

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Debt Policy

Finance Branch
June 2021*

*Updated on June 28, 2021 (R-313616)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	4
CHAPTER I – PURPOSE & NEED FOR FINANCING	7
1.1 Purpose of Financing.....	7
1.2 Financing Priorities	8
1.3 Asset Life	9
CHAPTER II – CREDIT RATINGS	10
2.1 Credit Ratings	10
CHAPTER III – TYPES OF FINANCING INSTRUMENTS	11
DIRECT DEBT OBLIGATIONS	11
3.1 General Obligation Bonds	11
3.2 Certificates of Participation / Lease Revenue Bonds.....	11
3.3 Revenue Bonds.....	12
OTHER DEBT OBLIGATIONS.....	12
3.4 Revenue Securitizations	12
3.5 Pension Obligation Bonds	12
FORMER REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY DEBT OBLIGATIONS.....	13
3.6 Tax Allocation Bonds.....	13
CONDUIT FINANCINGS.....	13
3.7 Special Districts Financing	13
3.8 Marks-Roos Pooled Financings	14
3.9 Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Bonds	14
3.10 Industrial Development Bonds	14
HOUSING AUTHORITY DEBT OBLIGATIONS.....	15
3.11 Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds.....	15
SHORT-TERM BORROWINGS	15
3.12 Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes.....	15
3.13 Bond Anticipation Notes	16
3.14 Lines of Credit.....	16
3.15 Lease – Purchase Financings.....	16
3.16 Commercial Paper Programs.....	16
LOAN OBLIGATIONS	17
3.17 State and Federal Loans	17
3.18 HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program	18
CHAPTER IV – DEBT RATIO GUIDELINES	19
4.1 General Obligation Bonds	19
4.2 General Fund-Supported Debt.....	19
4.3 Coverage Ratios for Revenue Bonds and Loans	20
CHAPTER V – STRUCTURE & TERM OF CITY INDEBTEDNESS	22

5.1	Term of Debt.....	22
5.2	Rapidity of Debt Repayment.....	22
5.3	Serial Bonds, Term Bonds, and Capital Appreciation Bonds.....	22
5.4	Interest Rate	23
5.5	Debt Instrument Rating.....	23
5.6	Credit Enhancement.....	23
5.7	Debt Service Reserve Fund/Surety Policy	24
5.8	Capitalized Interest.....	24
5.9	Call Options/Redemption Provisions	24
CHAPTER VI – METHOD OF ISSUANCE & SALE		26
6.1	Method of Sale	26
6.2	Bidding Parameters.....	27
6.3	Initial Disclosure Requirements	27
6.4	Approval Process	27
CHAPTER VII – FINANCING TEAM – ROLES AND SELECTION PROCESS		29
7.1	Selection and Compensation	29
7.2	Financing Team: Outside Consultants	29
CHAPTER VIII – REFUNDING OF CITY INDEBTEDNESS		32
CHAPTER IX – POST ISSUANCE COMPLIANCE & ADMINISTRATION		33
9.1	Investment of Bond Proceeds.....	33
9.2	Arbitrage Compliance	33
9.3	Ongoing Disclosure.....	33
9.4	Compliance with Other Bond Covenants.....	33
9.5	Compliance with State and Federal Reporting Requirements	34
CHAPTER X – COMPLIANCE WITH CITY DEBT POLICY		35
APPENDIX A – SPECIAL DISTRICT FORMATION AND FINANCING POLICY		37
	Overview.....	37
A1	Background: Types of Special Districts	38
A2	Considerations for Authorization of Special District Financing.....	39
A3	Eligible Facilities and Priorities	42
A4	Credit Quality Requirements for Bond Issuances.....	43
A5	Tax and Assessment Allocation Formulas	46
A6	Appraisal Standards.....	47
A7	Sources of Payment for Special Districts Bonds	48
A8	Non-City Disclosure Requirements	48
A9	Application and Administrative Procedures.....	49
A10	Timing.....	50
A11	Policy Exceptions.....	51
APPENDIX B – COUNCIL POLICY 800-14 “PRIORITIZING CIP PROJECTS”		53
APPENDIX C – BASIC LEGAL DOCUMENTS		67

C1	<i>Authorizing Resolution</i>	67
C2	<i>Bond/Note Purchase Agreement/Broker-Dealer Agreement</i>	67
C3	<i>Closing Documents</i>	68
C4	<i>Continuing Disclosure Agreement</i>	68
C5	<i>Indenture</i>	69
C6	<i>Loan Agreement</i>	69
C7	<i>Official Statement</i>	70
C8	<i>Reimbursement Agreement</i>	70
C9	<i>Tax Certificate</i>	71
APPENDIX D – DISCLOSURE PRACTICES WORKING GROUP		72
DISCLOSURE CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES		72
	<i>Article I</i>	72
	<i>Article II</i>	73
	<i>Article III</i>	74
	<i>Article IV</i>	75
	<i>Article V</i>	78
	<i>Article VI</i>	80
	<i>Article VII</i>	80
	<i>Article VIII</i>	81
	<i>Article IX</i>	82
	<i>Article X</i>	82
	<i>Article XI</i>	82
APPENDIX E – GLOSSARY		96

OVERVIEW

The City of San Diego (the City), through the Chief Financial Officer, executes debt instruments, administers debt proceeds, manages ongoing disclosure and debt compliance, and makes debt service payments, acting with prudence and diligence and with attention to prevailing economic conditions. The City believes that debt is an equitable means of financing projects and represents an important means of meeting fiscal responsibilities.

When debt is determined to be the best source of funding for a capital purpose, the debt service payments must be paid by the revenue, or “credit,” of the City agency sponsoring the project, since its stakeholders are most likely receiving the majority of the benefit to be derived from the project. Once the City determines the most appropriate credit(s) for a particular financing, that credit(s) will continue to make the debt service payments for the duration of the obligation (e.g., bonds, loan, etc.). Currently, the City primarily utilizes the following credits: General Fund, Special Districts (each district under its own credit), Sewer Utility, and Water Utility. In the future, the City may issue debt for new credits as new revenue sources become available, or for existing enterprises or sources that are not currently leveraged.

The Debt Policy primarily addresses debt instruments/securities issued by the City in public or private bond markets, but also recognizes other debt-like long-term *financial obligations*¹ and agreements of the City that place a direct obligation on the City and/or its related entities. This is consistent with examples of debt policies of other comparable municipalities, GFOA guidelines, and rating agency guidelines. The Debt Policy pertains to debt that is typically incurred when capital is raised in the public or private markets, including borrowings from sophisticated qualified institutional buyers, to meet the City’s funding needs (the purpose and need for financings is discussed in Chapter 1). Such debt constitutes obligations whereby a third-party has provided funds, which is evidenced by the formal execution of a bond or certificate (or a similar instrument), and is held by the third-party until it is repaid.

The policy covers capital uses and related financings; it does not cover other obligations like operating leases, or net pension obligation (NPO) and/or pension Unfunded Actuarial Liability (UAL) and Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) UAL. The City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports provide a complete list of the outstanding long-term liabilities. The sections in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report listing the long-term liabilities are: Governmental Activities Long-Term Liabilities; Business Type Activities Long-Term Liabilities; and Discretely Presented Component Units Long-Term Debt. Consistent with GASB standards, the NPO is reflected in the Governmental Activities Note 5 of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report as a long-term liability. Since Fiscal Year 2008, OPEB-related NPO has been captured in the same section as the NPO. The pension UAL and OPEB UAL are reflected in Notes 12 (Pension) and 13 (OPEB) of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

The policy documents the City’s procedures and goals for the use of debt to finance City needs. A regularly updated debt policy, in conjunction with the Five-Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook, City’s

¹ Under SEC laws, the term “financial obligation” means a (i) debt obligation; (ii) derivative instrument entered into in connection with, or pledged as security or a source of payment for, an existing or planned debt obligation; or (iii) guarantee of (i) or (ii). The term financial obligation shall not include municipal securities for which a final official statement has been provided to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board consistent with Rule 15c2-12.

Capital Improvements Program budget, the Five-Year Financial Outlook, the Investment Policy, and the Reserve Policy, serves as an important tool that supports the use of the City's resources to meet its financial commitments and to maintain sound financial management practices. This policy is enacted in an effort to standardize and plan the issuance and management of debt by the City. While the Debt Policy serves as a guideline for general use, it allows for exceptions in extraordinary conditions.

Appendices of this Debt Policy consist of: Appendix A, which provides policy direction on Special Districts Formation and Financing; Appendix B, Council Policy 800-14 (Prioritizing CIP Projects); Appendix C, Basic Legal Documents; Appendix D, Disclosure Practices Working Group – Disclosure Controls and Procedures; and Appendix E, the Glossary.

The primary objectives of this Debt Policy are to establish guidelines for the use of various categories of debt; create procedures and policies that minimize the City's debt service and issuance costs; retain the highest practical credit ratings; and to provide full and complete financial disclosure and reporting. In meeting these objectives, the City also fulfills the requirements of California Government Code 8855 with respect to local debt policies.

The City's Debt Policy is also designed to:

- Establish parameters for issuing and managing debt;
- Provide guidance to decision makers related to debt affordability standards;
- Document the pre- and post-issuance objectives to be achieved by staff;
- Promote objectivity in the debt approval decision making process; and
- Facilitate the actual financing process by establishing important policy decisions in advance.

A biennial review of the Debt Policy will be performed and any changes to the Debt Policy will be brought forward for City Council consideration and approval. Further, in the event there are any deviations or exceptions from the Debt Policy when a certain bond issue is structured, those exceptions will be discussed in the staff reports when the bond issue is docketed for City Council's consideration.

California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) Reporting/Debt Policy Requirements

Effective January 1, 2017, Government Code Section 8855 was amended to require reporting to CDIAC both before and after the issuance of debt by or on behalf of local governments, including the City. Section 8855 also requires local governments to have a debt policy that includes the following (locations in this policy are identified parenthetically):

- The purposes for which the debt proceeds may be used (Section 1.1).
- The types of debt that may be issued (Chapter 3).
- The relationship of the debt to, and integration with, the issuer's capital improvement program or budget, if applicable (Section 1.1).
- Policy goals related to the issuer's planning goals and objectives (Chapters 4-6).
- The internal control policies that the issuer has implemented, or will implement, to ensure that the proceeds of the proposed debt issuance will be directed to the intended use (Section 9.5).

In addition to the Formal Centralized Monitoring Program (FCMP) requirements related to post-issuance compliance (See Section 9.4), the Policy and Procedures to Document and Retain Records for Expenditure of Bond Proceeds (Bond Proceeds Expenditure Policy) ensures that bond proceeds are appropriately expended and that records of such expenditures are maintained. The Bond Proceeds Expenditure Policy is incorporated by reference to this Policy and can be found on the City's website at: <http://www.sandiego.gov/debtmanagement>.

CHAPTER I – PURPOSE & NEED FOR FINANCING

1.1 Purpose of Financing

The City borrows money primarily to fund long-term capital improvement projects, essential equipment and vehicle needs, and to refinance existing debt. The issuance of debt to fund operating deficits is not permitted, with the exception of Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes (See Section 3.13). Debt will be used to finance eligible projects only if it is the most cost-effective means available to the City.

While the “pay-go” means of using current revenues to pay for capital projects is often considered the preferred means of financing because it avoids interest payments, it may not be entirely equitable. The “pay-go” funding option requires current citizens to pay taxes over long periods of time in order to accumulate reserves sufficient to pay for capital projects. The City would be able to undertake capital projects under this method only if sufficient cash accumulates. Prudent use of debt financing rather than pay-go funding of capital projects can facilitate better allocation of resources and increased financial flexibility.

The three primary borrowing purposes for which debt proceeds may be used are summarized below:

A. Long-Term Capital Improvements

The City prepares a multi-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) budget working with asset managing departments in accordance with Council Policy 800-14, “Prioritizing CIP Projects” (see Appendix B). The CIP budget includes projections for upcoming fiscal years and is updated during each annual budget process or if there are significant changes to the scope and/or cost of projects. In accordance with Council Policy 800-14, future operations and maintenance costs associated with capital improvement projects are developed and identified prior to submission of the project for approval. The Department of Finance works with the Engineering & Capital Projects Department to ensure that accurate and complete budgeting of the CIP is prepared as part of the annual budget process.

Since the aggregate cost of desired capital projects generally exceeds available funds, the capital planning process prioritizes projects and identifies the funding needs. The City will initially rely on internally-generated funds and/or grants and contributions from other governments to finance its capital needs. Debt is issued for a capital project only when it is an appropriate means to achieve a fair allocation of costs between current and future beneficiaries and if a secure revenue source is identified to repay the debt.

The Debt Management Department, working with City departments within the context of the Capital Improvements Program budget and the City’s Five-Year Financial Outlook, oversees and coordinates the timing, processing, and marketing of the City’s borrowing and capital funding activities. Close coordination of capital planning and debt planning ensures that the maximum benefit is achieved with the limited capital funds. The debt management process determines the availability of funds which can be raised through debt based upon the debt capacity/affordability analysis.

B. Essential Vehicle and Equipment Needs

In addition to capital projects, the City regularly finances certain essential equipment and vehicles. These assets range from public safety vehicles and garbage trucks to information technology systems. The underlying asset must have a minimum useful life of three years. Short-term financings, including loans and capital lease purchase agreements, are executed to meet such needs.

C. Refinancings/Refunding of Existing Debt

The Chief Financial Officer working with the Debt Management Department periodically evaluates the City's existing debt and executes refinancings when economically beneficial. A refinancing may include the issuance of bonds to refund existing bonds or the issuance of bonds in order to refund other obligations, such as pension obligations. See Chapter VIII for refunding considerations.

1.2 *Financing Priorities*

All borrowing requests or debt refunding proposals shall be reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer. The Finance Branch shall be responsible for analyzing the proposal to determine if it is beneficial to the City and complies with the City's long-term financial planning objectives. Borrowing requests include any debt or refunding proposals made to the City involving a pledge or other extension of the City's credit through the sale of securities, execution of loans or leases, or making of guarantees or otherwise involving directly or indirectly the lending or pledging of the City's credit.

For each financing proposal related to a new capital improvement project, the Finance Branch will work with the Engineering & Capital Projects Department or other client department to assess the feasibility and the impact of debt to fund the project based on the following assessments:

A. Nature of Project and Use of Funds

Each proposal is evaluated by comparing the nature of the project and use of funds with competing proposals on the basis of the benefits derived and how it furthers the City's policy objectives as laid out in the City's Annual Budget, Five-Year Financial Outlook, Capital Improvement Program budget, and Five-Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook.

B. Cost-Benefit Analysis of Project:

A cost-benefit analysis is required for each project.

1. The benefits of a proposed project must be defined and, where appropriate, quantified in monetary terms. The funding sources are identified and estimated. Where revenues are part of the benefits, all assumptions made in deriving the revenues are documented. The validity of the assumptions and the risk associated with the revenue streams are assessed.

-
2. The costs of the project are estimated, with the basis documented and the risk associated with the estimates assessed. The uses of funds are identified and estimated.
 3. The project's increases or reductions in ongoing operation and maintenance expenses are identified.

C. Expenditure Plan

A detailed plan for the expenditure of funds is developed for each project. The underlying assumptions of the project cost expenditure plan are documented and the risk associated with these projections are analyzed.

D. Revenue for Debt Service Payment

A detailed plan for the debt repayment is developed for each project. The underlying assumptions of revenue cash flow estimates are documented and the risk associated with these revenue streams is analyzed. Where general fund revenues are proposed to service debt, the impact upon budgets is assessed.

All requests are prioritized based upon this evaluation. If the Debt Management Director recommends the financing proposal and the Chief Financial Officer is in concurrence, the Debt Management Department will prepare the financing proposal for the City Council's authorization.

1.3 Asset Life

Consistent with its philosophy of keeping its capital facilities and infrastructure systems in good condition and to maximize a capital asset's useful life, the City makes every effort to set aside sufficient current revenues to finance ongoing maintenance needs and to provide reserves for periodic replacement and renewal. Pursuant to federal tax code sections governing the issuance of tax-exempt municipal bonds, bonds can be issued up to a weighted average life that does not exceed 120% of the combined weighted average useful life of the projects to be financed.

The City will consider short or long-term financing for the acquisition, maintenance, replacement, or expansion of capital assets, including land, facilities, system improvements, essential equipment or vehicles. A suitable repayment structure for the financed capital project will be chosen in conformance with federal tax code provisions.

