the San Francisco Health Service System (the "San Francisco Health Service System" or "SFHSS") pursuant to City Charter Sections 12.200 *et seq.* and A8.420 *et seq.* Pursuant to such Charter Sections, the SFHSS also administers medical benefits to active and retired employees of SFUSD, SFCCD and the San Francisco Superior Court; however, the City is only required to fund medical benefits for City Beneficiaries.

The San Francisco Health Service System is overseen by the City's Health Service Board (the "Health Service Board"). The plans (the "SFHSS Medical Plans") for providing medical care to the City Beneficiaries are determined annually by the Health Service Board and approved by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Charter Section A8.422.

The San Francisco Health Service System oversees a trust fund (the "Health Service System Trust Fund") established pursuant to Charter Sections 12.203 and A8.428 through which medical benefits for the City Beneficiaries are funded. The San Francisco Health Service System issues an annual, publicly available, independently-audited financial report that includes financial statements for the Health Service Trust Fund. This report may be obtained through the SFHSS website at sfhss.org, by writing to the San Francisco Health Service System, 1145 Market Street, Third Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, or by calling (628)

652-4646. Audited annual financial statements for prior years are posted to the SFHSS website, however the information available on the SFHSS website is not incorporated in this Official Statement by reference.

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

Determination of Employer and Employee Contributions for Medical Benefits

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

Unions representing approximately 93.3% of City employees, negotiate through collective bargaining rather than applying the "average contribution" to determine the amount the City is required to contribute for active employees. To the extent annual medical premiums exceed the contributions made by the City as required by the Charter and union agreements, such excess must be paid by SFHSS Beneficiaries. Medical benefits for City Beneficiaries who are retired or otherwise not employed by the City (e.g., surviving spouses and surviving domestic partners of City retirees) ("Nonemployee City Beneficiaries") are funded through contributions from such Nonemployee City Beneficiaries and the City as determined pursuant to Charter Section A8.428. The San Francisco Health Service System medical benefit eligibility requirements for Nonemployee City Beneficiaries are described below under "– *Post-Employment Health Care Benefits."*

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

City Contribution for Retirees

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

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

Health Care Reform

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

Three ACA taxes impact SFHSS rates for medical coverage. The taxes and the current status are as follow:

- **Excise Tax on High-cost Employer-sponsored Health Plans**
  The Excise Tax on High-cost Employer-sponsored Health Plans (Cadillac Tax) is a 40% excise tax on high-cost coverage health plans. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 repealed the Cadillac tax, effective January 1, 2020.

- **Health Insurance Tax ("HIT")**
  The ACA also imposed a tax on health insurance providers, which was passed on to employer sponsored fully-insured plans in the form of higher premiums. The HIT was in effect in 2020 and substantially impacted rates. The tax was repealed effective January 1, 2021 also by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

- **Medical Device Excise Tax**
  The ACA's medical device excise tax imposes a 2.3 percent tax on sales of medical devices (except certain devices sold at retail). The tax was repealed effective January 1, 2020.

- **Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) Fee**
  Congress revived and extended the PCORI fee, which had expired in 2019. The PCORI fee, adopted in the ACA, is paid by issuers of health insurance policies and plan sponsors of self-insured health plans to help fund the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute. The fee is based on the average number of lives covered under the policy or plan. The fee will now apply to policy or plan years ending on or after October 1, 2012, and before October 1, 2029.

Employer Contributions for San Francisco Health Service System Benefits

For fiscal year 2020-21, based on the most recent audited financial statements, the San Francisco Health Service System received approximately $853.8 million from participating employers for San Francisco Health Service System benefit costs. Of this total, the City contributed approximately $735.6 million; approximately $236.6 million of this $735.6 million amount was for health care benefits for approximately 23,201 retired City employees and their eligible dependents, and approximately $499 million was for benefits for approximately 32,956 active City employees and their eligible dependents.

The 2022 aggregate (employee and employer) cost of medical benefits offered by SFHSS to the City increased by 2.16%, which is below national trends of 5.5% to 6%. This can be attributed to several factors including aggressive contracting by SFHSS that maintains competition among the City's vendors, implementing Accountable Care Organizations that reduced utilization and increased use of generic prescription rates and changing the City's Blue Shield plan from a fully-funded to a flex-funded product and implementing a narrow network. Flex-funding allows lower premiums to be set by the City's actuarial consultant, Aon, 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 2022 aggregate cost of benefits offered by SFHSS to the City increased 1.28% which is also less than the national trends.

Post-Employment Health Care Benefits

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 these employees equal to 2% of their salary, with the City contributing an additional 1%, into a Retiree Health Care Trust Fund.

Under Proposition C, passed by San Francisco voters in November of 2011, employees hired on or before January 9, 2009, were required to contribute 0.25% of compensation into the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund beginning in fiscal year 2016-17. This contribution increased to 0.50% in fiscal year 2017-18, 0.75% in fiscal year 2018-19, and reached the maximum contribution of 1.00% in fiscal year 2019-20. These contributions are matched by the City on a one-to-one basis.

Unlike employee pension contributions that are made to individual accounts, contributions to the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund are non-refundable, even if an employee separates from the City and does not receive retiree health care from the City.

Proposition A, passed by San Francisco voters on November 5, 2013, restricted the City's ability to withdraw funds from the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund. The restrictions allow payments from the fund only when certain conditions are met. The balance in the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund as of June 30, 2019 is approximately $366.6 million. The City will continue to monitor and update its actuarial valuations of liability as required under GASB 75.

GASB 75 Reporting Requirements

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

City's Estimated Liability

The City is required by GASB 75 to prepare a new actuarial study of its postemployment benefits obligation at least once every two years. As of the measurement date of June 30, 2020 (issued December 2021), used in the most recent actuarial valuation report updated June 30, 2020, the retiree health care fiduciary plan net position as a percentage of the total OPEB liability was 11.3%. This reflects the net position of the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund in the amount of $489.0 million divided by the total OPEB liability of $4.3 billion. The estimated covered payroll (annual payroll of active employees covered by the plan) was $3.95 billion, and the ratio of the Net OPEB liability to the covered payroll was 96.7%.

While GASB 75 does not require funding of the annual OPEB cost, any differences between the amount funded in a year and the annual OPEB cost are recorded as increases or decreases in the net OPEB liability. Five-year trend information is displayed in Table A-24, which reflects the annual OPEB expense and the City's charter mandated payments on a percentage basis. For example, for fiscal year 2020-21 the annual OPEB expense was $320.7 million, and the City paid $246.0 million, which includes "pay-as-you-go" benefit payments and contributions to the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund.

TABLE A-24

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Five-year Trend
Fiscal Years 2015-16 to 2020-21
(000s)

Fiscal Year	Annual OPEB	Percentage of Annual OPEB Cost Funded	Net OPEB Obligation
2015-16	$326,133	51.8%	$2,147,434
2016-17	421,402	43.6%	2,384,938
2017-18	355,186	57.4%	3,717,209 [1]
2018-19	320,331	68.2%	3,600,967
2019-20	330,673	71.4%	3,915,815 [2]
2020-21	320,684	76.7%	3,823,335

1 Starting in FY2017-18, the liability amount reflects what is referred to as Net OPEB Liability due to the implementation of GASB Statement No. 75.