CHAPTER II – CREDIT RATINGS

2.1 Credit Ratings

The City seeks to maintain the highest possible credit ratings that can be achieved for debt instruments without compromising the City's policy objectives. Ratings are a reflection of the general fiscal soundness of the City, the local economy and other regional economic factors, and the capabilities of City management. By maintaining the highest possible credit ratings, the City can issue its debt at a lower interest cost. To enhance creditworthiness, the City is committed to prudent financial management, systematic capital planning, interdepartmental cooperation and coordination, and long-term financial planning.

Rating agencies consider various factors in issuing a credit rating; these typically include:

- City's fiscal status
- City's financial and general management capabilities
- Economic conditions that may impact the stability and reliability of debt repayment sources
- City's general reserve levels
- City's debt history and current debt structure
- The capital improvement project that is being funded
- Covenants and conditions in the governing legal documents

The City recognizes that external economic, natural, or other events may from time to time affect the creditworthiness of its debt. Each proposal for additional debt will be analyzed for its impact upon the City's credit rating on outstanding debt. There are no predetermined credit rating formulas available from the rating agencies, although recent updates to rating methodologies from certain rating agencies have added transparency to their credit evaluation processes. This information provides a better understanding of how key quantitative and qualitative factors and risk factors are likely to affect rating outcomes. The City will monitor rating agency guidelines and methodologies regularly to stay informed of changes to the rating metrics and processes.

The Chief Financial Officer is responsible for managing the rating reviews associated with the City's various debt obligations. This effort includes providing periodic updates, both formal and informal, on the City's general financial condition and coordinating meetings and presentations in conjunction with a new debt issuance when determined necessary. Credit material provided to the Rating Agencies shall be approved by the City's Disclosure Practices Working Group² (DPWG).

The Chief Financial Officer, working with the Debt Management Department and, if applicable, a Municipal Advisor, shall be responsible for determining whether a rating shall be requested on a particular financing, and which of the major rating agencies shall be asked to provide such a rating. Obtaining ratings and credit enhancements for new issuances is discussed in Chapter V.

² The role of the DPWG in review and approval of disclosure documents is further discussed in Sections 6.3 and 6.4.

CHAPTER III – TYPES OF FINANCING INSTRUMENTS

There are many different types of financing instruments available to the City; long-term financing debt obligations like General Obligation Bonds, Lease Revenue Bonds and Revenue Bonds would typically constitute direct debt of the City. Lease Revenue Bonds and Revenue Bonds are not considered debt for purposes of the Charter or California Constitution and therefore do not require a vote of the public. The City issues conduit financings to benefit third parties where public benefit can be achieved. The following are brief summaries of different types of long and short-term financing instruments that the City may consider.

DIRECT DEBT OBLIGATIONS

3.1 General Obligation Bonds

General Obligation (GO) Bonds, which are addressed in Section 90 of the City Charter, are secured either by a pledge of full faith and credit of an issuer or by a promise to levy taxes in an unlimited amount as necessary to pay debt service, or both. An ad valorem tax, or a tax based on the assessed value of property, may be levied in order to pay debt service associated with GO Bonds. GO Bonds usually achieve lower rates of interest than other financing instruments since they are considered to be a lower risk. Uses of Bond proceeds are limited to the acquisition and improvement of real property.

California State Constitution, Article 16 - Public Finance, Section 18, requires that the issuance of a GO Bond must be approved by a two-thirds majority of those voting on the Bond proposition.

3.2 Certificates of Participation / Lease Revenue Bonds

Certificates of Participation (COPs) and Lease Revenue Bonds (LRBs) are lease obligations secured by an installment sale or by a lease-back arrangement between the City and another public entity (such as a Joint Powers Authority³), where the general operating revenues of the City are used to make lease payments, which are, in turn, used to pay debt service on the bonds or Certificates of Participation. As noted above, these obligations do not constitute indebtedness under the state constitutional debt limitation and, therefore, are not subject to voter approval.

Payments to be made under valid leases are payable only in the year in which use and occupancy of the leased property is available, and lease payments may not be accelerated. Lease financing requires the annual fair market rental value of the leased property to be equal to or greater than the lease payment. The governmental lessee is obligated to place in its Annual Budget the rental payments that are due and payable during each fiscal year that the lessee has use of the leased property.

³ The City utilizes Joint Powers Authorities such as the Public Facilities Financing Authority (PFFA) of the City of San Diego and the Convention Center Expansion Financing Authority to issue LRBs.

3.3 *Revenue Bonds*

Revenue Bonds are obligations payable from revenues generated by an enterprise, such as water or wastewater utilities, public golf courses or parking facilities.

The City's utility Revenue Bonds are issued by a Joint Powers Authority and are payable solely from the City's Water or Wastewater Enterprise Funds and are not secured by any pledge of ad valorem taxes or general fund revenues of the City. In accordance with the agreed upon bond covenants, the revenues generated by these Enterprise Funds must be sufficient to maintain required coverage levels, or the rates of the enterprise have to be raised to maintain the revenue coverages (see Section 4.3). The issuance of utility revenue bonds does not require voter approval.

Pursuant to Section 90.1 of the City Charter, the Council may authorize the issuance of revenue bonds by a two-thirds vote of the Council provided the bonds are not secured by or payable from the general fund or any fund other than an enterprise fund and that the purpose of the bond issue is to provide for the construction, reconstruction or replacement of water facilities, wastewater facilities, or storm water facilities. All revenue bonds may be issued and sold in accordance with state law or any procedure established by ordinance.

OTHER DEBT OBLIGATIONS

3.4 *Revenue Securitizations*

Revenues are said to be securitized when the right to receive the revenues is sold to investors at a discounted price in exchange for an upfront lump sum payment. The current value of the receivable is determined by applying a discount rate to the projected receivable and the buyer of the revenue will offer to buy the receivable at the agreed discount rate.

Revenue securitization may be used as a mechanism to raise monies when the City is able to identify suitable revenue streams. Voter approval is not required. However, a legal validation of the financing may be necessary.

3.5 *Pension Obligation Bonds*

Pension Obligation Bonds (POBs) are financing instruments used to pay some or all of the unfunded pension liability of a pension plan. POBs are issued as taxable instruments over a 30-40-year term or by matching the term with the amortization period of the outstanding unfunded actuarial accrued liability. The purpose of the pension obligation bond, its structure, and the use of the proceeds will go through a judicial validation process prior to the sale of the bonds. POBs are not typically subject to voter approval.

In California, municipal and county POBs have traditionally been issued under the local agency refunding law and considered valid without a vote under a judicially created exception to the State Constitution: Article XVI, Section 18, is a debt limitation exception referred to as "obligations imposed by law." If issued, POBs are treated as a general obligation of the City.

POBs may allow municipal governments to borrow at a rate that is lower than the assumed actuarial rate that is built into the unfunded actuarially accrued liability (UAAL). Such assumed actuarial rate is used to project the investment rate to be earned on the proceeds of the POBs and the investment rate payable on the UAAL. The City may consider the issuance of POBs if they are cost effective and in the City's overall best financial interest.

FORMER REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY DEBT OBLIGATIONS

3.6 Tax Allocation Bonds

Tax Allocation Bonds are special obligations secured by the allocation of tax increment revenues from the former project areas of a redevelopment agency. Tax Allocation Bonds are not a debt of the City, the State, or any of their political subdivisions.

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego (RDA) was dissolved pursuant to state law on February 1, 2012. The RDA's operations were substantially eliminated but for the continuation of certain enforceable RDA obligations administered by the City as the Successor Agency to the RDA. The Successor Agency continues to make debt service payments and perform all other obligations of the former RDA under the bond indentures (or similar documents) governing the issuance of the former RDA's outstanding Tax Allocation Bonds. Pursuant to state law, the Successor Agency can only issue new bonds, either to refund the former RDA's outstanding Tax Allocation bonds to achieve debt service savings, or to satisfy prior obligations of the RDA. Any refunding bonds issued must satisfy strict state law guidelines and are subject to both the Oversight Board to the Successor Agency and the California State Department of Finance's approval. Any refunding bonds issued are also subject to the guidelines in Chapter VIII and the Successor Agency Board approvals.

CONDUIT FINANCINGS

3.7 Special Districts Financing

The City's Special Districts primarily consist of Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) and 1913/1915 Act Assessment Districts (Assessment Districts). Special Districts are typically developer initiated, whereby a developer seeks a public financing mechanism to fund public infrastructure required by the City in connection with development permits or agreements, and/or tentative subdivision maps. Special District formation may also be initiated by an established community. Subject to voter approval, once a district is formed, special taxes or assessments may be levied upon properties within the district to pay for facilities and services directly, or to repay bonds issued to finance public improvements.

The City will consider requests for Special District formation and debt issuance when such requests address a public need or provide a public benefit. Each application will be considered on a case by case basis, and the Chief Financial Officer may not recommend a financing if it is determined that the financing could be detrimental to the debt position or the best interests of the City. Refer to Appendix A – Special District Formation and Financing Policy for additional information.

3.8 *Marks-Roos Pooled Financings*

The Marks-Roos Local Bond Pooling Act of 1985 permits two or more public agencies to form a joint-powers authority (JPA) to facilitate the financing of public capital improvements, working capital, or other projects when use of these provisions results in savings in effective interest rate, bond underwriting and issuance costs, or any other significant public benefit can be realized. Once established, the JPA can purchase the bonds of local agencies with the proceeds of the Mark-Roos bonds.

3.9 *Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Bonds*

An Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) is a governmental entity, separate and distinct from the agency that establishes it, and is governed by a Public Financing Authority (PFA). The formation of an EIFD involves numerous legislative actions by the agency forming the district and the PFA, the development and adoption of an EIFD Infrastructure Financing Plan, and extensive noticing. EIFD bonds are an obligation of the EIFD, not the agency forming the district, and voter approval is not required.

EIFDs are authorized under state law to aid local government entities in funding public capital facilities, or other specified projects of communitywide significance, by capturing property tax increment revenue and certain other revenues of participating forming entities. The amount and duration of property tax increment revenue allocated to the district, that otherwise would flow to the City's General Fund, is decided by the City during the formation process. While property tax increment is currently the main source of revenue, an EIFD is not precluded from utilizing additional revenues such as special taxes and impact fees. An EIFD may finance the purchase, construction, expansion, or improvement of projects with a useful life of 15 years or longer, as well as ongoing capitalized maintenance of such projects (pursuant to the September 2018 amendments discussed below). Among the eligible projects are transportation improvements, public facilities, and affordable housing. The property tax increment generated within the EIFD can be used to cash fund projects and/or pay debt service on bonds issued to finance the projects.

Amendments to EIFD law (SB961 and SB1145) were enacted in September 2018. SB961 allows EIFD forming entities (Cities, Counties, etc.) to allocate any portion of their existing sales and use tax revenue (in addition to property tax increment) to an EIFD (whether new or already formed) for use on affordable housing projects and to issue bonds without a vote upon meeting certain conditions including proximity to major transit centers, 40% of total revenue allocation must be allocated to housing for occupants at less than 60% median income and the district boundaries must be coterminous with the City. SB1145 amends EIFD law to allow EIFDs to fund ongoing, capitalized maintenance costs for public infrastructure that was originally funded by the EIFD.

An EIFD is an important financing mechanism to fund public infrastructure. Formation of a new EIFD and debt issued for an EIFD will be considered on a case by case basis, upon evaluating feasibility, cost benefit, and a review of financing tools to complement an EIFD measure. Generally, because tax increment revenue is the result of increases in assessed value within the district, an EIFD will be most effective in areas with significant portions of undeveloped or underdeveloped land.

3.10 *Industrial Development Bonds*

Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs) are tax-exempt private activity bonds that provide manufacturing and processing companies financing for capital expenditures. While the authorization to issue IDBs is

provided by a state statute (the Industrial Development Financing Act of 1980 (Act), the tax-exempt status of these bonds is derived from federal law (Internal Revenue Code Section 103(b) (2)). Under state law, IDBs are issued by a local government agency, which can be a city, county, economic development authority, redevelopment agency or a joint powers authority. The California Industrial Development Financing Advisory Commission (CIDFAC), a state agency within the California State Treasurer's Office, approves the issuance of IDBs.

The local government agency is required to schedule a Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) hearing prior to an IDB issuance, to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the use of tax-exempt funds to finance capital needs. The City, through membership in two joint powers authorities, has the ability to provide a TEFRA hearing. Interested parties may apply for bonds to be issued by the California Statewide Communities Development Authority (CSCDA) or the California Municipal Finance Authority (CMFA), both joint powers authorities, in which the City holds membership.

Since IDBs are tax-exempt municipal bonds, interest rates are substantially lower than commercial financing rates. The bonds also allow long-term amortization periods up to 30 years (depending on the useful life of the assets financed), so a growing company will also devote less cash-flow to service loan principal repayment.

HOUSING AUTHORITY DEBT OBLIGATIONS

3.11 Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds

The Multifamily Housing Bond Program provides tax exempt financing for developers willing to set aside a portion of the units in their projects as affordable housing. The issuer of these bonds is the San Diego Housing Authority. The authority to issue bonds is limited under the Internal Revenue Code. The San Diego Housing Commission administers the Housing Authority's Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bond Program and has a bond issuance and post-issuance compliance policy specific to the program.

SHORT-TERM BORROWINGS

3.12 Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes

Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) are short-term notes, proceeds of which allow a municipality to cover the periods of cash shortfalls resulting from a mismatch between timing of revenues and timing of expenditures.

The City may issue TRANs, if necessary, to meet General Fund cash flow needs in the upcoming fiscal year, in anticipation of the receipt of property tax and other revenues later in the fiscal year. The issuance of TRANs is authorized pursuant to Section 92 of the City Charter, together with article 7.6 (commencing with Section 53850) of Chapter 4, Part 1, Division 2, Title 5 of the California Government Code. The cash flow needs are determined by projections prepared by the Department of Finance Director, working with the City Treasurer, and reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer. The timing of the note sale, the notes' due date, and the timing and structuring of repayment will be components of the cash flow and cash

management analysis performed by the Finance Branch. As tax payments and other revenues are received, they are used in part to repay the TRANS. Voter approval is not required.

3.13 Bond Anticipation Notes

Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) are short-term interest-bearing bonds issued in the anticipation of long-term future bond issuances. The City may choose to issue BANs as a source of interim financing when it is considered by the Chief Financial Officer to be prudent and advantageous to the City. Voter approval is not required.

3.14 Lines of Credit

A Line of Credit is a contract between the issuer and a bank that provides a source of borrowed monies to the issuer in the event that monies available to pay debt service or to purchase a demand bond are insufficient for that purpose.

In the event that a Line of Credit is under consideration as an interim financing mechanism for a long-term capital need, before entering into any such agreements, takeout financing for such lines of credit must be planned for and determined to be feasible by the Chief Financial Officer.

When it is considered by the Chief Financial Officer to be prudent and advantageous to the City, the City may enter into agreements with commercial banks or other financial entities for purposes of acquiring a Line of Credit. Voter approval is not required.

3.15 Lease – Purchase Financings

The City's Equipment and Vehicle Financing Program (EVFP) provides a mechanism for the short-term financing of essential equipment through a lease-purchase mechanism. The lease-purchase terms are typically five to ten years. Under this program, the City enters into a master lease agreement with a lessor to finance the lease purchase of essential equipment up to a certain amount. Equipment is funded on an as needed basis through that fiscal year under this master lease agreement. The City may enter into other standalone operating leases and lease-purchase agreements on an as-needed basis without voter approval. The City has used the lease-purchase financing mechanism to acquire real estate assets and streetlights, with lease terms ranging from 11- 30 years.

3.16 Commercial Paper Programs

The Commercial Paper (CP) Programs serve as cash management tools that are primarily used to provide interim funding for capital expenditures by issuing notes (Notes) that will ultimately be funded from another source such as long-term bonds. The CP Notes will be used to finance only capital expenditures. As described in Chapter 1 (Section 1.2A), projects will be prioritized in accordance with City Council Policy No. 800-14 titled *Prioritizing Capital Improvement Program Projects*. A CP program can be leveraged to fund various capital expenditures. However, the total outstanding Notes at any given time will not exceed the established not-to-exceed amount of the CP program.