2 Fiscal Year 2019-20 figures are unaudited.

Total City Employee Benefits Costs

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

Table A-25 below provides a summary of the City's employee benefit actual costs for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2020-21 and budgeted costs for fiscal years 2021-22 through 2022-23.

TABLE A-25

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Employee Benefit Costs, All Funds
Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2022-23
(000s)

	2017-18 Actual[1]	2018-19 Actual[1]	2019-20 Actual[1]	2020-21 Actual[1]	2021-22 Budget[4]	2022-23 Budget[4]
SFERS and PERS Retirement Contributions	$621,055	$650,011	$759,933	$823,317	$766,968	$747,585
Social Security & Medicare	$212,782	$219,176	$231,557	$229,044	$250,776	$258,764
Health - Medical + Dental, active employees [2]	$501,831	$522,006	$555,780	$564,453	$585,439	$622,087
Health - Retiree Medical [2]	$178,378	$186,677	$196,641	$216,916	$225,025	$236,951
Other Benefits [3]	$44,564	$26,452	$28,493	$24,111	$23,410	$23,937
Total Benefit Costs	$1,558,609	$1,604,322	$1,772,403	$1,857,841	$1,851,618	$1,889,324

[1] Fiscal year 2017-18 through fiscal year 2020-21 figures are actuals.
[2] Does not include Health Service System administrative costs. Does include flexible benefits that may be used for health insurance.
[3] "Other Benefits" includes unemployment insurance premiums, life insurance and other miscellaneous employee benefits.
[4] Reflects Final Adopted Budget for 2021-22 and 2022-23.
Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.

INVESTMENT OF CITY FUNDS

Investment Pool

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

Investment Policy

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

The Investment Policy is reviewed and monitored annually by a Treasury Oversight Committee established by the Board of Supervisors. The Treasury Oversight Committee meets quarterly and is comprised of members drawn from (a) the Treasurer; (b) the Controller; (c) a representative appointed by the Board of Supervisors; (d) the County Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee; (e) the Chancellor of the Community College District or his/her designee; and (f) Members of the general public. A complete copy of the Treasurer's Investment Policy, dated May 2021, is included as an Appendix to this Official Statement.

Investment Portfolio

As of January 31, 2022, the City's surplus investment fund consisted of the investments classified in Table A-26 and had the investment maturity distribution presented in Table A-27.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-26

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Portfolio
Pooled Funds
As of January 31, 2022

Type of Investment	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	$4,725,000,000	$4,747,762,985	$4,656,908,900
Federal Agencies	4,869,925,000	4,874,111,222	4,828,911,470
Public Time Deposits	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	2,195,000,000	2,195,000,000	2,194,800,278
Commercial Paper	535,000,000	534,218,715	534,292,151
Money Market Funds	814,137,972	814,137,972	814,137,972
Supranationals	488,543,000	496,703,792	487,064,047
Total	$13,667,605,972	$13,701,934,686	$13,556,114,817

January Earned Income Yield: 0.540%

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

TABLE A-27

City and County of San Francisco
Investment Maturity Distribution
Pooled Funds
As of January 31, 2022

Maturity in Months			Par Value	Percentage
0	to	1	$1,369,837,972	10.02%
1	to	2	809,425,000	5.92%
2	to	3	504,550,000	3.69%
3	to	4	655,000,000	4.79%
4	to	5	1,483,735,000	10.86%
5	to	6	350,000,000	2.56%
6	to	12	959,527,000	7.02%
12	to	24	2,224,222,000	16.27%
24	to	36	1,643,534,000	12.03%
36	to	48	1,982,775,000	14.51%
48	to	60	1,685,000,000	12.33%
			$13,667,605,972	100.00%

Weighted Average Maturity: 631 Days

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

Further Information

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

CAPITAL FINANCING AND BONDS

Capital Plan

In October 2005, the Board of Supervisors adopted, and the Mayor approved, Ordinance No. 216-05, which established a new capital planning process for the City. The legislation requires that the City develop and adopt a 10-year capital expenditure plan for City-owned facilities and infrastructure. It also created the Capital Planning Committee ("CPC") and the Capital Planning Program ("CPP"). The CPC makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on the City's capital expenditures and plans. The CPC reviews and submits the Capital Plan, Capital Budget, and issuances of long-term debt for approval. The CPC is chaired by the City Administrator and includes the President of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor's Budget Director, the Controller, the City Planning Director, the Director of Public Works, the Airport Director, the Executive Director of the Municipal Transportation Agency, the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, the General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department, and the Executive Director of the Port of San Francisco. 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 10-year capital plan every other fiscal year for approval by the Board of Supervisors. The Capital Plan is a fiscally constrained long-term finance strategy that prioritizes projects based on a set of funding principles. It provides an assessment of the City's infrastructure and other funding needs over 10 years, highlights investments required to meet these needs and recommends a plan of finance to fund these investments. Although the Capital Plan provides cost estimates and proposes methods to finance such costs, the document does not reflect any commitment by the Board of Supervisors to expend such amounts or to adopt any specific financing method. The Capital Plan is required to be updated and adopted biennially, along with the City's Five-Year Financial Plan and the Five-Year Information & Communication Technology Plan. The CPC is also charged with reviewing the annual capital budget submission and all long-term financing proposals and providing recommendations to the Board of Supervisors relating to the compliance of any such proposal or submission with the adopted Capital Plan.

The Capital Plan is required to be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors by each March 1 in odd-numbered years and adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on or before May 1 of the same year. The fiscal years 2022-2031 Capital Plan ("Adopted Capital Plan") was approved by the CPC on February 22, 2021 and was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 30, 2021. The Adopted Capital Plan contains $38.0 billion in capital investments over the coming decade for all City departments, including $4.6 billion in projects for General Fund-supported departments. The Adopted Capital Plan proposes $1.2 billion for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects over the next 10 years. The amount for General Fund pay-as-you-go capital projects is $1 billion lower than the previous capital plan funding level due to budget impacts in the early years resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Major capital projects for General Fund-supported departments included in the Capital Plan consist of critical seismic projects and relocation of staff from seismically vulnerable facilities; upgrades to public health, police, and fire facilities; transportation and utility system improvements; improvements to homeless service sites and permanent supportive housing projects; affordable housing; street and right-of-way improvements; the removal of barriers to accessibility; and park improvements, among other capital projects. $1.5 billion of the capital projects of General Fund supported departments are expected to be financed with general obligation bonds and other long- term obligations, subject to planning policy constraints. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, the General Fund and other sources.

In addition to the City General Fund-supported capital spending, the Adopted Capital Plan recommends $18.0 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, the Sewer System Improvement Program, and building adequate facilities to support the City's growing transit fleet, among others. Approximately $8.5 billion of enterprise fund department capital projects are anticipated to be financed with revenue bonds and general obligation bonds. The balance is expected to be funded by federal and State funds, user/operator fees, General Fund and other sources.

While significant investments are proposed in the City's Adopted Capital Plan, identified resources remain below those necessary to maintain and enhance the City's physical infrastructure. As a result, over $7.5 billion in capital needs including enhancements are deferred from the plan's horizon.

Failure to make the capital improvements and repairs recommended in the Capital Plan may have the following impacts: (i) failing to meet federal, State or local legal mandates; (ii) failing to provide for the imminent life, health, safety and security of occupants and the public; (iii) failing to prevent the loss of use of the asset; (iv) impairing the value of the City's assets; (v) increasing future repair and replacement costs; and (vi) harming the local economy.

Tax-Supported Debt Service – City General Obligation Bonds

Under the State Constitution and the Charter, City bonds secured by *ad valorem* property taxes ("general obligation bonds" or "GO bonds") can only be authorized with a two-thirds approval of the voters. As of March 1, 2022, the City had approximately $3.0 billion aggregate principal amount of GO bonds outstanding. In addition to the City's general obligation bonds, BART, SFUSD and SFCCD also have outstanding general obligation bonds as shown in Table A-33.

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

TABLE A-28

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds Debt Service
As of March 1, 2022 [1] [2]

Fiscal Year	Principal	Interest	Annual Debt Service
2021-22 [3]	$254,268,401	$112,541,848	$366,810,249
2022-23	175,615,251	105,087,992	280,703,243
2023-24	179,121,206	97,010,847	276,132,052
2024-25	181,756,476	88,750,603	270,507,078
2025-26	170,246,279	80,453,741	250,700,020
2026-27	177,075,840	73,055,975	250,131,815
2027-28	183,409,035	65,664,553	249,073,589
2028-29	185,371,751	58,329,402	243,701,153
2029-30	183,465,095	50,649,022	234,114,117
2030-31	148,431,950	43,311,830	191,743,780
2031-32	153,595,000	37,851,481	191,446,481
2032-33	120,745,000	32,455,186	153,200,186
2033-34	101,745,000	28,200,045	129,945,045
2034-35	95,040,000	24,705,347	119,745,347
2035-36	80,045,000	21,475,808	101,520,808
2036-37	69,590,000	18,769,081	88,359,081
2037-38	60,880,000	16,429,118	77,309,118
2038-39	42,505,000	14,358,049	56,863,049
2039-40	42,240,000	12,952,057	55,192,057
2040-41	36,635,000	11,535,894	48,170,894
2041-42	37,970,000	10,201,011	48,171,011
2042-43	39,365,000	8,802,762	48,167,762
2043-44	40,820,000	7,352,149	48,172,149
2044-45	42,315,000	5,846,885	48,161,885
2045-46	38,505,000	4,285,480	42,790,480
2046-47	5,005,000	2,880,246	7,885,246
2047-48	5,170,000	2,710,945	7,880,945
2048-49	5,345,000	2,535,881	7,880,881
2049-50	5,530,000	2,354,712	7,884,712
2050-51	5,725,000	2,159,925	7,884,925
2051-52	5,935,000	1,950,338	7,885,338
2052-53	6,155,000	1,732,790	7,887,790
2053-54	6,380,000	1,506,973	7,886,973
2054-55	6,610,000	1,272,671	7,882,671
2055-56	6,855,000	1,029,667	7,884,667
2056-57	7,110,000	777,438	7,887,438
2057-58	7,370,000	515,551	7,885,551
2058-59	3,895,000	243,790	4,138,790
2059-60	4,010,000	123,668	4,133,668
TOTAL [4]	**$2,921,851,283**	**$1,051,870,762**	**$3,973,722,044**

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

[2] Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

[3] Net of payment of principal and interest which came due on October 15 on the Series 2021C-2, 2021D-2 and 2021E-2 Bonds.

[4] Section 9.106 of the City Charter limits issuance of general obligation bonds of the City to 3% of assessed value.

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

Authorized but Unissued City GO Bonds

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

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

In November 2018, voters approved Proposition A ("2018 Embarcadero Seawall Improvement Proposition"), authorizing the issuance of up to $425.0 million in general obligation bonds for repair and improvement projects along the City's Embarcadero and Seawall to protect the waterfront, BART and Muni, buildings, historic piers, and roads from earthquakes, flooding, and sea level rise. On June 2, 2020, the City closed the first series of bonds in the par amount of $49.7 million, leaving $375.3 million authorized and unissued.

In November 2019, voters approved Proposition A ("2019 Affordable Housing Proposition"), which authorized the issuance of up to $600.0 million in general obligation bonds to finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of affordable housing for certain vulnerable San Francisco residents; to assist in the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of existing affordable housing to prevent the displacement of residents; to repair and reconstruct distressed and dilapidated public housing developments and their underlying infrastructure; to assist the City's middle-income residents or workers in obtaining affordable rental or home ownership opportunities including down payment assistance and support for new construction of affordable housing for SFUSD and City College of San Francisco employees; and to pay related costs. On March 30, 2021, the City closed the first series of bonds in the par amount of $254.6 million, leaving $345.4 million authorized and unissued.

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

In November 2020, voters approved Proposition A ("2020 Health and Recovery Bond"), which authorized the issuance of up to $487.5 million in general obligation bonds to fund permanent investments in transitional supportive housing facilities, shelters, and/or facilities that serve individuals experiencing homelessness, mental health challenges, or substance use; improve the safety and quality of parks; and improve the safety and condition of streets and other public rights of way. In 2021, the City closed the first two series of bonds in an aggregate par amount of $258.5 million, leaving approximately $229 million authorized and unissued.

Refunding General Obligation Bonds

The Board of Supervisors adopted and the Mayor approved Resolution No. 272-04 in May of 2004 ("2004 Resolution"). The 2004 Resolution authorized the issuance of $800.0 million 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 outstanding General Obligation Bonds. In November of 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted and the Mayor approved, Resolution No. 448-11 ("2011 Resolution," and together with the 2004 Resolution, the "Refunding Resolutions"). The 2011 Resolution authorized the issuance of approximately $1.5 billion 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. In March of 2020, the Board of Supervisors adopted and the Mayor approved, Resolution No. 097-20 ("2020 Resolution," and together with the 2004 Resolution and 2011 Resolution, the "Refunding Resolutions"). The 2020 Resolution authorized the issuance of approximately $1.5 billion general obligation refunding bonds from time to time in one or more series for the purpose of refunding certain outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City. The refunding bonds currently outstanding, under the Refunding Resolutions, are shown in Table A-29 below.

TABLE A-29

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Refunding Bonds
As of March 1, 2022

Series Name	Date Issued	Principal Amount Issued	Amount Outstanding
2015-R1	February 2015	$293,910,000	$208,800,000 [1]
2020-R1	May 2020	195,250,000	181,945,000 [2]
2021-R1	May 2021	91,230,000	91,230,000
2021-R2	September 2021	86,905,000	86,905,000 [3]

[1] Series 2006-R1, 2006-R2, and 2008-R3 Bonds were refunded by the 2015-R1 Bonds in February 2015.

[2] Series 2008-R1 Bonds were refunded by the 2020-R1 Bonds in May 2020.

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

Table A-30 on the following page lists for each of the City's voter-authorized general obligation bond programs the amount issued and outstanding, and the amount of remaining authorization for which bonds have not yet been issued. Series are grouped by program authorization in chronological order. The authorized and unissued column refers to total program authorization that can still be issued and does not refer to any particular series. As of March 1, 2022, the City had authorized and unissued general obligation bond authority of approximately $1.5 billion.