CP Notes allow for borrowing smaller amounts as needed based on short-term rates in place of issuing large amounts in the form of long-term bonds at long-term interest rates. The Notes will typically be

structured as revenue obligations for the City enterprises or lease revenue obligations for City General Fund's capital needs, similar to the long-term Revenue Bonds and the Lease Revenue Bonds. Notes have a maturity of up to 270 days and thus bear short-term interest rates. Upon maturity, the Notes can be rolled over (or remarketed) for additional intervals until the Notes are refinanced with a long-term financing or cash repayment option.

Depending on the term of a Note and the timing of the long-term financings that will ultimately be used to retire it, CP Notes may need to be remarketed more than once before they are replaced with long-term financing. This means that Notes are subject to rollover remarketing risk – the risk that the Note can be reissued timely to a buyer at a reasonable rate of interest. Additional risk that will need to be considered is that interest rates on long-term financings can change between the time Notes are originally issued and the time at which long-term financings will retire the Notes. If interest rates rise, the total debt service paid using commercial paper and the long-term financings to take out the Notes will increase, although near term debt service cost differential may still be achieved. Debt Management evaluates these risks in light of capital market conditions before proceeding with any issuance of Notes.

Additional consideration is given to the timing and impact of the CP Notes' take-out financing. Existing CP programs for General Fund CIP and the Water Utility take into consideration market conditions and other funding or refunding needs requiring long-term issuances. For these or other reasons, long-term take-out financing may occur before the maximum amount of CP Notes has been issued.

Establishing a new CP program or increasing the maximum principal amount of an existing program requires City Council approval. The resolutions approving either will include, among other parameters, both the maximum principal amount of Notes that may be outstanding at any time and the not-to-exceed cap on the interest rate to be paid on the Notes.

In the course of seeking Council approval of the program, the Chief Financial Officer and/or Debt Management Director will provide the Council with their rationale for the recommendation, an overview of current capital market conditions (including potential risk considerations), and a comprehensive plan for using the Notes to finance specific capital improvements. The Council may periodically request information update presentations at either Committee or Council meetings.

LOAN OBLIGATIONS

3.17 State and Federal Loans

State and federal loan proceeds are an important source of funds for capital projects in addition to the bond proceeds. State Revolving Funds (SRFs) and the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) program make low cost loans available to local agencies to fund certain public infrastructure projects. Through these programs, various state agencies, such as the California State Water Resources Control Board, California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IBank), and California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, as well as federal agencies such as the Department of Transportation and Environmental Protection Agency, offer local agencies loans to fund qualifying public infrastructure projects. Benefiting departments within the City will evaluate such programs in conjunction with Debt Management on a case by case basis.

3.18 HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program

The U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program allows cities to leverage their annual Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement grants to apply for federally guaranteed loans large enough to finance major community development and economic development projects. In order to utilize the Program, the City must include the use of Section 108 Loans in its Consolidated Plan for HUD Programs.

The Economic Development Department currently oversees the fiduciary and reporting requirements of the City's current HUD Section 108 loans.

In addition to some of the long and short-term financing instruments described above that the City may access, the City may also consider joint arrangements with other governmental agencies when a project serves the public interest beyond the City boundaries. Communication and coordination will be made with other local, state, and federal governments regarding potential jurisdictional overlap, joint projects, tax issues, and other issues that may arise. If the potential does exist, then the possibility of grants or cost sharing will be explored, quantified, and specific financial arrangements and liabilities negotiated. Municipal issuers are authorized to join together to create a separate entity, a Joint Powers Authority (JPA), to issue bonds on behalf of the municipality. The City Council may sit as the governing body of the agency or authority. Other governmental agencies that a municipal issuer can jointly issue bonds with include housing authorities. Typically, joint venture debt is repaid through revenues generated by the project and if structured as a JPA, a debt issuance associated with joint venture arrangements does not require voter approval. The City will only be liable for its share of debt service, as specified in a contract executed in connection with the joint venture debt.

CHAPTER IV – DEBT RATIO GUIDELINES

Given the significant restrictions in California on local agency revenue sources, especially those imposed under Proposition 218, the City is aware of the need to gauge the effect of ongoing debt service and other fixed obligations on its budgets and fiscal priorities over time. To provide a debt affordability plan and keep debt levels within acceptable ranges, the City will consider generally accepted debt affordability standards in evaluating when, why, and how much debt should be incurred. Debt ratio guidelines discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 below pertain only to the City's general fund debt supported by tax levy or General Funds, and coverage ratios in Section 4.3 pertain to revenue-supported debt such as those obligations issued by the City's Water and Wastewater utilities.

4.1 General Obligation Bonds

As discussed in Section 3.1, General Obligation Bonds are secured either by a pledge of full faith and credit of an issuer or by a promise to levy taxes in an unlimited amount as necessary to pay debt service, or both. Generally accepted measures of assessing the impact of general obligation bonds include:

- Debt per capita: This is the outstanding principal as a percentage of population.
- Debt as a percent of assessed valuation: This is the outstanding principal as a percentage of assessed valuation.

The City shall monitor and strive to achieve and/or maintain these debt statistics at a low to moderate classification, as generally viewed by the municipal bond market.

4.2 General Fund-Supported Debt

An important ratio used in analyzing the City's debt position with respect to General Fund supported debt obligations is the required annual debt service/lease payment as a percentage of total available general revenues or expenditures (Debt Ratio).⁴ This analysis includes the annual debt service/lease payment for all fixed rate obligations of the City such as lease revenue bonds, CP (interest and program fees only), and capital leases backed by the City's General Fund. This analysis excludes debt liabilities of the City's related agencies, debt supported by rates and user charges (e.g., enterprise fund-backed revenue bonds) or securitization of revenue such as tobacco settlement bonds. The City shall strive to maintain this Debt Ratio below 10%.

Short-term debt (issued with maturities of no longer than 10 years) creates pressure on the near-term debt service capacity of the City. To mitigate the burden of short-term debt on the City, the City strives to maintain a ratio of short-term annual debt service to General Fund revenues of approximately 2%. Debt service impacts of medium-term debt (issued with maturities of 11 to 20 years) will be evaluated in conjunction with other long-term debt.

⁴ The Debt Ratio is calculated using aggregate annual debt service/lease payments divided by all available annual general purpose revenues.

It is a strong financial management practice and an important planning tool to also evaluate the effects of other significant long-term fixed costs, such as pension and retiree health care (OPEB) costs, on the City's General Fund. Pension and OPEB costs and the City's annual contributions to meet these obligations are not controlled by this Debt Policy. However, these contributions need to be taken into account in calculating the City's overall debt burden. To that end, the ratio of the Actuarially Determined Contribution (ADC) to the pension system and retiree health care (OPEB) annual contributions as a percentage of available general revenues or expenditures (Pension/OPEB Ratio) shall also be taken into consideration for sound financial planning. Taken together, the City will strive to maintain the combined Debt Ratio and Pension/OPEB Ratio below 25%.

Capacity analysis as determined by these measures will be undertaken when new General Fund-supported debt is issued or new Pension/OPEB benefits are examined. Further, the availability of sufficient suitable City properties to serve as lease properties if required for a lease revenue bond measure will also be evaluated (see Section 3.2 for annual fair rental value requirement). Whenever authorization is sought for a lease revenue bond, the City Council will be provided with an estimate of the amount of unpledged and suitable City properties that are expected to be available to support additional lease revenue borrowings.

In addition to the City's direct debt (General Obligation bonds and other General Fund Supported debt), debt levels of underlying and overlapping entities such as counties, school districts, and special districts add to a City's overall debt burden. The City's proportional share of the debt of other local governmental units which either overlap it or underlie it is called overlapping debt. Overlapping debt is generally apportioned based upon relative assessed value. While the City does not control debt issuance by other entities, it recognizes that its taxpayers share the overall debt burden. The City shall include a statement of overlapping debt in its initial and continuing disclosure.

4.3 Coverage Ratios for Revenue Bonds and Loans

Long-term obligations payable solely from specific pledged sources, in general, are not subject to a debt limitation. Examples of such long-term obligations include those which achieve the financing or refinancing of projects provided by the issuance of debt instruments that are payable from restricted revenues or user fees (enterprise funds) and revenues generated from a project. Also see Section 3.3, Revenue Bonds.

The debt coverage ratio, which is the ratio of available annual revenues to annual debt service, is one of the primary indicators of the ability of an enterprise to meet its annual operating expenses and debt service payments. Generally, legal covenants requiring a minimum debt coverage ratio are set forth in the bond or loan documents. The City's Water and Wastewater Revenue Bonds require a debt coverage ratio of at least 120% for senior debt obligations and at least 100% for senior and subordinate debt obligations combined.

State and Federal loans may also have certain coverage ratio requirements for enterprise funds which are pledged as revenue sources for repayment of the loan. The City will evaluate criteria required by each agency, apply and actively negotiate favorable loan terms for each loan. Rate covenants for the bonds and loans will require a rate increase if coverage ratios are expected to fall below the legal coverage levels.

The City will also evaluate appropriate affordable target coverage levels (i.e., financial coverage ratios), for the outstanding bonds and new debt issue planning when conducting cost of service studies, which are undertaken periodically for the enterprises.

CHAPTER V – STRUCTURE & TERM OF CITY INDEBTEDNESS

5.1 Term of Debt

Debt will be structured for the shortest period possible, consistent with a fair allocation of costs to current and future beneficiaries or users. Borrowings by the City should be of a duration that does not exceed the useful life of the improvement that it finances and where feasible, should be shorter than the projected economic life. The standard term of long-term borrowing is typically 15-30 years but can be longer.

5.2 Rapidity of Debt Repayment

In structuring a bond issuance, Debt Management will manage the amortization of debt, and to the extent possible, match its cash flow to the anticipated debt service payments.

The City will typically seek to structure debt with aggregate level principal and interest payments over the life of the borrowing. The City has also utilized a customized debt structure for certain obligations and will continue to consider such an approach on a case by case basis; taking into consideration factors such as affordability, existing debt profile, and legal provisions of the debt instrument. The Debt Management Director, with input from a Municipal Advisor if appropriate, will determine whether a customized debt structure should be implemented. “Backloading” of debt service will be considered only when one or more of the following occur:

- Natural disasters or extraordinary or unanticipated external factors make payments on the debt in early years prohibitive
- The benefits derived from the debt issuance can clearly be demonstrated to be greater in the future than in the present
- Such structuring is beneficial to the City’s aggregate overall debt payment schedule
- Such structuring will allow debt service to more closely match project revenues during the early years of the project’s operation

5.3 Serial Bonds, Term Bonds, and Capital Appreciation Bonds

Serial bonds are bonds maturing annually (or serially) in specified amounts comprising all or a portion of a bond issue.

Term bonds are those where all bonds, or a portion of the issue equal to that which would mature over a period of two or more years in a bond issuance, mature at a single time. Term bonds can be structured so that a portion of term maturity is mandated to be called or retired each year (called “sinking funds”) to mirror a serial bond structure. The funds paid into the sinking fund each year may be used at that time to retire a portion of the term bonds ahead of their scheduled redemption. Sinking funds are preferred by investors since these funds provide the security of knowing that the issuer appropriately budgets and accounts for its expected future payments. The sinking fund also ensures that the payment of funds at maturity does not overtax the issuer’s resources at that time. The decision to use term or serial bonds is typically driven by market conditions when bonds are issued.

Capital Appreciation Bonds (CABs), also known as Zero Coupon Bonds, do not pay periodic interest payments but are issued as deep discounted bonds that pay investors the principal amount invested plus the interest, compounded semi-annually at the original interest rate, of the bond at maturity. CABs can be utilized in certain cases to better match a project's cash flow to the bond's debt service but typically carry significantly higher interest rates than bonds that pay semi-annual or periodic interest payments.

For each issuance, the City will select serial bonds or term bonds, or both. On the occasions where circumstances warrant, CABs may be used.

5.4 Interest Rate

The City currently issues securities on a fixed interest rate basis only. Fixed rate securities ensure budget certainty through the life of the securities and can be advantageous in a low interest rate environment.

5.5 Debt Instrument Rating

The Debt Management Director, with a Municipal Advisor if appropriate, will assess whether a credit rating should be obtained for an issuance and make a recommendation to the Chief Financial Officer. If it is determined that a credit rating is desirable, the probable rating of the proposed debt issuance is assessed before its issuance, and necessary steps are taken in structuring the debt issuance to ensure that the best possible rating is achieved.

5.6 Credit Enhancement

Credit enhancement may be used to improve or establish a credit rating on a City debt obligation. Types of credit enhancement include Letters of Credit, bond insurance or surety policies (see Section 5.7). The Debt Management Director will recommend to the Chief Financial Officer the use of credit enhancement if it reduces the overall cost of the proposed financing or if, in the opinion of the Chief Financial Officer, the use of such credit enhancement furthers the City's overall financial objectives.

A *Letter of Credit* is an arrangement with a bank that provides supplemental security, or in some cases, direct security that money will be available to pay debt service on an issue in the event insufficient funds are available to meet a debt service obligation. For a Commercial Paper program, a direct-pay Letter of Credit is obtained from a bank to represent a guarantee to pay, on behalf of the City, the principal and interest on Commercial Paper Notes when due for a defined period of time, and subject to certain conditions. In this case, the direct-pay Letter of Credit is directly drawn upon to make debt service payments. A Letter of Credit can enhance or substitute the credit rating by providing the City with access to credit under terms and conditions as specified in such agreements.

Bond Insurance is an unconditional pledge by an insurance company to make principal and interest payments on the City's debt in the event insufficient funds are available to meet a debt service obligation. Bond insurance may be obtained from an insurance company and is a potential means of enhancing the debt's rating.

5.7 *Debt Service Reserve Fund/Surety Policy*

Debt service reserve funds, if established for a bond series, are held by and are available to the bond Trustees to make principal and interest payments to bondholders in the event that pledged revenues are insufficient to do so. Debt service reserve funds may also be required under certain loan agreements.

The Chief Financial Officer will make a determination whether one will be included and, if so, the size of the debt service reserve fund on a case-by-case basis at the time of a new bond/loan issuance. Factors that are taken into consideration are cost of setting a debt service reserve fund over the life of the bond/loan issue compared to interest earnings, pricing or credit rating impacts, conditions in the bond/loan documents, if applicable, and other market conditions.

The maximum size of the reserve fund is governed by tax law, which permits the lesser of: 1) 10% of par; 2) 125% of average annual debt service; and 3) 100% of maximum annual debt service. The City may issue bonds with a debt service reserve fund that is sized at a lower level or without a reserve fund.

The reserve fund requirement may also be satisfied by a surety policy, a form of insurance provided by a bond insurer to satisfy a reserve fund requirement for a bond issuance. Under this arrangement, instead of depositing cash in a reserve fund, the issuer buys a surety policy by paying a one-time premium equal to a percentage of the face amount of the policy. The City may use a surety policy instead of a debt service reserve fund when economically feasible.

The City will not rely on any uncollateralized credit instruments for any reserve requirement unless justified by significant financial advantage. If a surety policy is used in lieu of a debt service reserve fund, a provider distinct from the bond insurer shall be used.

5.8 *Capitalized Interest*

Generally, interest shall be capitalized for the construction period of a revenue producing project so that debt service expense does not begin until the project is expected to be operational and producing revenues. In addition, for lease back arrangements, such as those used for lease revenue bond transactions; interest may be capitalized for the construction period, until the asset is operational. When warranted, interest may be capitalized for a period longer than the construction period. Capitalized interest may also be referred to as “funded interest.”

5.9 *Call Options/Redemption Provisions*

The Debt Management Director will evaluate and recommend to the Chief Financial Officer the use of a call option, if any, and call protection period for each issuance.

A call option, or optional redemption provision, gives the City the right to prepay or retire debt prior to its stated maturity. This option may permit the City to achieve interest savings in the future through refunding of the bonds with lower interest rates. Often the City must pay a higher interest rate as compensation to the buyer for the risk of having the bond called in the future. In addition, if a bond is called, the holder may be entitled to a premium payment (call premium). Because the cost of call options can vary widely, depending largely on market conditions, an evaluation of factors such as the following will be conducted in connection with each issuance:

-
- Interest rate premium for adding call provision
 - The call premium paid to the bond holder
 - Level of rates relative to historical standards
 - The time until the bonds may be called at a premium or at par
 - Interest rate volatility

Generally, 30-year tax-exempt municipal borrowings are structured with a 10-year call at no premium. From time to time, market conditions may facilitate shorter call options (6-9 years) with no premium.

CHAPTER VI – METHOD OF ISSUANCE & SALE

Under the direction of the Chief Financial Officer, Debt Management will coordinate the issuance of all debt, including issuance size, debt structure, cash flow analysis, and method of sale. The selection of the financing team and the role of the various consultants are discussed in Chapter VII.