TABLE A-30

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds
As of March 1, 2022[1]

Bond Authorization Name	Election Date	Authorized Amount	Series	Bonds Issued	Bonds Outstanding	Authorized & Unissued
Seismic Safety Loan Program	11/3/92	$350,000,000	1994A	$35,000,000	-	
			2007A	$30,315,450	$15,571,283	[2]
			2015A	$24,000,000	-	
Reauthorization to Repurpose for Affordable Housing	11/8/16		2019A	$72,420,000	$70,605,000	
			2020C	$102,580,000	$96,895,000	$85,684,550
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks	2/5/08	$185,000,000	2008B	$42,520,000	-	
			2010B	$24,785,000	-	
			2010D	$35,645,000	$30,090,000	
			2012B	$73,355,000	-	
			2016A	$8,695,000	$6,500,000	-
San Francisco General Hospital & Trauma Center	11/4/08	$887,400,000	2009A	$131,650,000	-	
Earthquake Safety			2010A	$120,890,000	-	
			2010C	$173,805,000	$146,725,000	
			2012D	$251,100,000	$130,435,000	
			2014A	$209,955,000	$137,480,000	-
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	6/8/10	$412,300,000	2010E	$79,520,000	-	
			2012A	$183,330,000	-	
			2012E	$38,265,000	$25,050,000	
			2013B	$31,020,000	-	
			2014C	$54,950,000	$36,160,000	
			2016C	$25,215,000	$19,415,000	-
Road Repaving & Street Safety	11/8/11	$248,000,000	2012C	$74,295,000	-	
			2013C	$129,560,000	-	
			2016E	$44,145,000	$33,990,000	-
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks	11/6/12	$195,000,000	2013A	$71,970,000	-	
			2016B	$43,220,000	$21,100,000	
			2018A	$76,710,000	$41,345,000	
			2019B	$3,100,000	-	-
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	6/3/14	$400,000,000	2014D	$100,670,000	$66,230,000	
			2016D	$109,595,000	$65,500,000	
			2018C	$189,735,000	$127,615,000	-
Transportation and Road Improvement	11/4/14	$500,000,000	2015B	$67,005,000	$38,005,000	
			2018B	$174,445,000	$94,030,000	
			2020B	$135,765,000	$113,265,000	
			2021C-1	$104,785,000	$104,785,000	
			2021C-2	$18,000,000	-	-
Affordable Housing Bond	11/3/15	$310,000,000	2016F	$75,130,000	$43,730,000	
			2018D	$142,145,000	$94,120,000	
			2019C	$92,725,000	$24,120,000	-
Public Health and Safety Bond	6/7/16	$350,000,000	2017A	$173,120,000	$107,185,000	
			2018E	$49,955,000	$33,900,000	
			2020D-1	$111,925,000	$81,925,000	
			2020D-2	$15,000,000	-	-
Embarcadero Seawall Earthquake Safety	11/6/18	$425,000,000	2020A	$49,675,000	-	$375,325,000
Affordable Housing Bond	11/5/19	$600,000,000	2021A	$254,585,000	$180,390,000	$345,415,000
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond	3/3/20	$628,500,000	2021B-1	$69,215,000	$69,215,000	
			2021B-2	$11,500,000	-	
			2021E-1	$74,090,000	$74,090,000	
			2021E-2	$13,000,000	-	$460,695,000
Health and Recovery Bond	11/4/20	$487,500,000	2021D-1	$194,255,000	$194,255,000	
			2021D-2	$64,250,000	$29,250,000	$228,995,000
SUBTOTAL		$5,978,700,000		$4,482,585,450	$2,352,971,283	$1,496,114,550
General Obligation Refunding Bonds	**Dated Issued**			**Bonds Issued**	**Bonds Outstanding**	
Series 2015-R1	2/25/15			$293,910,000	$208,800,000	
Series 2020-R1	5/7/20			$195,250,000	$181,945,000	
Series 2021-R1	5/6/21			$91,230,000	$91,230,000	
Series 2021-R2	9/16/21			$86,905,000	$86,905,000	
SUBTOTAL				$667,295,000	$568,880,000	
TOTALS		**$5,978,700,000**		**$5,149,880,450**	**$2,921,851,283**	**$1,496,114,550**

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

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

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

General Fund Lease Obligations

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

Table A-31 sets forth the aggregate annual lease payment obligations supported by the City's General Fund with respect to outstanding long-term lease revenue bonds and certificates of participation as of March 1, 2022.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE A-31

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Lease Revenue Bonds and Certificates of Participation
As of March 1, 2022[1]

Fiscal Year[2]	Principal	Interest [3]	Annual Payment Obligation
2021-22 [4]	$42,900,000	$29,100,051	$72,000,051
2022-23	64,495,000	62,883,794	127,378,794
2023-24	67,610,000	59,842,818	127,452,818
2024-25	69,050,000	56,626,537	125,676,537
2025-26	70,595,000	53,385,116	123,980,116
2026-27	73,950,000	49,994,327	123,944,327
2027-28	69,060,000	46,627,707	115,687,707
2028-29	74,220,000	43,291,810	117,511,810
2029-30	74,995,000	39,990,713	114,985,713
2030-31	70,485,000	36,975,914	107,460,914
2031-32	63,590,000	34,282,816	97,872,816
2032-33	64,685,000	31,871,841	96,556,841
2033-34	67,135,000	29,260,160	96,395,160
2034-35	60,275,000	26,761,447	87,036,447
2035-36	60,515,000	24,174,243	84,689,243
2036-37	60,190,000	21,538,229	81,728,229
2037-38	62,625,000	18,910,664	81,535,664
2038-39	65,160,000	16,175,156	81,335,156
2039-40	67,805,000	13,324,472	81,129,472
2040-41	70,555,000	10,357,468	80,912,468
2041-42	56,000,000	7,430,811	63,430,811
2042-43	20,990,000	5,247,200	26,237,200
2043-44	19,855,000	4,388,600	24,243,600
2044-45	20,650,000	3,594,400	24,244,400
2045-46	13,695,000	2,768,400	16,463,400
2046-47	14,245,000	2,220,600	16,465,600
2047-48	13,220,000	1,650,800	14,870,800
2048-49	13,750,000	1,122,000	14,872,000
2049-50	14,300,000	572,000	14,872,000
TOTAL [5]	**$1,506,600,000**	**$734,370,095**	**$2,240,970,095**

[1] Excludes the 833 Bryant lease, commercial paper and the following privately placed lease purchase financings (with current outstanding amounts):

SFGH Emergency Backup Generators Project ($8,283,869)

Gsmart Citywide Emergency Radio Replacement Project ($17,802,052)

[2] For LRBs Series 2018A (Refunding Open Space), 7/1 payments reflect be paid in the current fiscal year, as budgeted.

[3] Totals reflect rounding to nearest dollar.

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

[5] For purposes of this table, the interest rate on the Lease Revenue Bonds Series 2008-1, and 2008-2 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) is assumed to be 3.50%. These bonds are in variable rate mode.

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

Voter-Approved Lease Revenue Bonds

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

In 1987, voters approved Proposition 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.

In 1990, voters approved Proposition C ("1990 Proposition C"), which amended the Charter to authorize the City to lease- purchase equipment through a nonprofit corporation without additional voter approval but with certain restrictions. The City and County of San Francisco Finance Corporation (the "Corporation") was incorporated for that purpose. 1990 Proposition C provides that the outstanding aggregate principal amount of obligations with respect to lease financings may not exceed $20.0 million, with such amount increasing by five percent each fiscal year. As of July 1, 2021, the total authorized and unissued amount for such financings was $90.8 million.

In 1994, voters approved Proposition B ("1994 Proposition B"), which authorized the issuance of up to $60.0 million in lease revenue bonds for the acquisition and construction of a combined dispatch center for the City's emergency 911 communication system and for the emergency information and communications equipment for the center. In 1997 and 1998, the Corporation issued $22.6 million and $23.3 million of 1994 Proposition B lease revenue bonds, respectively, leaving $14.1 million in remaining authorization. There is no current plan to issue additional series of bonds under 1994 Proposition B.

In 2000, voters approved Proposition C ("2000 Proposition C"), which extended a two- and one-half cent per $100.0 in assessed valuation property tax set-aside for the benefit of the Recreation and Park Department (the "Open Space Fund"). 2000 Proposition C also authorized the issuance of lease revenue bonds or other forms of indebtedness payable from the Open Space Fund. In August 2018 the City issued refunding lease revenue bonds to refund Series 2006 and 2007 Open Space Fund lease revenue bonds.

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

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

*TABLE A-32**

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Outstanding Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds
As of March 1, 2022

Issue Name	Final Maturity	Original Par	Outstanding Principal
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION			
Series 2009C (525 Golden Gate Avenue)	2022	$38,120,000	$4,375,000
Series 2009D - Taxable BABs (525 Golden Gate Avenue)	2041	129,550,000	129,550,000
Refunding Series 2011A (Moscone Center South)	2024	23,105,000	7,040,000
Series 2012A (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2036	42,835,000	31,055,000
Series 2013B - Non-AMT (Port Facilities Project)	2038	4,830,000	4,830,000
Series 2013C - AMT (Port Facilities Project)	2043	32,870,000	21,345,000
Refunding Series 2014-R2 (Juevenile Hall Project)	2034	33,605,000	24,560,000
Series 2015A (War Memorial Veterans Building)	2045	112,100,000	112,100,000
Series 2015B - Taxable (War Memorial Veterans Building)	2024	22,225,000	5,185,000
Refunding Series 2015-R1 (City Office Buildings - Multiple Properties)	2040	123,600,000	105,330,000
Series 2016A (War Memorial Veterans Building)	2032	16,125,000	11,630,000
Series 2017A - Taxable (Hope SF)	2047	28,320,000	25,850,000
Series 2017B (Moscone Convention Center Expansion Project)	2042	412,355,000	381,445,000
Series 2019A (49 South Van Ness Project)	2050	247,810,000	245,700,000
Refunding Series 2019-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2035	116,460,000	99,985,000
Refunding Series 2020-R1 (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2033	70,640,000	67,405,000
Series 2020 (Animal Care & Control Project)	2041	47,075,000	47,075,000
Series 2021A (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)	2041	76,020,000	76,020,000
SUBTOTAL CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION		**$1,577,645,000**	**$1,400,480,000**
LEASE PURCHASE FINANCINGS			
2010 Lease Purchase Financing (SFGH Emergency Backup Generators)	2025	$22,549,489	$8,283,869
2016 Lease Purchase Financing (Public Safety Radio Replacement Project)	2026	34,184,136	17,802,052
SUBTOTAL LEASE PURCHASE FINANCINGS		**$56,733,625**	**$26,085,920**
FINANCE CORPORATION LEASE REVENUE BONDS			
Refunding Series 2008-1 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) - Variable	2030	$72,670,000	$32,700,000
Refunding Series 2008-2 (Moscone Center Expansion Project) - Variable	2030	72,670,000	32,700,000
Refunding Series 2010-R1 (Emergency Communications System)	2024	22,280,000	4,750,000
Refunding Series 2018A (Open Space Fund - Various Park Projects)	2029	34,950,000	26,080,000
Refunding Series 2018B (Branch Library Improvement Program)	2028	13,355,000	9,890,000
SUBTOTAL LEASE REVENUE BONDS		**$215,925,000**	**$106,120,000**
TOTAL GENERAL FUND OBLIGATIONS		**$1,850,303,625**	**$1,532,685,920**

*Excludes California HFA Revenue Bonds (San Francisco Supportive Housing - 833 Bryant Apartments) ($26,985,000)

Board Authorized and Unissued Long-Term Certificates of Participation

Treasure Island Improvement Project: In October of 2013, the Board authorized, and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $13.5 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation to finance the cost of additions and improvements to the utility infrastructure at Treasure Island. At this time there is not an expected timeline for the issuance of these certificates, but commercial paper is anticipated to be issued to finance the projects in fiscal year 2021-22.

Housing Trust Fund Project: In April 2016, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $95.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Affordable Housing Projects) to provide funds to assist in the development, acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing projects. The City currently issues commercial paper to finance these projects and pays down their commercial paper balance annually rather than issuing certificates at this time.

Hall of Justice Relocation Projects: In October 2019, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $62.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation (Multiple Capital Projects) to finance or refinance tenant improvements involving the construction, acquisition, improvement, renovation, and retrofitting of City-owned properties as needed for the Hall of Justice Improvement Project enabling staff and offices to be consolidated in acquired City-owned properties. The City issued $3.81 million of the certificates in May 2021 and expects to issue the remainder in fiscal year 2022-23.

HOPE SF Project: In December 2019, the Board authorized, and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $83.6 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation to finance or refinance certain capital improvements, including but not limited to certain properties generally known as Hunters View, Sunnydale, and Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments. As of April 2022, $28.3M has been issued (Series 2017A) and $55.3 million remains unissued from the authorization. The City anticipates issuing the remaining authorization in fiscal year 2023-24.

Department of Public Health Facilities Improvements: In November 2020, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $157.0 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation to finance projects for the Department of Public Health ("DPH"), including but not limited to certain projects generally known as the Homeless Services Center, Laguna Honda Hospital Wings Reuse Project, AITC Immunization and Travel Clinic Relocation, and San Francisco General Hospital Chiller and Cooling Tower Replacement Project. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in fiscal year 2022-23.

Critical Repairs and Recovery Stimulus: In July 2021, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved the issuance of not to exceed $67.5 million of City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation, to finance and refinance certain capital improvements generally consisting of critical repairs, renovations and improvements to City-owned buildings, facilities and works utilized by various City departments and local economic stimulus projects. The City anticipates issuing the certificates in fiscal year 2022-23.

Commercial Paper Program

In March 2009, the Board authorized and the Mayor approved a not-to-exceed $150.0 million Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation Program, Series 1 and 1-T and Series 2 and 2-T (the "Original CP Program"). In July of 2013, the Board authorized, and the Mayor approved an additional $100.0 million of Lease Revenue Commercial Paper Certificates of Participation, Series 3 and 3-T and Series 4 and 4-T (the "Second CP Program" and together with the Original CP Program, the "City CP Program") that increased the total authorization of the City CP Program to $250.0 million. Commercial Paper Notes (the "CP Notes") are issued from time to time to pay approved project costs in connection with the acquisition, improvement, renovation and construction of real property and the acquisition of capital equipment and vehicles in anticipation of long-term or other take-out financing to be issued when market conditions are favorable. Projects are eligible to access the CP Program once the Board and the Mayor have approved the project and the long-term, permanent financing for the project.