6.1 *Method of Sale*

Debt issuances are sold by a single underwriter or to an underwriting syndicate through either a public offering or a private offering. The selected method of sale will be that which is the most advantageous to the City in the judgment of the Chief Financial Officer, in terms of lowest net interest rate, most favorable terms in the financial structure used, and market conditions.

Public Offerings – Public offerings can be executed through either a competitive sale or a negotiated sale. Method of sale for each bond offering is based on the recommendation of the Chief Financial Officer with advice from the City's municipal advisor.

Competitive Sale – In a Competitive Sale, bids will be awarded on a true interest cost basis (TIC), providing other bidding requirements are satisfied. In such instances where the City deems the bids received unsatisfactory, it may, at the discretion of the Chief Financial Officer, enter into negotiation for sale of the securities or reject all bids. In general, the Competitive Sale method is recommended for “plain vanilla” financings with a strong underlying credit rating, if the bond is not expected to be treated as a “story bond” by the investors and generally stable and strong market conditions exist. In a Competitive Sale, the bidder's role is limited to its review of the offering circular released by the City, making a credit assessment based on the facts presented in the offering circular, and offering its bid per the bidding parameters established by the City.

Negotiated Sale – The negotiated sale process provides the City control over the financing structure and the issuance timing, and provides flexibility of distribution. Negotiated sales may be executed when competitive sales are not suitable or not a viable option. Examples of such circumstances include unusual financing terms, market volatility, and weaker credit quality. Special District bonds, which are often non-rated, are typically issued through a negotiated sale process. In a negotiated sale, the underwriter or the underwriting syndicate for the bonds is identified upfront through a competitive selection process along with other professionals for the transaction. The underwriter will actively assist the City in structuring the financing and marketing the bonds including providing assistance in preparing the bond offering circular.

Private Offerings – When determined appropriate by the Chief Financial Officer, the City will negotiate financing terms with banks and financial institutions for specific borrowings on a private offering basis. Typically, private offerings are carried out by the City when extraneous circumstances preclude public offerings, as an interim financing, or to avoid the costs of a public offering for smaller issuances.

6.2 *Bidding Parameters*

In a Competitive Sale, the Notice Inviting Bids will be carefully constructed so as to ensure the best possible bid for the City, in light of existing market conditions and other prevailing factors. Parameters to be examined include:

- Limits between lowest and highest coupons
- Discount or premium coupons
- Use of bond insurance
- Call provisions

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 53693, Debt Management will publish the Notice Inviting Bids in a financial publication generally circulated throughout the state or reasonably expected to be disseminated among all prospective bidders for the proposed bond issuance.

6.3 *Initial Disclosure Requirements*

Debt Management, together with the City Attorney's Office and Disclosure Counsel, coordinates all the necessary documents for disclosure, with input from various other City departments (as applicable for a particular bond issuance) and outside consultants. Each publicly offered debt issuance will meet the disclosure requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and other government agencies before and after the bond sale takes place. The disclosure documents, particularly the Official Statement, will provide the potential investor with full and accurate information necessary to make prudent investment decisions.

All primary disclosure documents, which are a part of the bond offering documents (e.g., Official Statement), will be approved by the DPWG before being taken to the City Council for approval (see Section 6.4). The City will also provide ongoing disclosure, in accordance with the Continuing Disclosure Agreements executed when the financing is authorized, as required by SEC Rule 15c2-12 (see Chapter IX). Ongoing disclosure will also be approved by the DPWG before it is disseminated to the markets.

The DPWG Disclosure Controls and Procedures (Appendix D) details the preparation and approval process of primary disclosure documents.

6.4 *Approval Process*

In coordinating the bond issuance process, Debt Management will work with the City Attorney's office, other responsible City departments, and outside consultants to compile all bond related documents (see Chapter VII for the role of various outside consultants). The City Attorney's office will assess any legal issues that may arise with respect to the issuance of the bonds in consultation with the external bond counsel and/or disclosure counsel. In circumstances where there may be legal uncertainty about some aspect of a proposed bond transaction, the City may pursue an active validation action to obtain judicial approval before the bonds are issued. If a bond transaction is controversial and gives rise to a reverse validation action, the City may find itself a party to that litigation.

All proposed debt financings shall be authorized by the City Council. To ensure accuracy, all disclosure and bond related documents will go through many levels of review prior to being submitted for City Council approval.

- As stipulated by City Ordinance O-19942, the City's DPWG will serve as an oversight body that is responsible to ensure accuracy of disclosure documents. See Appendix D for DPWG Disclosure Controls and Procedures.
- The City's Audit Committee will serve as an oversight body that is responsible to ensure accuracy of the audited financial statements.
- Pursuant to the City's Municipal Code, section 22.2301, the Independent Budget Analyst (IBA) assists the City Council with regard to its decisions. In keeping with normal docketing processes, the IBA receives copies of all documents related to the bond offerings.
- Bond related documents will be submitted by established docket deadlines. All efforts will be made to distribute documents to reviewers at the earliest possible date.
 - A form of the preliminary official statement (POS) will be provided to the City Council and the IBA for review at least two weeks prior to approval request.
 - All updates to a POS or an official statement (OS) following City Council approval will be distributed to the City Council and the IBA by the disclosure counsel for the bond offering for review before they are printed and released to the market.
- Debt Management, the City Attorney's office, and other responsible City Departments will engage in briefing Councilmembers and their staffs, if requested, regarding the proposed bond offering prior to the City Council hearing.

Pursuant to City Charter Section 99, all financial obligations of the City extending for a period of more than five years have to be authorized by ordinance adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the City Council. Financial obligations of a shorter period may be authorized by a resolution.

CHAPTER VII – FINANCING TEAM – ROLES AND SELECTION PROCESS

The Debt Management Director, working with the City Attorney's Office and the City's Purchasing & Contracting Department, shall be responsible for establishing a solicitation and selection process for securing professional services that are required to develop and implement a debt issuance. Goals of the solicitation and selection process shall include encouraging participation from qualified service providers, both local and national, and securing services at competitive prices.

7.1 Selection and Compensation

The identification of municipal advisors, trustees, and paying agents is accomplished through a selection process conducted by Debt Management, and may also be based upon recommendations from advisors that are specifically skilled in the type of bond issuance being proposed.

Selection of consultants will be made from either an as-needed pool, which is assembled via a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process, or a separate Request for Proposals (RFP) issued for a specific bond issuance. Once the selection of a Municipal Advisor has occurred, the Municipal Advisor will assist the City in the selection of other service providers, including broker-dealers/underwriters, trustees, escrow agents, credit enhancers, verification agents, title and insurance companies, and printers.

Compensation for Bond Counsel, Disclosure Counsel, Municipal Advisor, and other consultants will be as low as possible, given desired qualification levels, and consistent with industry standards.

The City may encumber and advance the fees associated with municipal advisory services, which are later reimbursed from the bond proceeds, or may enter into contracts on a contingent basis. Compensation for the other service providers listed above is typically included in the cost of issuance, and is paid from the bond proceeds. The ongoing trustee fee, semiannually or annually, for a bond issuance is budgeted under administration costs and appropriated in respective bond payment accounts.

The City Attorney's Office will take the lead in selecting the Bond Counsel and the Disclosure Counsel. Generally, Bond and Disclosure Counsel compensation is contingent on the issuance of bonds, and is either paid or reimbursed from bond proceeds. This practice is generally consistent with industry standards.

Eligible City staff costs related to issuance of long-term bonds may also be reimbursed from bond proceeds.

7.2 Financing Team: Outside Consultants

Contracts with Municipal Advisors, Bond Counsel, and Disclosure Counsel will be processed in accordance with Administrative Regulation 25.70, "Hiring of Consultants Other Than Architects and Engineers."

A. Municipal Advisors

As needed, the Debt Management Director, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, will identify an independent Municipal Advisor. The primary responsibilities of the

Municipal Advisor are to advise and assist on bond or loan document negotiations, transaction structuring including advising on pricing and call provision options and timing of issuance, running debt service cash flow numbers, obtaining ratings on the proposed issuance, and generally acting as an independent financial consultant and economic and bond market expert.

The Municipal Advisor will serve the City as a Municipal Advisor, as defined by and in accordance with the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The Municipal Advisor has a fiduciary duty to the City. Fiduciary duty is generally understood to encompass a duty of loyalty and a duty of care to the public agency.

B. Bond Counsel

The City will retain external Bond Counsel for all debt issuances. As part of its responsibility in the debt issuance process, the City Attorney will coordinate the selection of Bond Counsel. Bond Counsel will prepare the necessary authorizing resolutions, ordinances, agreements, and other legal documents necessary to execute the financing. All debt issued by the City will include a customary approving legal opinion of Bond Counsel. The City will also retain Bond Counsel for direct loans on a limited capacity, as necessary. Bond Counsel for direct loans will primarily provide a legal opinion of Bond Counsel and/or Tax Counsel opinion but may advise on other matters including legal agreements.

C. Disclosure Counsel

The City will retain Disclosure Counsel for all public issuances that entail City disclosure. Disclosure Counsel shall be required to deliver a customary 10(b)-5 opinion on City offering documents. The City Attorney shall oversee the selection of Disclosure Counsel. The Disclosure Counsel will work with City staff to draft all disclosure documents for a bond financing.

The City Attorney's Office may engage separate firms in the capacity of Bond and Disclosure Counsel or one single firm to perform bond and disclosure counsel functions.

The City also retains a General Disclosure Counsel to review the City materials that are to reach investors or the securities markets. The General Disclosure Counsel will also be a member of the City's Disclosure Practices Working Group.

D. Broker-Dealer/ Underwriters

For a competitive sale, the criteria used to select a broker-dealer/underwriter shall be the bid providing the lowest true interest cost to the City.

For a negotiated sale debt issuance, the Chief Financial Officer, working with Debt Management, will identify broker-dealers/underwriters. The Chief Financial Officer will recommend to the City Council the selected broker-dealer/underwriter or a syndicate of underwriters. Broker-dealers/underwriters will be required to demonstrate sufficient

capitalization and experience related to the debt issuance being proposed, among other criteria determined for each issuance. The Chief Financial Officer will consider the following criteria in selecting a broker-dealer/underwriter and/or a syndicate:

- Experience with the particular type of financing, and size of the financing
- Overall experience
- Familiarity with City issues
- Marketing expertise
- Distribution capability
- Previous experience as managing or co-managing broker-dealer/underwriter
- Financial strength, as evidenced by the firm's current financial statements
- Experience of the public finance team assigned to the financing
- Resources to complete the financing
- Compensation
- Community Reinvestment⁵

E. Trustee / Paying or Fiscal Agent

A Trustee or Paying/Fiscal Agent is the institution – usually a commercial bank or trust company – appointed in the indenture or bond resolution to act as the agent of the issuer to pay principal and interest from monies provided by or on behalf of the issuer.

Paying or Fiscal Agent duties are typically limited to receiving money from the issuer and paying principal and interest to bondholders on behalf of the issuer. A Trustee, in addition to performing the duties of a Paying Agent, is responsible for establishing and holding the funds and accounts relating to the bond issuance, including accounts for bond proceeds and revenues, determining that the conditions for disbursement of proceeds and revenues have been met, and, in some cases, collecting revenues, and executing investments.

The Trustee/ Paying Agent solicitation and selection is typically coordinated by the Municipal Advisor in consultation with the Debt Management Director for a new bond issuance. The Debt Management Department will monitor the ongoing performance of a Trustee/Paying Agent. The Debt Management Director, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, may periodically solicit for trustees or paying agent services from qualified commercial and trustee banks.

F. Other Service Providers

Other professionals may be selected, at the discretion of the Chief Financial Officer, on an as-needed basis. These include the services of credit rating agencies, escrow agents, bond insurance providers, credit and liquidity banks, verification agents, title insurance companies, bidding agents, and services related to printing.

⁵ In accordance with guidelines stated in Council Policy 900-09 "Community Reinvestment."

CHAPTER VIII – REFUNDING OF CITY INDEBTEDNESS

The City will consider refunding its existing debt when benefits of the refunding outweigh the costs and risks. Refunding bonds are typically issued less than 90 days before the date upon which the refunded bonds will be redeemed, or commercial paper will mature.

They may be undertaken to

- Take advantage of lower interest rates and achieve debt service cost savings
- Eliminate restrictive or burdensome bond covenants
- Restructure debt to either shorten/lengthen the duration of debt or free up reserve funds
- Refund outstanding indebtedness when existing financial structures impinge on prudent and sound financial management
- Pay down outstanding commercial paper

In some circumstances, the refunding bonds are issued more than 90 days prior to the date upon which the refunded bonds will be redeemed in order to refinance outstanding debt before the date the outstanding debt becomes due or callable. In these situations, proceeds of the advance refunding bonds are placed into an escrow account with a fiduciary and used to pay interest and principal on the refunded bonds and then used to redeem the refunded bonds at their maturity or call date. Under federal tax law changes enacted in December 2017, refundings issued more than 90 days prior to the date the outstanding debt becomes due or callable may no longer be executed on a tax-exempt basis. Such refunding transactions may be undertaken via alternative mechanisms such as taxable refundings.

Generally, the City will consider a refunding only when there is a net economic benefit (i.e., when there is an aggregate net present value savings, expressed as a percentage of the par amount of the refunded bonds, at 3% and above for a typical tax-exempt refunding, and 4% and above for a refunding enacted more than 90 days prior to the date upon which the refunded bonds will be redeemed). In addition, in the case of the latter situation, consideration is to be given to the impact of inefficient investment yields in the refunding escrow account (i.e., yield on the escrow investment is less than the yield on the refunding bonds. This inefficiency is also known as negative arbitrage.) Aggregate net present value savings should be greater than the aggregate amount of negative arbitrage to achieve an economic benefit. These savings requirements for a refunding may be waived by the Chief Financial Officer upon a finding that such a restructuring is in the City's overall best financial interest.

When an escrow account will be used, the City will seek to purchase State and Local Government Securities (SLGS) to fund its refunding escrows. However, at the discretion of the Chief Financial Officer, the City may choose to fund an escrow through purchase of treasury and agency securities on the open market when market conditions make such an option financially preferred or necessary.

CHAPTER IX – POST ISSUANCE COMPLIANCE & ADMINISTRATION

9.1 *Investment of Bond Proceeds*

The proceeds of the bond sales will be invested until used for the intended project in order to maximize utilization of the public funds. The investments will be made to obtain the highest level of safety. The City of San Diego Investment Policy and the bond indentures govern objectives and criteria for investment of bond proceeds. The City Treasurer, or the bond trustees under the direction of the City Treasurer, will invest the bond proceeds in a manner to avoid, if possible, and minimize any potential negative arbitrage over the life of the bond issuance, while complying with arbitrage and tax provisions.

9.2 *Arbitrage Compliance*

The Department of Finance shall establish and maintain a system of record keeping and reporting to meet the arbitrage rebate compliance requirements as required by the federal tax code. This effort shall include tracking investment earnings on bond proceeds, calculating rebate payments in compliance with tax law, and remitting any rebate earnings to the federal government in a timely manner in order to preserve the tax-exempt status of the City's outstanding debt issuances. Additionally, general financial reporting and other tax certification requirements embodied in bond covenants shall be monitored to ensure that all covenants are in compliance. The ongoing compliance verification function will be coordinated by the Debt Management Department.

9.3 *Ongoing Disclosure*

The City will meet secondary disclosure requirements in a timely and comprehensive manner, as stipulated by the SEC Rule 15c2-12. The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) shall be responsible for providing ongoing disclosure information to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board's (MSRB's) Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) system, the central depository designated by the SEC for ongoing disclosures by municipal issuers. The CFO is responsible for maintaining compliance with disclosure standards promulgated by state and national regulatory bodies, including the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB), the National Federation of Municipal Analysts, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). The City may also employ the services of firms that improve the availability of or supplement the City's EMMA filings.

The City will provide full and complete financial disclosure to rating agencies, institutional and individual investors, other levels of government, and the general public to share clear, comprehensible, and accurate financial information using the appropriate channels/policies/procedures.

All disclosure information shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Disclosure Practices Working Group.