The Series 1 and 1-T and Series 2 and 2-T CP notes are secured by credit facilities from: (i) State Street Bank and Trust Company (with a maximum principal amount of $75 million) and (ii) U.S. Bank National Association (with a maximum principal amount of $75 million). These credit facilities were extended with the same banks in May 2021 until May 2023. The Series 3 and 3-T and 4 and 4-T are secured by a $100 million letter of credit issued by State Street Bank and Trust Company, which expired in February 2022. On [April 5, 2022], the Board approved a Resolution re-authorizing CP Series 3 and 4 and approving a revolving credit agreement with Bank of the West, which the City anticipates closing on in May 2022.

As of March 25, 2022, the outstanding principal amount of CP Notes is $26.7 million. The weighted average interest rate for the outstanding CP Notes is approximately 0.51%. The projects with Board Authorized and Unissued Certificates of Participation currently utilizing the CP Program includes the Housing Trust Fund, DPH Facilities Improvements and Critical Repairs & Recovery Stimulus. The following is a summary of the outstanding liability by project associated with the CP Notes outstanding.

Project	**CP Notes Liability as of 3/25/2022**
Housing Trust Fund	$19,510,000
DPH Facilities Improvements	$4,981,077
Critical Repairs & Recovery Stimulus	$1,068,923
TOTAL	**$25,560,000**

Overlapping Debt

Table A-33 shows bonded debt and long-term obligations as of March 1, 2022 sold in the public capital markets, except for those financings otherwise noted in the table, by the City and those public agencies whose boundaries overlap the boundaries of the City in whole or in part. Long-term obligations of non-City agencies generally are not payable from revenues of the City. In many cases, long-term obligations issued by a public agency are payable only from the General Fund or other revenues of such public agency. In the table, lease obligations of the City which support indebtedness incurred by others are included. As noted below, the Charter limits the City's outstanding general obligation bond debt to 3% of the total assessed valuation of all taxable real and personal property within the City.

TABLE A-33

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Direct and Overlapping Debt and Long-Term Obligations
As of March 1, 2022

2021-22 Assessed Valuation (includes unitary utility valuation):	$312,594,683,687 [1]
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	
San Francisco City and County	$2,921,851,283
San Francisco Unified School District	969,800,000
San Francisco Community College District	474,030,000
TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	$4,365,681,283
LEASE OBLIGATIONS BONDS	
San Francisco City and County	$1,524,402,052
TOTAL LEASE OBLIGATION BONDED DEBT	$1,524,402,052 [2]
TOTAL COMBINED DIRECT DEBT	$5,890,083,335
OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT	
Bay Area Rapid Transit District General Obligation Bond (34.740%)	$637,423,416
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 4	4,420,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 6	115,847,406
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 7	31,315,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2009-1, Improvement Areas 1 and 2	2,466,543
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 Transbay Transit Center	502,625,000
San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 Treasure Island, Improvement Areas 1 and 2	83,405,000
San Francisco Special Tax District No. 2020-1 Mission Rock Facilities	106,230,000
City of San Francisco Assessment District No. 95-1	310,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2004-1 Seismic Safety Improvements	8,870,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2006-1 San Francisco Rincon Hill	4,820,000
ABAG Community Facilities District No. 2006-2 San Francisco Mint Plaza	2,765,000
TOTAL OVERLAPPING TAX AND ASSESSMENT DEBT	$1,500,497,365
OVERLAPPING TAX INCREMENT DEBT:	
Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency	$678,834,565
Transbay Joint Powers Authority	262,120,000
TOTAL OVERLAPPING INCREMENT DEBT	$940,954,565
TOTAL DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING BONDED DEBT	$8,331,535,265 [3]
Ratios to 2021-22 Assessed Valuation ($312,594,683,687)	**Actual Ratio**
Direct General Obligation Bonded Debt ($4,365,681,283)	1.40% [4]
Combined Direct Debt ($5,890,083,335)	1.88%
Total Direct and Overlapping Bonded Debt	2.67%
Ratio to 2021-22 Redevelopment Incremental Valuation ($39,850,418,650)	
Total Overlapping Tax Increment Debt	2.36%

[1] Includes $596,875,972 homeowner's exemption for FY21-22.

[2] Excludes 833 Bryant lease and privately placed SFGH Emergency Backup Generators Project, outstanding in the principal amount of $8,283,869 as of 3/1/22.

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

[4] The Charter limits the City's outstanding general obligation bond debt to 3% of the total assessed valuation of all taxable real and personal property within the City. The City's general obligation debt as a percentage of FY21-22 AV is 0.93%.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON TAXES AND EXPENDITURES

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

Article XIIIA of the California Constitution

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

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

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

Article XIIIB of the California Constitution

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

Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution

Proposition 218, an initiative constitutional amendment, approved by the voters of the State in 1996, added Articles XII C and XIIID to the State Constitution, which affect the ability of local governments, including charter cities such as the City, to levy and collect both existing and future taxes, assessments, fees and charges. Proposition 218 does not affect the levy and collection of taxes for voter-approved debt. However, Proposition 218 affects the City's finances in other ways. Article XIIIC requires that all new local taxes be submitted to the electorate for approval before such taxes become effective. Taxes for general governmental purposes of the City require a majority vote and taxes for specific purposes require a two-thirds vote. Under Proposition 218, the City can only continue to collect taxes that were imposed after January 1, 1995 if voters subsequently approved such taxes by November 6, 1998. All of the City's local taxes subject to such approval have been either reauthorized in accordance with Proposition 218 or discontinued. The voter approval requirements of Article 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 XIIIC addresses the initiative power in matters of local taxes, assessments, fees and charges. Pursuant to Article XIIIC, the voters of the City could, by initiative, repeal, reduce or limit any existing or future local tax, assessment, fee or charge, subject to certain limitations imposed by the courts and additional limitations with respect to taxes levied to repay bonds. The City raises a substantial portion of its revenues from various local taxes which are not levied to repay bonded indebtedness, and which could be reduced by initiative under Article XIIIC. No assurance can be given that the voters of the City will 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 XIIID contains several provisions making it generally more difficult for local agencies, such as the City, to levy and maintain "assessments" (as defined in Article XIIID) for local services and programs. The City has created a number of special assessment districts both for neighborhood business improvement purposes and community benefit purposes and has caused limited obligation bonds to be issued in 1996 to finance construction of a new public right of way. The City cannot predict the future impact of Proposition 218 on the finances of the City, and no assurance can be given that Proposition 218 will not have a material adverse impact on the City's revenues.

Proposition 1A

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

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

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

Proposition 22

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

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

Proposition 26

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

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

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

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

Future Initiatives and Changes in Law

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

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

LEGAL MATTERS AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Pending Litigation

There are a number of lawsuits and claims routinely pending against the City. Included among these are a number of actions which if successful would be payable from the City's General Fund. In the opinion of the City Attorney, such suits and claims presently pending will not materially impair the ability of the City to pay debt service on its General Fund lease obligations or other debt obligations, nor have an adverse impact on City finances.

Ongoing Investigations

Public Works Investigation. On January 28, 2020 the City's former Director of Public Works Mohammad Nuru was indicted on federal criminal charges of public corruption, including honest services wire fraud and lying to Federal Bureau of Investigation officials. The allegations contained in the complaint involve various schemes, including an attempt by Mr. Nuru and Mr. Nick Bovis, a local restaurateur who was also indicted by the federal government, to bribe an Airport Commissioner to influence the award of lease of space at the San Francisco International Airport, Mr. Nuru using his official position to benefit a developer of a mixed-use project in San Francisco in exchange for personal gifts and benefits; Mr. Nuru attempting to use his former position as the chair of the Transbay Joint Powers Authority to secure a lease for Mr. Bovis in the Salesforce Transit Center, in exchange for personal benefits provided by the restauranteur; Mr. Nuru providing Mr. Bovis with inside information on City projects regarding contracts for portable bathroom trailers and small container-like housing units for use by the homeless, so that Mr. Bovis could win the contracts for those projects; and Mr. Nuru obtaining free and discounted labor and construction equipment from contractors to help him build a personal vacation home while those contractors were also engaging in business with the City. Mr. Nuru resigned from employment with the City two weeks after his arrest.