9.4 *Compliance with Other Bond Covenants*

In addition to financial disclosure and arbitrage compliance, once the bonds are issued, the City is responsible for verifying compliance with all undertakings, covenants, and agreements of each bond issuance on an ongoing basis. This typically includes ensuring:

-
- Annual appropriation of revenues to meet debt service payments
 - Taxes/fees are levied and collected where applicable
 - Timely transfer of debt service/rental payments to the trustee or paying agent
 - Compliance with insurance requirements
 - Compliance with rate covenants where applicable
 - Recordkeeping and continued public use of financed asset
 - Compliance with tax covenants including the timely spend-down of project fund proceeds
 - Compliance with all other bond covenants

In January 2006, the Debt Management Department implemented a Formal Centralized Monitoring Program (FCMP) to coordinate, monitor, and report ongoing compliance requirements. Through this program, the Debt Management Department coordinates verification of covenant compliance and works with the City Attorney's Office, the Department of Finance and all other responsible departments to monitor compliance with the aforementioned compliance requirements.

9.5 *Compliance with State and Federal Reporting Requirements*

The City will meet required State and Federal reporting requirements related to bond and loan obligations. Effective January 1, 2017, Government Code Section 8855 was amended requiring state and local issuers, including the City, to submit an annual debt transparency report for any new issue of debt within seven (7) months of the close of the reporting period, which is defined as July 1 to June 30.

CHAPTER X – COMPLIANCE WITH CITY DEBT POLICY

In the event there are proposed exceptions from the Debt Policy when a certain bond issue is structured, those exceptions will be discussed in the applicable staff reports when the bond issue is docketed for City Council consideration. Any exception will also be stated in the financing resolution or ordinance to be approved by City Council for the corresponding bond offering.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEBT POLICY

HISTORY:

Adopted by Resolution R-303152	11/16/2007
Amended by Resolution R-304301	10/27/2008
Amended by Resolution R-305810	5/03/2010
Amended by Resolution R-306752	4/12/2011
Amended by Resolution R-307375	4/10/2012
Amended by Resolution R-308090	4/09/2013
Amended by Resolution R-309577	3/27/2015
Amended by Resolution R-311057	4/24/2017
Amended by Resolution R-312484	5/22/2019
Amended by Resolution R-313616	6/28/2021

APPENDIX A – SPECIAL DISTRICT FORMATION AND FINANCING POLICY

Overview

The following Special District Formation and Financing Policy is enacted to provide a uniform guideline for Community Facilities District (CFD) and 1913/1915 Act Assessment District formation and financing. A Special District is typically formed to provide funding for public infrastructure in connection with new development, but may also be formed to finance improvements pertaining to developed properties. Subject to voter approval and once a district is formed, special taxes or assessments may be levied upon properties within a district to directly pay for facilities, and, in certain cases, services. Special taxes or assessments may also be levied to repay bonds issued to finance public improvements.

The City expects that private developers should have primary responsibility for providing public infrastructure required in connection with new development. With this policy as a guideline, the City will continue to consider requests for Special District formation and debt issuance to finance such public infrastructure when the requests address an extraordinary public need or benefit. However, due to the significant burden placed on the City to provide these conduit financings, and in light of potential impacts to the City's debt position, the Chief Financial Officer, working with the Debt Management Director, will consider each application for Special District debt issuance on a case by case basis, and may not proceed with such financing if it is determined that the financing could be detrimental to the debt position or best interests of the City. Whenever feasible, the City will consider authorizing qualified state joint powers authorities (JPAs) such as the CSCDA¹ or the CMFA² to provide conduit Special District formation and financing services and ongoing parcel administration for interested developers/property owners. In these cases, the developers/property owners and the JPA would still be required to adhere to the guidelines contained in the City's Special District Formation and Financing Policy unless extraordinary circumstances exist and a waiver of specific guidelines contained in the policy is provided when the City Council approves the authorizing resolution. Further, the JPA is required to present an informational report to the City Council at least 30 days prior to a debt issuance on behalf of the district.

This Special District Formation and Financing Policy is specific to Special Districts and supplemental to the City's Debt Policy. As such, guidelines provided in the City's Debt Policy would, in many cases, also be applicable to Special Districts. In addition, the City will adhere to all state and federal laws concerning the issuance of Special Districts related debt.

The City's Special District Formation and Financing Policy is specifically designed to:

- Establish parameters for the Special District formation and financing processes
- Assist concerned parties in following the City's approach for forming districts and issuing any related debt
- Facilitate the actual formation and financing processes by establishing important policy guidance in advance

¹ CSCDA is a joint powers authority created to enable local government and eligible private entities access to financing for public projects throughout the state. The City has been a member since 1988.

²CMFA is a joint powers authority created to assist with the financing of economic development throughout the state. The City joined CFMA as a member in September 2014.

-
- Set forth the City's Local Goals and Policies for CFD formation and financing, as required by Section 53312.7 of the California Government Code

A1 *Background: Types of Special Districts*

This Special District Formation and Financing Policy is intended to provide a uniform guideline for Community Facilities District (CFD)³ and 1913/1915 Act⁴ Assessment District formation and financing. These Special Districts are primarily developer initiated, whereby a developer seeks a public financing mechanism to fund public infrastructure required of it by the City in connection with development permits or agreements, and/or tentative or subdivision maps. Special District formation may also be initiated by an established community.

It is important to note that the formation and debt issuance processes related to Special Districts may be considered as distinct activities. That is, districts may be established and the assessments or special taxes levied could pay directly for improvements, and in certain cases, services. Alternatively, associated bonds may be issued by such districts to finance improvements, in which case the debt service would be paid with assessment or special tax revenues.

A. Community Facilities District Financing – Mello-Roos Bonds

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (the “Mello-Roos Act”) was enacted by the State to help growing areas finance certain essential public facilities that typically accompany major development projects. The Mello-Roos Act permits a public agency to create a defined area within its jurisdiction and, by a two-thirds majority vote of the registered voters within the district (or, if there are fewer than 12 registered voters, through a landowner vote), levy a special tax within the district to pay directly for public improvements or services, or pay debt service on bonds issued to finance improvements. CFD, or Mello-Roos, Bonds are not fiscal obligations of the City, and are limited obligations of the CFD, payable solely from special taxes levied upon property within the district. The special taxes are calculated and levied pursuant to a Rate and Method of Apportionment, or tax formula. Under the Mello-Roos Act, the formula must be reasonable.

Formation of a CFD may be initiated by the legislative body on its own or when the appropriate request or petition, as defined by the Mello-Roos Act, is filed with the City. Currently, there are no CFDs initiated by the City's legislative body. At the discretion of the CFO, the City may choose to self-initiate a CFD, and may give priority to the provision of public facilities and/or services benefiting the City to any CFD established by the City.

The financed public facilities must ultimately be owned and operated by a public entity, such as the City, and may include, among other things, parks, libraries, police and fire

³ The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 permits a public agency to levy a special tax within a defined area to finance certain essential facilities, or to pay for certain services, when specific voting requirements are met.

⁴ An Assessment District may be formed pursuant to the Streets and Highways Code Municipal Improvement Act of 1913. The associated bond acts, also contained within the Streets and Highways Code, include the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 and the Refunding Act of 1984, which provide for the issuance of bonds under various assessment proceedings and the refunding of assessment bonds, respectively.

facilities, roadways, and water and sewer infrastructure improvements that have a useful life of five years or more. In accordance with Section 53313 of the California Government Code, CFDs may also provide funds for certain public services, including police and fire services, recreation program services, and maintenance and operation, so long as they are in addition to, and do not supplant, services already provided within the territory.

B. Assessment District Financing

The Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 provides for a local agency to form an Assessment District to finance certain infrastructure, including roadways, water and sewer facilities, storm drains, and other improvements often required in connection with new development. Assessment Districts formed under this Act may also finance, but in very limited circumstances, maintenance services. Assessment Districts may also be formed to provide for, among other things, the undergrounding of overhead utility lines or the abatement of hazardous geological conditions, upon a successful petition signed by owners of property who want the improvement.

An Assessment District must include all properties that will benefit directly from the improvements to be constructed, and formation of the district requires an election in which at least 50% of property owners vote in favor of the district. If an Assessment District is formed, the City may levy assessments that can be utilized to directly finance the public improvements, or may be pledged to support debt service on bonds, which may be issued under the Improvement Bond Act of 1915. The assessments that are levied upon each parcel must be based upon the direct and special benefit received by the property.

A2 *Considerations for Authorization of Special District Financing*

The formation and financing processes related to Special Districts may be considered as two distinct processes. In order for a financing process to occur, a formation process is also necessary. However, a district could be formed without an associated bond financing. In this case, the special taxes or assessments that are levied would provide revenues to pay directly for public improvements, or, in certain cases, services (versus paying debt service on bonds issued to finance improvements). The following guidelines generally relate to the financing process for Special Districts.

A. Credit Considerations

It is the City's policy to exercise caution in approving requests for Special District financing and that each request be weighed in the context of the City's total infrastructure and financing needs. Although the rating agencies consider Special District financings as overlapping debt (as compared to direct debt), if, and to the extent, the City's overlapping debt burden is viewed as excessive, there could be an impact to the City's credit. Such an impact could increase the costs of all future City bond financings. In light of potential impacts to the City's debt position, the Chief Financial Officer will consider each application for Special District financing on a case by case basis, and may not recommend such financing if it is determined the financing could be detrimental to the City's overall debt position or the best interests of the City.

B. Extraordinary Public Benefit

With respect to CFD financing, the applicant should demonstrate that a proposed project will provide an extraordinary public benefit. This condition may be met if at least one of the following criteria is satisfied:

Regional Benefit – The improvements must be generally large in scope and provide a community-wide or regional benefit. Examples of regional improvements are libraries, fire stations, and transportation improvements that result in a significant net improvement to the regional transportation system, and parks and recreational improvements of a unique or otherwise significant nature that are anticipated to serve residents from across the City.

Additional Public Benefits – The proposed improvements must provide some other extraordinary benefit which otherwise would not be realized through the normal subdivision process. Examples of this type of benefit would include: the provision of the proposed improvements in a timelier fashion; facilitating a project that multiple properties/developments are responsible for providing; the provision of environmental benefits; the provision of public infrastructure undertaken in connection with affordable housing; or a similar benefit that the City finds acceptable.

C. Competing Projects

The City's ability to provide the resources necessary to implement new Special District financings must be considered in the context of competing needs for general City and Water and Wastewater Utility debt issuances. Also, priority for Special District financing will generally be given to the projects that will confer the greater level of benefit to the City's residents.

It is the City's policy that bond financing will not generally be utilized in conjunction with the formation of smaller districts, defined as district projects totaling in the range of \$3.0 million - \$5.0 million and under. Such projects often benefit only a relatively small number of property owners and bond financing is not typically cost effective. Due to these factors, the allocation of limited staff resources would not generally be justified in relation to the City's other financing priorities. In these cases, an Assessment District may be formed, followed by a one-time enrollment of assessments to pay for the subject public facilities directly.

D. Administrative Considerations

Although Special District financings are not fiscal obligations of the City, the City is required to provide extensive on-going annual disclosure with respect to each Special District financing in conformance with federal securities laws, and must also perform extraordinary on-going administrative work. Such work includes the calculation, enrollment, and collection of special taxes and assessments each year, the monitoring of delinquency activity and conducting of foreclosure activities if certain delinquency thresholds are reached, the calculation and processing of pre-payments and subsequent updating of debt

service schedules, and preparation of additional annual disclosure pursuant to State law. In its assessment of each application for Special District financing, consideration will also be given to the significant burden placed on the City's limited resources to administer these conduit financings for the term of the bonds.

E. Recommended Method of Special District Financing

The generally recommended method of Special District financing is CFDs due to the following factors:

Flexibility of Taxing Formula: CFD financing offers more flexibility with respect to the taxing formula as compared to Assessment District financing (e.g., publicly owned property, such as property owned by a school district or the City, can be exempted from the payment of special taxes, and low-income housing can be assessed a nominal special tax thereby easing the burden on such properties).

Eligible Facilities: CFDs offer more flexibility than Assessment Districts with respect to the types of facilities and services that may be funded. In addition, eligible facilities under Assessment Districts are limited to facilities located within the district; this is not the case for CFDs.

Credit Strength: For a given project, CFD Bonds are perceived to be a stronger credit than Assessment District Bonds because the Mello-Roos Act permits greater than 100% debt service coverage and allows an administering agency to factor in a certain amount for delinquencies in the annual enrollment of special taxes. Comparatively, only 100% debt service coverage is permitted with respect to Assessment Districts and there is no allowance for delinquencies.

On-Going Costs: CFDs are less resource intensive than Assessment Districts to administer on a post-debt issuance basis (e.g., for Assessment Districts, any changes in parcel configuration require a costly and time-intensive reapportionment process under the State law).

F. Mello-Roos Special Tax Elections

Notwithstanding Section 53326 of the Mello-Roos Act, which provides for a landowner election if there are fewer than 12 registered voters within a proposed district, or if the property subject to the tax will not be in residential use, due to the August 2014 California Court of Appeal ruling in *City of San Diego v. Melvin Shapiro, et al.*, the City will only consider the formation of a CFD by landowner vote in proposed districts where there are no registered voters.

Unless circumstances warrant otherwise, it is the policy of the City to support CFD financing versus Assessment District financing for a given project. However, as noted above, in the case of districts that would finance smaller projects, such as those pertaining to established communities, an

Assessment District may be more appropriate. In such cases, a one-time enrollment of assessments (versus a bond financing) may also be recommended.

A3 *Eligible Facilities and Priorities*

A. Ownership and Useful Life of Proposed Facilities

The improvements eligible to be financed must be owned by a public agency or public utility, and must have a useful life of at least ten years. Notwithstanding the foregoing, private renewable energy, energy efficiency, and water conservation improvements may also be financed as prescribed under the San Diego Municipal Code Division 26, Sections 61.2601 through 61.2619.

B. Types of Eligible Facilities

The list of public facilities eligible to be financed by a CFD may include, but is not limited to the following: streets, highways, and bridges; water, sewer, and drainage facilities; parks; libraries; police and fire stations; traffic signals and street lighting; recreation facilities; governmental facilities; flood control facilities; environmental mitigation measures; and public rights-of-way landscaping. Notwithstanding the foregoing, private renewable energy, energy efficiency, and water conservation improvements may also be financed as prescribed under the San Diego Municipal Code Division 26, Sections 61.2601 through 61.2619.

C. Priority of Facilities

In general, with respect to CFDs, none of the types of facilities listed under Section A3B will have priority over the others; however, when a developer submits an application to finance more than one eligible facility, the applicable City departments (e.g., the Library Department, the Park and Recreation Department, the Engineering & Capital Projects Department, Planning / Facilities Financing, etc.) will confer and determine the priority based on the estimated impacts (i.e., benefits conferred) of the eligible projects to the district and surrounding impacted communities.

D. Joint Communities Facilities Agreement(s)

Under Section 53316.2 of the California Government Code, a CFD may be formed to finance facilities owned or operated (or to fund services to be provided) by a public entity other than the agency that created the district, if a Joint Communities Facilities Agreement (JCFA) or a joint exercise of powers agreement is adopted. The City will not enter into a JCFA or joint exercise of powers agreement for a CFD proposed to be formed by another public agency unless:

- The proposed CFD complies with the provisions of this Special District Formation and Financing Policy with regard to Sections A5C, "Maximum Tax and Assessment Rates," Section A8C "Disclosure to Prospective Purchasers of Property," as well as

any other provisions the Debt Management Director may deem applicable to the proposed CFD;

- The applicant/developer requesting CFD financing provides funds to reimburse City costs incurred to review and approve the JCFA.

All disclosures provided to prospective property owners within a CFD formed by another public agency in which the City has entered into a JCFA shall clearly specify that such public agency is solely responsible for the CFD, including formation of the CFD, the levy and administration of special taxes, and the bond financing.

E. Services

Consistent with recent trends in other municipalities across the State, the Chief Financial Officer, working with Debt Management, recommends that services be included among the list of authorized items to be financed through a new CFD. Under Section 53313 of the California Government Code, a CFD may finance any one or more of the following types of services so long as they are in addition to the services provided in the territory before the district was established and do not supplant services already available in such territory: police protection services; fire protection services; recreation program services; library services; maintenance of parks, parkways, and open space; and flood and storm protection services.

In general, the City would expect that when a CFD provides for public facilities that require on-going City operations and/or maintenance (or when the impacts of the new development create other on-going service demands within the area), a mechanism would be established to off-set a portion of those associated costs through the CFD. Methods that could be employed may include: (1) the incorporation of some pre-determined amount into the special tax formula for services; or (2) a provision in the special tax formula that special taxes would be levied up to the maximum tax rates, with any amounts collected over and above the amount needed for debt service, replenishment of the Debt Service Reserve Fund, administrative costs, and any other periodic items required in connection with a bond issuance, to be allocated for services. The City will have complete discretion as to the method of incorporating a services component into the CFD, and would consult with its Bond Counsel and special tax consultant in developing the appropriate mechanism.

A4 *Credit Quality Requirements for Bond Issuances*

It is the objective of the City to minimize the credit risks associated with Special District bonds. To this end, the following policies are established:

A. Value of Property

Bonds shall be sold in connection with a district or improvement area only if the value of each individual parcel of real property that would be subject to the special tax or

assessment is at least four times the share of the bond principal allocable to such parcel and the share of principal allocable from any other outstanding bonds that are secured by a special tax or special assessment levied on the parcel. On a case by case basis, the City reserves the right to require a higher value to lien ratio. In determining the value to lien ratio, either assessed values for individual properties may be obtained from the County of San Diego Assessor's Office or the City may utilize an appraisal prepared by an independent appraiser under contract to the City.

To meet this policy, property owners may elect to prepay special taxes to comply with this requirement. In certain circumstances, the City may allow property owners to meet this requirement through the provision of credit enhancements to the satisfaction of the City. Also, in certain circumstances, the City reserves the right to require the provision of credit enhancement to the satisfaction of the City. These enhancements may include letters of credit or other appropriate assurance.

B. Debt Service Coverage for CFD Bonds

The maximum tax rate adopted in each CFD must provide a minimum of 110% coverage of debt service (excluding earnings on a Debt Service Reserve Fund) in order to finance delinquencies out of special tax revenues.

C. Capitalized Interest

Generally, for Special District financings, a capitalized interest account would be established from bond proceeds if such proceeds are necessary to pay principal and interest on the bonds prior to the enrollment and receipt of the first year of special taxes and assessments for the district. A capitalized interest account should be established if it will improve the credit quality of the bonds and result in lower borrowing costs. In no event will the capitalized interest period exceed two years.

D. Debt Service Reserve Fund

A Debt Service Reserve Fund should be established for Special District financings. Generally, the Debt Service Reserve Fund for Special District financings should be the least of (i) maximum annual debt service on the bonds; (ii) 125% of average annual debt service on the bonds; or (iii) 10% of the original principal amount of the bonds.

E. Maturity Date

No bonds shall be issued with a maturity date greater than the expected useful life of the facilities or improvements being financed.

F. Acquisition Type Districts

Unless there are extraordinary circumstances, Special Districts will be formed as acquisition type districts whereby a developer will be reimbursed for projects only when discrete, useable facilities are deemed completed by the City, as opposed to merely

completing a section of a facility. Acquisition type districts present stronger credit features, and better assure that the public facilities, which are ultimately paid for by assessment and special tax payers, are completed.

G. Third Party Guarantee of Special Tax and Assessment Payments During Project Development

The greatest exposure to default on Special District bonds is the period between the issuance of bonds and project build out. The risk of default is increased when only a single or a few property owners are responsible for the special assessment or special tax payments. While the City's credit is not pledged to support the bonds, a default on Special District bonds can negatively impact the investment community's perception of the City.

To minimize the risk of default, the City may require a third-party guarantee for the annual special tax or assessment payments within a district while the project is being developed and until there is significant absorption of the new development. The need for, nature, and duration of any third-party guarantees will be evaluated by the City and its Financing Team on a case by case basis. However, a third party guarantee, such as a letter of credit (LOC), would be specifically required of a property owner/developer prior to a bond issuance when project build out is still occurring and in each year in which the property owner/developer owns or leases property within the district which is responsible for 10% or more of the special taxes or assessments levied to support the repayment of bonds; the LOC would provide for 100% of the of the special tax or assessment levy due in each applicable fiscal year for property owned or leased by such property owner/developer. If required, the third-party guarantee must be provided at least five business days prior to the release of the preliminary official statement to the market.

Third-party guarantees may include letters of credit, surety bonds, or some other mechanism which assures payment of special taxes or assessments while the project is being developed. When LOCs are required, they must meet any City standards for LOCs that exist at the time the LOC is provided.

H. Foreclosure Covenants

Because Special District financings are generally solely secured by liens against property within the district, the investment market expects to see appropriate foreclosure covenants. Foreclosure covenants would compel the City to take action to file a foreclosure lawsuit against a parcel when certain delinquency thresholds are reached. For each financing, the Debt Management staff and its consultants will analyze key aspects of the district (e.g., number of parcels, special tax/assessment rates, and debt service) to structure foreclosure covenants in a manner that reduces the likelihood of a shortfall in special taxes/assessments to pay debt service. If a parcel reaches a foreclosure covenant threshold, the City would diligently proceed with the steps necessary to file a foreclosure lawsuit, as required under the applicable bond indenture.

A5 *Tax and Assessment Allocation Formulas*

A. Calculation and Allocation of Special Taxes and Assessments

Special Assessments – By law, the amount of an assessment must directly reflect the benefit received from the improvement. Typically, this means the total cost of the project, including any financing costs, is spread to property owners based on the appropriate property-based measure of benefit. The City will hire an outside assessment engineer, which specializes in the area of calculation and allocation of special assessments, to develop the appropriate assessment spread methodology.

Special Taxes – Significant flexibility is allowed for structuring CFD special taxes because the law does not require a direct relationship between the tax and the benefit received. However, the Rate and Method of Apportionment of the special tax must be both reasonable and equitable in apportioning the costs of the public facilities and/or services to be financed to each of the taxable parcels within the boundaries of the proposed district.

When a proposed special taxing formula gets developed for a new district, with advice from formation legal counsel and the special tax consultant, the City will determine an appropriate source of records that can be reasonably relied upon to base the tax categorization under the proposed taxing formula. Consideration will be given to industry standards. If bonds are to be issued for the district, bond market expectations existing at the time of CFD formation when the taxing formula is established will also be considered.

If building permit square footage is proposed as the tax basis for any new CFDs, the City's permitting department--Development Services/Chief Building Inspector--will provide technical assistance on permit matters during the RMA structuring process. The developer/CFD applicant will be required to work with Development Services through project build-out to ensure all building permit records match what is originally constructed. The developer/CFD applicant will also be required to provide necessary certifications to the City verifying the accuracy of the construction data provided to Development Services for building permits.

Exemptions to the payment of special taxes may be provided for parcels that are to be dedicated at a future date to public entities, held by a homeowners' association, or designated as open space. Also, consideration should be made with respect to minimizing the special tax burden on any affordable units. Because the tax structure for CFDs can be very complicated, special tax consultants, who specialize in the development of Rates and Methods of Apportionment, are required.

B. Administrative Expenses

The calculation of special taxes and assessments should also provide, whenever possible, for the full recovery of all administrative expenses and other periodic costs of the proposed district.

C. Maximum Tax and Assessment Rates

For districts involving bond financing, the City desires to establish a maximum level of taxes to limit the overlapping debt burden on any parcel. As such, the total taxes and assessments collected through the property tax bill should not exceed 1.80% of the expected assessed value of the parcel upon final sale of the property to end users.

D. Special Tax Coverage and Maximum Tax Rates

The maximum tax rate adopted in each CFD must provide a minimum of 110% coverage of debt service (excluding earnings on a reserve fund) in order to finance delinquencies out of tax revenues. An allowance for delinquent properties will be factored in when calculating the subsequent year's special tax (the special tax would still be levied against such delinquent parcels).

E. Predictability of Special Tax Liabilities

Special tax formulas should promote stable and predictable tax liabilities, particularly for residential properties. With the exception of a variation for administrative expenses, the annual special tax levy on each residential parcel developed to its final land use shall be approximately equal each year. In the event special tax payments are supporting the provision of services, rather than, or in addition to, capital expenditures, an appropriate escalation factor may be incorporated into the Rate and Method of Apportionment to provide for the impact of inflation to on-going service costs.

F. Term of Special Tax

The term of the special tax should be sufficiently in excess of the term of any bond issue which it supports to allow for delinquencies, refinancing, and/or acquisitions of pay-as-you go facilities. However, the Rate and Method of Apportionment should also specify that the levy of special taxes would cease once the bonds are repaid. The exception would be for any special taxes levied to provide for on-going services; in this case, the City may consider a special tax term in excess of the final maturity of any bonds issued to provide for the on-going services.

A6 *Appraisal Standards*

The City recognizes the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission's Appraisal Standards for Land-Secured Financings (CDIAC Standards), released July 2004 (or any subsequently published update) as the basis for the conduct of appraisals performed in connection with Special District financings.

A7 Sources of Payment for Special Districts Bonds

As described above, Special District bonds are limited obligations of each district, payable from special taxes or assessments levied on property within the district. The bonds are not general or special obligations of the City and the City does not pledge its credit to payment of the bonds. The disclosure documents for each Special District bond offering will describe the sources of payment and will include statements that the City is not pledging its credit to pay debt service on the bonds.

Although there is no legal requirement that the City step in to make payments from its general revenues in the event of a shortfall in special taxes or assessments due to delinquencies to pay debt service on Special District bonds, the City does have the discretion to do so. However, it will be the City's policy that if there is such a shortfall, the City will not step in to make payments from its general revenues.

Refer to Section A4, H, Foreclosure Covenants, for additional information.

A8 Non-City Disclosure Requirements

A. Initial Disclosure to Investors

The applicant/developer will be required, as requested by Debt Management and Bond Counsel, to supply any and all material needed from it to help ensure appropriate information is disclosed to prospective investors.

B. Developer Continuing Disclosure to Investors

The City shall use all reasonable means to ensure that an appropriate Developer Continuing Disclosure Agreement is executed at the time a financing is issued to ensure that the developer and/or any affiliates deemed material to the district by Bond Counsel, are required to provide on-going disclosure to bond investors via the bond trustee so long as they remain material. Pursuant to Government Code Section 53357.1, the developer (including its affiliates) shall provide written consent for a notice of the Applicant/Developer Continuing Disclosure Agreement to be recorded in the office of the county recorder for the purpose of providing notice to a subsequent transferee.

C. Disclosure to Prospective Purchasers of Property

The developer will be required to provide a certification to the City that it will provide full disclosure of the special taxes or assessments to prospective purchasers of property it sells within the district, and in accordance with all applicable state and local laws.

D. Disclosure Requirements of Other Entities

Any other entities which are deemed material to the district by Bond Counsel will be required to fulfill the same disclosure responsibilities described in this section as the developer.

A9 *Application and Administrative Procedures*

As stated above, it is the policy of the City to exercise caution in approving requests for Special District financing and that each request be weighed in the context of the City's total infrastructure and financing needs. In light of potential impacts to the City's debt position, the Chief Financial Officer, working with the Debt Management Director, will consider each application for Special District financing on a case by case basis, and may not recommend such financing if it determines a financing could be detrimental to its overall debt position or the best interests of the City. Among other things, the guidelines below will help interested applicants understand the process for submitting a request for Special District formation and--if applicable--financing. (Also see Overview Section above for information concerning the provision of conduit Special District Formation and financing services by qualified JPAs.)

A. Petition

Notwithstanding the minimum petition thresholds established under the State law,⁵ the City requires that a preponderance of the affected property owners (75%) petition the City to form a Special District. The higher threshold is established due to the following factors: (1) significant City resources would be directed to the advance work to form the district, and it is prudent to have some assurance that formation of the district would be successful; and (2) a successful petition and subsequent ballot process in an established community (e.g., where there is residential property owners) could result in a significant lien on property whose owners voted against the proposed district.

B. Application Procedures

For developer-initiated districts, an application may be obtained from, and filed with, the Finance Branch. The Finance Branch will review the application for completeness and, if necessary, request the applicant to provide further information. In consultation with any applicable departments (e.g., the City Attorney's Office, the City Planning Department, the Engineering & Capital Projects Department, etc.) the Finance Branch will consider the public benefits offered by the proposed project in the context of these policies, and will make a recommendation on whether to authorize a feasibility study, pursuant to Section C, below.

C. Feasibility Study

For developer-initiated districts, if authorized by the Chief Financial Officer, the City will hire an independent financial or feasibility consultant to perform a comprehensive project review and feasibility analysis of the proposed project that would ultimately provide for the payment of special taxes or assessments in connection with a bond financing. Such comprehensive review will include, but not be limited to, a review of the audited financial

⁵ Pursuant to Sections 53318 and 53319 of the California Government Code, proceedings to form a CFD may be commenced upon: (1) the written request of two members of the legislative body; (2) majority approval of the City Council; or (3) a petition signed by at least 10% of registered voters (or if fewer than 12 registered voters, by the owners of at least 10% of the land). Under the California Streets and Highway Code, district formation proceedings may be commenced if landowners of 60% of the land area file a petition in which such landowners waive the requirements of the Special Assessment Investigation, Limitation and Majority Protect Act of 1931.

statements of all landowners who own more than 20% of the land contained within the proposed district in order to investigate the developer(s) financial strength and experience in large scale projects. In addition, the consultant will consider environmental requirements in connection with the development, and economic factors such as market absorption and how it relates to the project's overall feasibility. The consultant will also investigate and report on all liens against the property in question, the value to lien ratios, and other financial aspects of the project. For the Chief Financial Officer to consider a proposed financing, the study should conclude the project is feasible and could support the issuance of bonds, and that it is reasonable to proceed with formation of the district and the issuance of bonds.

D. Fees

It is the City's policy that all City and consultant costs incurred in the evaluation of applications for Special District formation and financing, as well as any and all costs incurred in forming the district and, if applicable, issuing bonds shall be paid by the applicant(s) by advance deposit increments or as otherwise agreed in writing by the City. Accordingly, fees will be collected pursuant to a Deposit and Reimbursement Agreement between the City and the applicant executed prior to the City beginning its project review. Some or all of these fees may be recoverable from bond proceeds when a financing is completed, and any surplus fees would be refunded (notwithstanding the foregoing, consultant and legal costs of the developer or applicant are not eligible for reimbursement). Additionally, the costs associated with administering a district after its formation will be included in the annual special tax or assessment for the district.

E. Selection of Financial Consultants and Service Providers

The policies established in the City's Debt Policy for the solicitation and selection of professional services that are required to develop and implement the City's debt program shall apply with respect to Special District financings. In addition to the professional services outlined in the City's Debt Policy, there are consultants specific to Special District formation and financing that may be engaged, including an appraiser, a market absorption consultant, and a special tax consultant or assessment engineer.

A10 *Timing*

If recommended by the Chief Financial Officer, and pursuant to the filing of an appropriate petition and application, and, if applicable, the completion of a Feasibility Study that concludes the project is feasible (all as set forth above in Sections A9 A, B, and C), the City will use its best efforts to form the district and, if a financing is contemplated, issue the bonds. However, the City will prioritize the formation and any financing activities as specified in Section A2 of this policy.

The City will not schedule any sale of Special District bonds so as to conflict with the sale of other securities issued for City purposes. In the event of any scheduling conflicts, the sale of bonds issued for City purposes will have priority.

A11 *Policy Exceptions*

The City may find in limited and exceptional instances that a waiver to any of the above stated policies is reasonable.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO SPECIAL DISTRICTS FORMATION AND FINANCING POLICY

HISTORY:

Adopted by Resolution R-303153	11/16/2007
Amended by Resolution R-304301	10/27/2008
Amended by Resolution R-305810	5/03/2010
Amended by Resolution R-306752	4/12/2011
Amended by Resolution R-307375	4/10/2012
Amended by Resolution R-308090	4/09/2013
Amended by Resolution R-309577	3/27/2015
Amended by Resolution R-311057	4/24/2017
Amended by Resolution R-312484	5/22/2019
Amended by Resolution R-313616	6/28/2021

PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED AS:

COUNCIL POLICY 800-03 - PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

HISTORY:

Adopted by Resolution R-183351	04/06/1965
Amended by Resolution R-185734	12/14/1965
Amended by Resolution R-188027	08/09/1966
Amended by Resolution R-193345	04/04/1968
Amended by Resolution R-212402	01/09/1975
Amended by Resolution R-258118	03/21/1983
Amended by Resolution R-274571	10/16/1989
Repealed by Resolution R-303153	11/16/2007

APPENDIX B – COUNCIL POLICY 800-14 “PRIORITIZING CIP PROJECTS”

SUBJECT: PRIORITIZING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS
POLICY NO: 800-14
EFFECTIVE DATE: November 13, 2013

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Defined

The City of San Diego’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is defined as the City’s financial plan for the repair and/or construction of municipal infrastructure. The term infrastructure in this Council Policy refers to capital assets within the City’s span of responsibility and includes, but is not limited to: streets and related right-of-way features; storm water and drainage systems; water and sewer systems; public buildings such as libraries, parks, recreational and community centers; and public safety facilities such as police, fire and lifeguard stations. Capital investments are necessary for the construction of all parts of municipal infrastructure.