On May 20, 2021 Mr. Bovis pled guilty to honest services wire fraud and wire fraud. On December 17, 2021 Mr. Nuru also pled guilty to honest services wire fraud.

As a result of the announcement of the Nuru and Bovis arrests, the City Attorney and Controller commenced a joint investigation seeking to identify officials, employees and contractors involved in these schemes or other related conduct, and to identify contracts, grants, gifts, and other government decisions possibly tainted by conflicts of interest and other legal or policy violations. The Controller's Office, in conjunction with the City Attorney's Office, has put into place interim controls to review Public Works contracts for red flags and process failures. The Controller's Office is also working with the City Attorney's Office to identify whether stop payments, cancellations or other terminations are justified on any open contracts, purchase orders or bids. Also, the Controller, in coordination with the City Attorney's Office, has made periodic public reports setting forth assessments of patterns and practices to help prevent fraud and corruption and recommendations about best practices, including possible changes in City law and policy.

On March 10, 2020, the City Attorney transmitted to the Mayor its preliminary report of investigations of alleged misconduct by the City's Director of the Department of Building Inspections ("DBI"). The allegations involve violations of the City Campaign and Conduct Code and DBI's Code of Professional Conduct by the Director by (i) providing intentional and preferential treatment to certain permit expediters, (ii) accepting gifts and dinners in violation of DBI's professional code of conduct, and (iii) otherwise violating City laws and policies by abusing his position to seek positions for his son and son's girlfriend. The Mayor placed the Director of Building Inspection on administrative leave, and he resigned shortly thereafter.

On June 29, 2020, the Controller released its preliminary assessment of Citywide procurement practices, with an emphasis on the Public Works Department. The report is subject to public comment and review and could be revised in the future. The preliminary assessment focused on City laws, practices and policies and made recommendations to make improvements on such City laws and policies to improve transparency, reduce the risk of loss and abuse in City contracting in the future. The Controller expects to issue additional reports in the future. Reviews of the City internal controls will be released in a subsequent report. Finally, the City Attorney investigation continues with respect to the review certain contracts and payments made to outside vendors. To date, the City Attorney's investigation has led to the release of at least four city employees (including the Director of Public Works and the Director of Building Inspections, as described above) or officials from their City positions.

On September 24, 2020 the Controller issued an additional report noting that Mr. Nuru also solicited donations from private sources and directed those donations to a non-profit supporting the Department of Public Works. Such arrangements, which were neither accepted or disclosed by the City, created a perceived risk of "pay-to-play" relationships. The report made recommendations to the Board of Supervisions that, among other things, would restrict the ability of department heads from soliciting donations from interested parties in the future and would increase transparency surrounding gifts made to benefit City departments.

On November 30, 2020, Harlan L. Kelly, Jr., the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("PUC"), was charged in a federal criminal complaint with one count of honest services wire fraud. The complaint alleges that Mr. Kelly engaged in a long-running bribery scheme and corrupt partnership with Walter Wong, a San Francisco construction company executive and permit expediting consultant, who ran or controlled multiple entities doing business with the City. The complaint further alleges that as part of the scheme, Mr. Wong provided items of value to Mr. Kelly in exchange for official acts by Mr. Kelly that benefited or attempted to benefit Mr. Wong's business ventures. Earlier criminal charges filed against Walter Wong alleged that Mr. Wong conspired with multiple City officials, including Mr. Nuru, in a conspiracy and money laundering scheme. Mr. Wong pled guilty in July of this year and is cooperating with the ongoing federal investigation.

Mr. Kelly resigned on December 1, 2020, and the PUC's Commission acted on his resignation on December 8, 2020. Dennis J. Herrera (the current City Attorney) was nominated by the Mayor to be the General Manager of the PUC and his nomination was confirmed by the PUC on September 28, 2021. Mr. Herrera is expected to assume office as General Manager of PUC on November 1, 2021.

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

On July 8, 2021 the San Francisco District Attorney announced the arrest of former Department of Public Works bureau manager Gerald "Jerry" Sanguinetti. Mr. Sanguinetti was charged with five felony counts of perjury and two misdemeanor charges arising from his alleged failure to report more than a quarter million dollars of income and file financial disclosure statements associated with the sale to the Public Works Department of merchandise by a company owned by his wife. The charges arise out of the continuing investigation into public corruption involving the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department investigation is ongoing.

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

Risk Retention Program

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

The City's decision to obtain commercial insurance depends on various factors. For property insurance these factors include whether the facility is currently under construction or if the property is owned by a self-supporting enterprise fund department. For new construction projects, the City has utilized traditional insurance, owner-controlled insurance programs or contractor-controlled insurance programs. Under the latter two approaches, the insurance program provides coverage for the entire construction project. When a traditional insurance program is used, the City requires each contractor to provide its own insurance, while ensuring that the full scope of work be covered with satisfactory limits. The majority of the City's commercial insurance coverage is purchased for enterprise fund departments and other similar revenue-generating departments (i.e. the Airport, MTA, the PUC, the Port and Convention Facilities, etc.). The remainder of the commercial insurance coverage is for General Fund departments that are required to provide coverage for bond-financed facilities, coverage for collections at City-owned museums and to meet statutory requirements for bonding of various public officials, and other limited purposes where required by contract or other agreement. In recent years, the City has purchased Cyber Liability insurance for departments and certain enterprise fund departments providing critical City services and/or managing high volumes of confidential/personal data.

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

The City is self-insured for the financial risk and liability to provide workers' compensation benefits to its employees. The administration of workers' compensation claims and disbursement of all benefit payments is managed by the Workers' Compensation Division of the City's Department of Human Resources and its contracted third-party claims administrator. Estimates of future workers' compensation costs are based on the following criteria: (i) the frequency and severity of historical claim filings; (ii) average claim losses by expense category; (iii) gross payroll and workforce composition; (iv) benefit cost inflation, including increases to the statewide average weekly wage, and medical cost growth; and (v) regulatory developments that impact benefit cost and delivery. The Workers' Compensation Division determines and allocates workers' compensation costs to departments based upon actual claim benefit expenditures and an allocated share of overhead expenses for self-insurance administration. The City continues to develop and implement programs to lower or mitigate workers' compensation costs.

APPENDIX B

ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 202__

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS

APPENDIX D

FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

$[Par Amount]*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION
SERIES 202[__]
(MULTIPLE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS)

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, dated as of May 1, 2009 (the "Original Trust Agreement"), as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as supplemented and amended, the "Trust Agreement"), between the City and U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee (the "Trustee"). Pursuant to Section 8.10 of the Original Trust Agreement and Section 4.8 of that certain Project Lease, dated as of May 1, 2009, as previously supplemented and amended and as supplemented and amended by the [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (as supplemented and amended, the "Project Lease"), 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.

"Financial Obligation" means "financial obligation" as such term is defined in the Rule.

"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.

"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 [202__-2__] Fiscal Year (which is due not later than [March 2__, 202__]), 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, in a timely manner, 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 of 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;
(14) Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee, if material;
(15) incurrence of a Financial Obligation of the City, if material, or agreement to covenants, events of default, remedies, priority rights, or other similar terms of a Financial Obligation of the City, any of which affect security holders, if material; and
(16) default, event of acceleration, termination event, modification of terms, or other similar events under the terms of a Financial Obligation of the City, any of which reflect financial difficulties.

(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: ______________

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

____
Benjamin Rosenfield
Controller

Approved as to form:

DAVID CHIU
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 Issuer:	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Name of Issue:	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION SERIES 202[__] (MULTIPLE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS)
Date of Delivery:	[__________]

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 1-10 of this APPENDIX E, concerning The Depository Trust Company ("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 or 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. As used in this appendix, "Securities" means the Certificates, "Issuer" means the City, and "Agent" means the Trustee.

1. The Depository Trust Company ("DTC") will act as securities depository for the securities (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 the Securities, in the aggregate principal amount of such issue, and will be deposited with DTC.

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"). DTC has a Standard & Poor's rating of AA+. The DTC Rules applicable to its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. More information about DTC can be found at www.dtcc.com.

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.

6. Redemption notices shall 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 Securities unless authorized by a Direct Participant in accordance with DTC's MMI Procedures. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an Omnibus Proxy to Issuer 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 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 Issuer or Agent, on payable date in accordance with their respective holdings shown on DTC's records. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name," and will be the responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC, Agent, or Issuer, 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 Issuer or Agent, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners will be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

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

10. Issuer 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.

APPENDIX F

PROPOSED FORM OF CO-SPECIAL COUNSEL OPINIONS

[Closing Date]

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Re: $__________ City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation, Series 202[__] (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects)

We have acted as co-special counsel to our client the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") in connection with the execution and delivery by the City of the $[Par Amount]* City and County of San Francisco Certificates of Participation, Series 202[__] (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) (the "Certificates"), evidencing undivided and proportionate interests of the owners of the Certificates in certain base rental payments (the "Base Rental Payments") to be made by the City pursuant to that certain Project Lease, dated as of May 1, 2009, as previously supplemented and amended (the "Original Project Lease"), as further supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Project Lease, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (the "[Nth] Supplement to Project Lease" and, together with the Original Project Lease, as previously supplemented and amended, the "Project Lease"), by and between [U.S. Bank National Association], as lessor, and the City, as lessee. In that regard, we have reviewed the Constitution and the laws of the State of California and certain proceedings taken by the City in connection with the authorization, execution and delivery by the City of the Project Lease. We have also reviewed that certain Trust Agreement, dated as of May 1, 2009, as previously supplemented and amended (the "Original Trust Agreement"), as further supplemented and amended by that certain [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement, dated as of [Month 1, 202__] (the "[Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement" and, together with the Original Trust Agreement, as supplemented and amended, the "Trust Agreement"), by and between [U.S. Bank National Association], as trustee (the "Trustee"), and the City. Each capitalized term used but not defined herein shall have the meaning given thereto in the Trust Agreement.

Pursuant to the Trust Agreement, the Trustee has agreed to execute and deliver the Certificates, which Certificates are dated their date of delivery. The Certificates mature on the dates and in the amounts set forth in the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement, and interest due with respect to the Certificates is payable on the dates and at the rates per annum set forth in the [Nth] Supplement to Trust Agreement.

In our capacity as co-special counsel, we have examined the transcript of proceedings relating to the issuance of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Project Lease, the Property Lease, a copy of the signed and authenticated Certificates and such other documents, matters and law as we deem necessary to render the opinions set forth in this letter.

Based on that examination and subject to the limitations stated below, we are of the opinion that under existing law:

1. Each of the Project Lease, the Property Lease and the Trust Agreement has been duly authorized, executed and delivered by the City and constitutes a valid and legally binding agreement of the City enforceable against the City in accordance with its terms.

2. The obligation of the City to pay Base Rental Payments in accordance with the terms of the Project Lease is a valid and binding obligation payable from the funds of the City lawfully

available therefor, and the obligation of the City to make Base Rental Payments under the Project Lease does not constitute a debt of the City, the State of California or any political subdivision thereof within the meaning of any statutory or constitutional debt limitation or restriction and does not constitute a pledge of the faith and credit or taxing power of the City, the State of California or any political subdivision thereof.

3. Under existing statutes, regulations, rulings and judicial decisions, and assuming the accuracy of certain representations and compliance with certain covenants and requirements described herein, the portion of each Base Rental Payment constituting interest with respect to the Certificates and received by the owners of the Certificates is excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes under Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), and is not an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax.

4. The portion of each Base Rental Payment constituting interest with respect to the Certificates and received by the owners of the Certificates is also exempt from State of California personal income taxes.

We express no opinion as to the treatment for federal income tax purposes or State of California income tax purposes of amounts paid to owners of the Certificates in the event of termination of the Project Lease as the result of money not being appropriated to pay Base Rental Payments, and we express no opinion as to any other tax consequences regarding the Certificates.

The opinions stated above are based on an analysis of existing laws, regulations, rulings and court decisions, which are subject to change, and cover certain matters not directly addressed by such authorities. In rendering all such opinions, we assume, without independent verification, and rely upon (i) the accuracy of the factual matters represented, warranted or certified in the proceedings and documents we have examined and (ii) the due and legal authorization, execution and delivery of those documents by, and the valid, binding and enforceable nature of those documents upon, any parties other than the City.

We express no opinion herein regarding the priority of the lien on moneys held by the Trustee or other funds created by the Trust Agreement. We express no opinion herein with respect to the status or quality of title to, or any interest in, any of the property described in the Project Lease, or the accuracy or sufficiency of the description contained therein of any of that property, or the priority of, or the remedies available to enforce, any claim on or interest in any of that property.

In rendering those opinions with respect to treatment of the portion of each Base Rental Payment constituting interest with respect to the Certificates under the federal tax laws, we further assume and rely upon compliance with the covenants in the proceedings and documents we have examined, including those of the City. Failure to comply with certain of those covenants subsequent to issuance of the Certificates may cause the portion of each Base Rental Payment constituting interest with respect to the Certificates paid to owners of the Certificates to be included in gross income for federal income tax purposes retroactively to their date of issuance.

The rights of the owners of the Certificates and the enforceability of the Certificates, the Trust Agreement, the Property Lease and the Project Lease are, and the opinions expressed above are qualified to the extent that they are, subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium, fraudulent conveyance or transfer, and other laws relating to or affecting the rights and remedies of creditors generally; to the application of equitable principles, whether considered in a proceeding at law or in equity; to the exercise of judicial discretion; and to limitations on legal remedies against public entities.

No opinions other than those expressly stated herein are implied or shall be inferred as a result of anything contained in or omitted from this letter. The opinions expressed in this letter are given only as of the time of its delivery, and we disclaim any obligation to revise or supplement this letter thereafter, including to reflect any facts or circumstances that may hereafter come to our attention or any changes in law that may hereafter occur. Our engagement as co-special counsel in connection with the original issuance and delivery of the Certificates is concluded upon delivery of this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

APPENDIX G

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