The Importance of Infrastructure

The importance of quality infrastructure cannot be overstated. Without world class infrastructure the City’s economic prosperity cannot be sustained. The quality of neighborhood infrastructure will directly determine the livability of the City’s neighborhoods. The community’s health, safety, and natural environment all depend on available and quality infrastructure. Decisions about capital investments affect the availability and quality of most government services, as well as many private services.

Infrastructure can also have a significant effect or improvement on the quality of life of the City’s neighborhoods by providing fair, transparent and equitable services. The prioritization of CIP projects that create that infrastructure should take into consideration social, economic and geographic disadvantaged and under-served communities. Under-served community is defined as having documented low levels of access and/or use of City services.

CIP Needs List

Typically, CIP projects are generated from needs list and implemented through an interrelationship of client departments, service departments, new private development, and multiple funding sources. For purposes of the CIP, needs lists are developed by Asset Owners (city departments) based upon input from several sources including, but not limited to: elected officials, community based organizations, private residents, operations and maintenance staff, or other stakeholders.

A need to repair, replace, improve, or construct a new facility based on failing condition, lack of a facility, excessive maintenance requirements of existing facilities, or health and safety issues, is submitted to the Asset Owners. Needs are compiled for each asset within an asset category. These needs are then evaluated and appropriately grouped for capital improvement consideration as part of the proposals for the new fiscal year CIP budget submittal. Prior to initiating a planning phase, all projects competing for funding and being submitted for budget consideration will undergo simple level scoring as outlined in this policy. The CIP project is reassessed in detail during the planning phase and, if needed, reprioritized based on the updated scope, costs and available funding.

The commitment of resources to CIP projects within the City has traditionally not had the benefit of a comprehensive evaluation to determine overall needs so that projects can be ranked in priority order, efficiently funded and constructed. This approach may have unintentionally limited the overall effectiveness of available CIP resources by providing projects with less funding than needed to accomplish major project requirements, such as planning and design. This may have limited the City's ability to compete for outside grant funding, since grant programs often place emphasis on having the design and associated pre-construction activities completed prior to application for construction financing.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to guide the Mayor's Capital Improvement Program Review and Advisory Committee (CIPRAC) in its CIP deliberations. The goal of this policy is to establish a capital-planning process that ultimately leads to policy decisions that optimize the use of available resources for projects competing from the same fund source or multiple fund sources.

CIPRAC shall use this policy as the exclusive methodology for ranking the relative needs and merits of CIP projects. This single CIP prioritization policy addresses all funding sources and asset categories, including enterprise funded projects (golf, water, sewer, airport facilities and landfill facilities), and non-enterprise funded projects (parks, transportation, drainage, buildings and major facility projects). This prioritization process shall be utilized for the purpose of analytical comparison of the costs and benefits of individual needs and projects, as well as an opportunity to evaluate projects against one another on their relative merits.

Process

In order to implement a prioritization system, there must be an understanding of the constraints associated with each project's funding source(s), asset type (project category), or phase of development.

An Asset Owner shall assess and plan projects in a needs list based on available information, including preliminary scope of work, and then create CIP projects that will be prioritized per this Council Policy for funding and budget approval. The project list shall have CIP projects with well-defined scopes of work for proposed improvements, such as replacement, relocation, realignment, upgrade, rehabilitation or new construction, as compared to a needs list that only defines the infrastructure need. Projects will not compete across the different funding sources, project categories, or project phases. However, projects within each of these areas will be evaluated according to the guidelines outlined below.

A. Project Funding

- I. Projects within restricted funding categories will compete only with projects within the same funding category. Prioritization within these restricted funding categories will occur in accordance with this CIP prioritization policy. For example, water system CIP projects are funded with enterprise funds paid by water ratepayers. All water CIP projects will be prioritized in accordance with this prioritization policy, but will not compete for funding with projects not funded by Water Enterprise funds.

The following is a partial listing of restricted funding categories:

- a. Community Development Block Grants
 - b. Developer Impact Fees
 - c. Enterprise Funds (Airport, Environmental Services, Golf, Undergrounding, Metropolitan Wastewater, and Water)
 - d. Facilities Benefit Assessments
 - e. Grants
 - f. Regional Park Fund
 - g. State and Federal Funds
 - h. TransNet Funds
- II. Projects that are not within a restricted funding category will compete for capital outlay funds, General Fund or bond proceeds in accordance with this CIP prioritization policy. Although capital needs from the restricted funds or revenue-producing departments are often separate from the General Fund, the capital investments of all City departments should be planned together to allow better coordination of capital projects in specific parts of the City over time. Citywide coordination of capital project planning can increase the cost-effectiveness of the City's capital programs by facilitating a holistic approach to infrastructure investments.

B. Asset Categories

To ensure that the comparison is conducted between similar types of projects, the needs and CIP projects shall be separated into categories according to the predominant type of asset and funding sources in the project. Project categories shall include the following asset categories:

1. **Enterprise-Funded Assets and Mandated Programs** - assets or specific services that are funded directly by fees and charges to users. These include the services provided by Public Utilities, Environmental Services, Airports and Golf Courses. This category also includes assets or services that are required by legal mandate or consent decree.
 - a. Airport Facilities
 - b. Drainage Facilities - Storm drain systems and improvements to create best management practices (BMPs, channels, pump stations, storm drain pipes and flood control systems) for treating storm water beyond the limits of roadways and streets
 - c. Golf Course and Facilities
 - d. Undergrounding Projects
 - e. Environmental Facilities - Landfills and supporting facilities and structures
 - f. Wastewater Pipelines and Facilities - Wastewater pipelines, facilities and structures (interceptors, mains, trunk sewers, treatment plants, pump stations, laboratories, land management and administration buildings)
 - g. Water Pipelines and Facilities - Water and reclaimed water pipelines, facilities, structures and land management (distribution mains, transmission mains, treatment plants, pump stations, reservoirs/dams, standpipes, wells and laboratories, land management and administration buildings)
2. **Mobility Assets** – assets that increase mobility options and the functionality of local roadways, streets, sidewalks and public transport that shall include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Bicycle facilities (all classifications)
 - b. Bridges (pedestrian and vehicular), including replacement, retrofit, and rehabilitation
 - c. Erosion control, slope stabilization, and retaining walls supporting transportation facilities

-
- d. Roads, roadway widening, roadway reconfigurations, and street enhancements including medians and streetscape
 - e. Guardrails, barrier rails, traffic calming, flashing beacons, speed abatement work and other structural safety enhancements
 - f. Traffic signals, traffic calming, traffic signal interconnections, signal coordination work, and other traffic signal upgrades and modifications
 - g. Pedestrian facilities including sidewalks, pedestrian accessibility improvements including curb ramps, street lighting including mid-block and intersection safety location
3. **Public Safety Assets** – assets that protect, preserve and maintain the safety of the community, its environment and property that include:
- a. Lifeguard stations
 - b. Fire facilities and structures
 - c. Police facilities and structures
4. **Neighborhood Assets** - assets that improve the quality of life and services in the community both socially and economically. These include but are not limited to community support facilities and structures such as:
- a. Libraries
 - b. Park and recreation facilities (mini and miscellaneous parks, neighborhood, open space) and structures, pool centers
 - c. Regional sport or event facilities
 - d. Community and civic facilities
 - e. Public arts and cultural facilities
 - f. Community gardens

CIP budgets shall reflect project allocations according to these categories. These project categories shall include resource allocation for all project components, including environmental mitigation, property acquisition, and all other activities necessary to complete the project.

C. Project Phases

To ensure that the prioritization is conducted between projects with a similar level of completion, all CIP projects shall be separated into the following standard phases within each project category:

- I. Needs List Assessment (Prior to Inclusion in the CIP Budget): This process is for scoring and prioritizing a need before the project is submitted for inclusion to budget. Asset Owners will group the needs with similar scope, funding sources and functional category, when appropriate, and establish high level project score. This proposed project will undergo a simple methodology of scoring based on available information of the asset, including whether the need contributes to an overall service level goal or other citywide performance metric. Score will be used to determine whether or not to put the project into the next fiscal year CIP Budget.
- II. After CIP Budget: This process shall be used by CIPRAC for scoring and prioritizing a project that has been approved for inclusion into the CIP budget. This process constitutes a detailed and complex scoring methodology of a project in the following phases of project development after further research of the existing condition of the asset or the lack of an asset and constraints in implementing the project:
 1. Planning and pre-design – includes assessment of the project based on existing condition of asset or absence of asset, and available information and development of a feasibility study and preliminary scope, schedule and budget.
 2. Design - includes development of the construction plans, specifications, environmental document, contract documents, and detailed cost estimate for the CIP project.
 3. Construction - includes site preparation, utilities placement, equipment installation, construction, environmental mitigation and project closeout.

D. Prioritization Factors

Based on the prioritization factors listed below, Asset Owners shall prioritize capital needs and projects for available budgetary resources. Before utilizing these prioritization factors, each Asset Owner shall incorporate the following considerations as the sole basis for scoring projects.

-
- a. Asset Owners via CIPRAC shall identify the minimum level of service expected from the proposed projects and use said service level as a baseline for scoring.
 - b. Identify operational and maintenance goals that are realistic and sustainable.
 - c. Maintain a basic facility assessment program (asset management program) that will be used to identify facilities needing improvements.
 - d. Maintain a basic infrastructure and facility program that will be used to identify city and neighborhood asset deficits as identified in the General Plan, community plans and master plans.
 - e. Create a multi-year (ideally five-year) Capital Improvement Planning Program that will be maintained and assessed annually.
 - f. Create and maintain a database of needs and CIP projects list with priority scoring system consistent among all other Asset Owners.
 - g. Designate a single staff to score the needs, monitor the status of each need and maintain/manage the needs list (listed geographically and based on priority scores) for stakeholder review and input.

The following are the prioritization factors:

1. Risk to Health, Safety and Environment and Regulatory or Mandated Requirements:

- a. Project avoids or minimizes the risk to health, safety and environment associated with the infrastructure based on condition assessment of the asset, or the lack of an asset, that may include the age, size, material, capacity, and history of failure of the infrastructure.
- b. Urgency of the project to reduce the potential hazards to the public, property and environment.
- c. Project is required by legal mandate or consent decree (project specific or programmatic, e.g. Department of Health and Environmental Protection Agency's mandates).
- d. Project is required by other regulatory requirements (project specific or programmatic, e.g. General Permit Compliance).
- e. Project is required to comply with court orders and settlements or avoids plausible legal claims (project specific or programmatic).
- f. Project complies with General Plan, Community Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and/or approved City-wide master plan.

-
- g. For Public Safety, this factor will also evaluate the potential in reducing the risks to the staff's health and safety minimizing the failure or maintenance of the existing deficient infrastructure.

For example, scoring projects higher that result in:

- i. Reduction in accidents, main breaks, sewer spills and flooding problems.
- ii. Improved structural integrity and reliability of infrastructure.
- iii. Mitigation of health and environmental hazards.
- iv. Fewer or less severe mobility related accidents.
- v. Reducing emergency response times to minimum operational standards.
- vi. Addressing consent decrees, court orders, settlements and/or other legal mandates.
- vii. Compliance with the community plan.

2. Asset Condition, Annual Recurring Costs and Asset Longevity:

- a. Existing conditions and capacity to meet the basic level of service is deficient.
- b. Avoids potential failure due to substandard conditions.
- c. The project improves the overall reliability of the capital asset and infrastructure system.
- d. There are major implications of delaying the project such as significant future costs, or negative community impacts.
- e. The extent to which the project reduces City operations and maintenance expenditures.
- f. The project increases the longevity of the capital asset or extends the useful life of the asset in the long term.

For example, scoring projects higher that result in:

- i. Reducing frequency and cost of repairs and bring the facility to current standards.
- ii. Reducing both maintenance requirements and energy consumption or the need for periodic cleaning.

3. Community Investment and Economic Prosperity:

- a. The project contributes toward economic development and revitalization efforts.
- b. The project reduces or avoids impacts to the community when infrastructure fails.
- c. The project will benefit under-served communities including those with low income households, low community engagement and low mobility or access to transportation systems based on San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) census tract.
- d. The project implements the Economic Prosperity Element of the General Plan and/or other community plans.
- e. The project is located in a census tract that is deemed eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.
- f. The project is located within half (1/2) mile of an existing affordable housing development.
- g. The project benefits communities that have the highest population served per acre.

For example, scoring projects higher that:

- i. Implement the City of Villages strategy.
- ii. Implement a corridor plan.
- iii. Implement an economic strategy to attract new employment centers or revitalize existing ones in neighborhoods where unemployment is above the city median.
- iv. Are located in CDBG eligible neighborhoods.
- v. Construct or renovate a library or other facility that would allow a low-income community to have more access to literacy services and other community services.

4. Level and Quality of Service:

- a. The project improves existing conditions and capacity to meet the minimum level and quality of services that is deficient. Avoids potential failure due to substandard conditions.
- b. The project addresses an infrastructure or facility deficit identified in a community plan.
- c. The project addresses the need to install new facilities or improve existing facilities to provide access to City services that promotes growth and employment opportunities in under-served communities consistent with the City's Living Wage Ordinance.

For example, scoring projects higher that:

- i. Brings a facility for the first time to a neighborhood as opposed to improving/expanding an undersized but existing functional facility.

5. Sustainability and Conservation:

- a. The project improves the health of the community and natural environment through sustainable designs with improved regional air quality and reduced greenhouse gas emission that contributes to climate change.
- b. The project facilitates multiple transportation options (including walk-ability, bicycles, and public transportation) and reduces the need for auto-dependency.
- c. Where appropriate, the project promotes infill development, open space and land form preservation, habitat protection and biological diversity, and enhanced urban runoff management.
- d. The project incorporates design that meets or exceeds recognized federal and state standards in the field of energy efficiency, such as State of California Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards, LEED building standards, etc.
- e. The project results in greener neighborhoods and reduces or avoids the potential public exposure to pollutants, contamination and other hazards to public health and environment.

For example, scoring projects higher that:

- i. Utilize renewable or green energy project materials and resources efficiently.
- ii. Promote community walk-ability and use of bicycles or public transit.
- iii. Promote community use of locally-sourced and environmentally friendly products and services.
- iv. Include planting of appropriate trees in street medians or adding park and open space.

6. Funding Availability:

- a. The greater a project leverages City funds against external funds (grant funds or cost sharing from outside entities) the greater priority said project shall receive.
- b. The project's rank is increased based on assessment of the amount of funding needed to complete the current project phase and the entire project.

For example, scoring projects higher that bring grant funds from an outside agency into the City and scoring projects lower that rely only on City funds.

7. Project Readiness:

- a. The project is ready to enter the phase corresponding to the funding proposed. For example, a design-build project with a completed environmental document will score higher than a design-build project without a complete environmental document.
- b. The project shall be scored based upon the delivery method. Project that can be delivered most expeditiously shall be preferred.
- c. Assessment of non-engineering issues involved in completing the project. (e.g., significant environmental issues, project complexity, and level of public support). For example, projects with complex environmental issues or known significant legal challenges shall be scored lower than projects without said complications.

8. Multiple Category Benefit and Bundling Opportunities:

- a. The project fulfills the prioritization factors described above across multiple scoring categories.
- b. The project reduces construction costs by potentially bundling with adjacent projects. c. The project provides for partnering or bundling opportunities with other local, state, or federal agencies (e.g. leverages shared resources).

For example, scoring a project higher for:

- i. A roadway project that also provides for the replacement of a deteriorated storm drain.
- ii. A streetscape project that also provides street lighting at critical intersections.
- iii. A bikeway project that provides slope stabilization at an area of known erosion problems.

E. Scoring Weights

The following are the corresponding scoring weights in percentage for each factor per asset category:

Factors	Enterprise-Funded Assets and Mandated Programs	Mobility Assets	Public Safety Assets	Neighborhood Assets
1. Risk to Health, Safety and Environment and Regulatory or Mandated Requirements	25	20	15	10
2. Asset Condition, Annual Recurring Costs and Asset Longevity	20	20	20	15
3. Community Investment and Economic Prosperity	20	20	10	25
4. Level and Quality of Service	10	20	30	20
5. Sustainability and Conservation	10	5	5	10
6. Funding Availability	5	5	10	5
7. Project Readiness	5	5	5	5
8. Multiple Category Benefit and Bundling Opportunities	5	5	5	10
Total	100	100	100	100

For consistent and accurate application of the prioritization factors each asset department shall develop asset-specific sub-criteria for each factor. These criteria shall be applied to their own projects at both the Needs List Phase and the Funding Phase.

F. Implementation Process

The following process discusses the steps in prioritizing projects from a need through project implementation.

1. Stakeholder, including but not limited to: the public, Community Planning Group, elected officials, Asset Owners, and other stakeholders submits a need to the Asset-Ownning Department (AO).
2. The AO reviews the needs and groups them with similar scope, funding sources and functional category, when appropriate. The AO prepares a preliminary scope, cost estimate and schedule, and establishes high level priority score.
3. The AO submits the project with the priority score to Capital Improvements Program Review and Advisory Committee (CIPRAC) for review and recommendation for Mayoral approval.
 - a. If the Mayor approves CIPRAC's recommendation the project is submitted as part of the Mayor's proposed CIP Budget.
 - b. If the Mayor rejects the recommendation the project goes back to the AO as a need for reconsideration for next budget cycle.
4. Once the project is in the Mayor's proposed CIP Budget:
 - a. If CIP project is approved during the budget process the AO submits the project to Public Works (PW) for further assessment of the scope, cost and schedule.
 - b. If CIP project is rejected during the budget process, the project goes back to the AO as a need for reconsideration for next budget cycle.
5. PW updates the priority score for the CIP project with complex and more detailed scoring using the policy's prioritization factors and weights. The detailed scoring is based on detailed research and available information that may require changes to the project scope, schedule, costs and prioritization score.
 - a. If a project with the final scope, cost, schedule and prioritization score is fully funded, PW starts design and implements the project through construction.
 - b. If project requires additional funding, the project is returned to AO for additional funding and to CIPRAC for review and approval.

Conditions:

1. Emergency projects will automatically have 100% priority score.
2. The resultant ranking list for each category and phase of needs and CIP projects shall be reported by the Mayor to the Council as part of the annual CIP budget, with recommendations for funding.
3. Upon approval of the CIP budget by the Council, the Mayor shall pursue the completion of each project phase according to the priority ranking resulting from this prioritization process up to the total amounts authorized by Council for each project category. The Mayor shall also utilize the resultant priority ranking for the pursuit of all outside grant funding opportunities.
4. The Mayor will update the priority score as the conditions of each project change or other new information becomes available. For instance, if grant funding becomes available for a lower ranked project, the priority score would be re-evaluated with this new information. When changes occur that would alter a project's priority ranking, the priority list will be revised. The City Council will receive an informational brief of changes to the priority list at mid-year, and the annual update of the list will be part of the budget process. Similarly, resources shall not be withdrawn from a project prior to the completion of its current phase, unless reallocation is authorized by the annual appropriation ordinance or approved by Council.

Review of this policy by the appropriate Council committee shall be performed one year after implementation of this policy and bi-annually thereafter to identify additional enhancements.

Implementation of this Council Policy is not intended to release or alter the City's current or future obligations to complete specific CIP projects by specified deadlines, as may be imposed by court order, or order of any federal, state or local regulatory agency.

HISTORY:

Adopted by Resolution R-302291 - 01/16/2007

Amended by Resolution R-303741 - 05/30/2008

Amended by Resolution R-308535 - 11/13/2013

APPENDIX C – BASIC LEGAL DOCUMENTS

The following basic legal documents are found in most public finance transactions.

C1 *Authorizing Resolution*

Purpose:

The resolution authorizes issuance and sale of bonds, authorized execution and delivery of documents, and directs staff to take other actions necessary to complete financing.

Substitutes: Authorizing Ordinance.

Principal Drafter: Bond Counsel or Issuer's Counsel.

Parties: Issuer.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Parameters for delegation of authority to sell bonds; maximum paramount and term of bonds; conformance to issuer's standard form of resolution.

C2 *Bond/Note Purchase Agreement/Broker-Dealer Agreement*

Purpose:

Provides for the sale of the bonds to the broker-dealer/underwriter; specifies discount, interest rates and terms for payment of purchase price; contains representations and warranties of the issuer; contains conditions precedent to underwriter's obligation to purchase the bonds at closing; specifies documents to be delivered at closing; specifies who will pay expenses.

Substitutes: Official Notice of Sale and Bid Form (competitive sales); Placement Agreement (private placements).

Principal Drafter: Broker-Dealer/Underwriter's Counsel or Disclosure Counsel.

Parties: Broker-Dealer/Underwriter, Issuer, and Conduit Borrower.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

All points listed under "Purpose" section.

C3 *Closing Documents*

Purpose:

Contains the certificates, receipts, written directions and requests, requisitions and similar documents, which are delivered at the closing of the issuance. These documents generally accomplish the following:

- A. Document the factual representations required by the purchase contract and accuracy and completeness of expertise portions of the disclosure;
- B. Document compliance with the requirements of law and contract for the issuance of the bonds;
- C. Document the flow of funds at closing; and
- D. Instruct parties to take certain actions upon closing; i.e., deposit funds in accounts, record documents, file reports, release security, etc.

Substitutes: None.

Principal Drafter: Bond Counsel.

Parties: All parties to transaction.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Accuracy of all amounts for receipt and deposit of funds, accuracy of representations, warranties, and certifications. All requisitions should be reviewed to determine correctness of payments, deposits and transfers.

C4 *Continuing Disclosure Agreement*

Purpose:

The Continuing Disclosure Agreement contains the undertakings of the issuer to provide ongoing disclosure in the form of annual reports and event notices pursuant to SEC Rule 15c2-12 and its subsequent amendments. The undertakings must remain in place for the life of the issuance, with certain exceptions for pool bonds.

Substitutes: Continuing Disclosure Certificate.

Principal Drafter: Broker Dealer/ Underwriter's Counsel, Disclosure Counsel, or Bond Counsel.

Parties: Issuer, Obligated Persons; Trustee.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Contents of annual reports; deadline for filing annual reports; listed event notices; amendment provisions.

C5 *Indenture*

Purpose:

The indenture is the basic security document of a bond transaction. It provides the terms of the bonds, including payment dates, maturities, redemption provision, registration, transfer and exchange, etc. The indenture creates the legal structure for the security for the bonds, including:

- Creation and granting of the Trust Estate
- Pledge of revenues and other collateral
- Covenants
- Default and remedy provisions
- Flow of funds
- Parity debt provisions for issuance of additional bonds in the future
- Trustee-related provisions

Substitutes: Trust Agreement; Fiscal Agent Agreement; Bond Resolution or Bond Ordinance.

Principal Drafter: Bond Counsel.

Parties: Issuer, Trustee.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Definitions of permitted investments and revenues; scope of trust estate and pledged collateral; payment and redemption terms of bonds; additional bonds test; flow of funds with special consideration to retaining the flexibility needed to use funds not otherwise needed for debt service; reserve fund provisions; covenants; default and remedy provisions; defeasance provisions.

C6 *Loan Agreement*

Purpose:

The loan agreement is the document under which proceeds are lent or otherwise provided for a project, vehicles, or equipment being financed and the user of the proceeds agrees to pay the principal amount, plus interest. It provides for payment of loan, installment sale or lease payments sufficient in time and amount to pay debt service on the bonds, loan, or lease.

Substitutes: Installment Sale Agreements; Facilities or Project Lease; Master Lease Agreement

Principal Drafter: Bond Counsel.

Parties: Conduit Borrower/Obligator, Issuer.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Representations and warranties; covenants; prepayment provisions; pledge provisions; title provisions; abatement provisions; insurance provisions.

C7 Official Statement

Purpose:

The Official Statement is the document, which provides disclosures to investors and potential investors. Most financings are required to have Official Statements under SEC Rule 15c2-12. This document provides disclosure to prospective investors regarding term of bonds, security, risk factors, and financial and operating information concerning issuer and background information.

Substitutes: Offering Memorandum; Limited Offering Memorandum, Offering Circular.

Principal Drafter: Issuer, Disclosure Counsel.

Parties: Issuer.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Security and sources of payment for the bonds; risk factors; financial and operating data regarding the entity responsible for payment; litigation; and general information about the issuer.

C8 Reimbursement Agreement

Purpose:

The Reimbursement Agreement appears in transactions involving a letter of credit or surety policy guaranteeing payment on the bond, commercial paper notes, or draws against the reserve fund, respectively. It contains the obligation to repay the letter of credit bank amounts drawn on the credit facility. Term and conditions vary depending upon the type of transaction involved.

The Reimbursement Agreement provides for costs incurred prior to the bonds or commercial paper being issued to be reimbursed from such proceeds up to the date that is specified therein.

Substitutes: Financial Guarantee Agreement.

Principal Drafter: Bank Counsel, Surety Provider Counsel.

Parties: Issuer, Bank, and Trustee (in some cases).

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Representations and warranties; fees payable to bank; ability of bank to “participate” the credit facility to other banks; affirmative covenants; negative covenants; renewals and extensions of the credit facility; default and remedy provisions; collateral provisions; choice of law provisions.

C9 Tax Certificate

Purpose:

The Tax Certificate contains certifications required to be made by the issuer, and in case of a conduit issue, the borrower, in order to satisfy the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code and the regulations issued thereunder for the bonds to be tax-exempt. It also describes the rules applicable to the investment of bond proceeds under federal tax law.

Substitutes: Tax Agreement; Arbitrage or Non-Arbitrage Certificate.

Principal Drafter: Bond Counsel.

Parties: Issuer, Borrower.

Critical Provisions for Issuer Review:

Spend down requirements, yield restrictions, arbitrage filing dates.

APPENDIX D – DISCLOSURE PRACTICES WORKING GROUP

DISCLOSURE CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

City of San Diego Disclosure Practices Working Group

Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Article I

General

Section 1.1. Purpose. These Disclosure Controls and Procedures are designed to (i) ensure the accuracy of the City of San Diego’s disclosures and the City’s compliance (including the City Council, City officers, and staff) with all applicable federal and state securities laws, and (ii) promote best practices regarding disclosures relating to securities issued by the City and its Related Entities.

Section 1.2. Disclosure Practices Working Group. Pursuant to Sections 22.4101 and 22.4103 of the Municipal Code, a Disclosure Practices Working Group (“DPWG”) has been established. Membership of the Disclosure Group shall be as set forth in Section 22.4103 of the Municipal Code.

Section 1.3. Responsibilities of DPWG. The DPWG shall have the responsibilities set forth in (i) subsection (b) of Section 22.4101 of the Municipal Code, (ii) Section 22.4107 of the Municipal Code, (iii) subsection (a) of Section 22.4108 of the Municipal Code, and such additional responsibilities as are set forth in the Municipal Code and these Procedures.

Section 1.4. Meetings of the Disclosure Group. In accordance with Section 22.4105 of the Municipal Code, DPWG shall meet as often as necessary to fulfill its obligations. Any member of the Disclosure Group may convene a meeting. Meetings may be attended in person or via telephone, however at least one in-person meeting is required for approval of Official Statements, Audited Financials and other Disclosure Documents if so requested by any Member. The Disclosure Coordinator shall distribute an agenda for each meeting. The agenda shall be prepared in consultation with members of the DPWG or at the request of City staff. Any member or ex officio participant of the DPWG may place an item on the agenda.

Section 1.5. Quorum; Delegation. A quorum will consist of at least four of the six individuals identified in Section 22.4103(a) of the Municipal Code or the designees of those individuals. Members may designate appropriate individuals to attend DPWG meetings in the event that the Member is not able to attend. Disclosure Documents may only be approved by Members or designees specifically permitted under the Municipal Code.

Current as of May 28, 2021

Article II

Definitions

Section 2.1. Definitions. Capitalized terms used in these Disclosure Controls and Procedures shall have the meanings set forth below:

“Audited Financials” means the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

“City” means the City of San Diego, California.

“Contributors” means those persons contacted by the Financing Group or the Disclosure Group, or assigned by a department director, to assist with the review or preparation of a Disclosure Document as described in Section 4.3.

“Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure” means the attorney designated as such pursuant to Section 22.0302 of the Municipal Code.

“Disclosure Coordinator” means the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure.

“Disclosure Documents” means those documents defined as such in Article III.

“EMMA” means the Electronic Municipal Market Access reporting system of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board

“Financing Group” means, collectively, those persons identified as such pursuant to subsection A. of Section 4.3.

“Member” means the individuals identified in Section 22.4103(a) of the Municipal Code.

“Municipal Code” means the San Diego Municipal Code, as amended from time to time.

“Preparer” means those persons defined as such in subsection A. of Section 4.5.

“Procedures” means these Disclosure Controls and Procedures.

“Related Entities” means those entities as defined in Section 22.4102 of the Municipal Code. Related Entities include, but are not limited to, those Related Entities as set forth in Exhibit A.

Article III
Disclosure Documents

Section 3.1. Disclosure Documents. “Disclosure Documents” means the following documents:

- A. Preliminary and final official statements, and preliminary and final private placement memoranda, relating to the City’s securities, together with any supplements;
- B. the City’s Financial Statements;
- C. any filing made by the City with EMMA, whether made pursuant to a continuing disclosure agreement to which the City is a party or made voluntarily;
- D. rating agency presentations, investor presentations and any postings on the City investor webpage, not including explanatory or informational items such as the forward calendar;
- E. any disclosure materials requiring, pursuant to the Municipal Code, approval and certification by the Mayor, City Attorney, or Chief Financial Officer;
- F. disclosures provided by the City in connection with securities issued by Related Entities, together with all of such documents and materials prepared, issued, or distributed in connection with such securities of such related entity, to the extent that the City, the City Council, or City officers, or staff have prepared or are responsible for the preparation of the form or content of such documents or materials;
- G. offering documents prepared by Related Entities if such documents are subject to the approval of the City Council (e.g. when the City Council is acting in its capacity as the governing board of the Housing Authority or the Successor Agency of the Redevelopment Agency or the legislative body of the Community Facilities Districts).

Section 3.2 Where a City Related Entity is a conduit issuer and no City or Related Entity financial information is being disclosed (e.g., Housing Authority multifamily housing revenue bonds), documents otherwise meeting the definition of Disclosure Document herein need not be reviewed by DPWG.

Article IV

Review Process

Section 4.1. Determination of “Disclosure Document” status. If any member raises a concern whether a particular document or other communication is a Disclosure Document, then the DPWG will make such determination. Any Member may seek the advice of DPWG to determine whether any document should be treated as a Disclosure Document. To assist DPWG in its determination whether a particular document is a Disclosure Document as described in subsection F. of Section 3.1, information shall be solicited from the appropriate Related Entity, if necessary.

Section 4.2. Review of Form and Content of Disclosure Documents. DPWG shall review the form and content of each Disclosure Document. DPWG may require the attendance of all persons responsible for the preparation or review of the Disclosure Document.

Section 4.3. Review of Official Statements. The following procedures shall apply to those Disclosure Documents described in subsections A. or G. of Section 3.1 (Official Statements):

- A. Financing Group. The Debt Management Director shall identify a Financing Group for each financing (the composition of which may differ for each financing), which shall include the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure (or such other Deputy City Attorney designated to work on the matter by the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure), such manager of Debt Management and other City finance and operations management staff as the Director of Debt Management determines is appropriate to interface with the bond financing team (i.e., bond counsel and/or disclosure counsel, underwriter(s), underwriter’s counsel, financial advisors, and appropriate City staff).
- B. Responsibilities of Financing Group. The Financing Group shall (i) assist the bond financing team in the preparation of the Disclosure Document and (ii) the Director of Debt Management working with the Financing Group shall certify to DPWG that, to the best of his or her knowledge, these Procedures were followed in such preparation.
 - 1. The Financing Group shall be responsible for soliciting material information from City departments. The Financing Group shall identify Contributors who may have information necessary to prepare, or who should review portions of, the Disclosure Document. These Contributors should be timely contacted and informed that their assistance will be needed for the preparation of the Disclosure Document, which notification will contain the information set forth in Exhibit C. Contributors shall be provided with adequate time to fulfill their responsibilities under these Procedures.
 - 2. The manager of Debt Management assigned to the financing, together with the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, shall maintain or cause to be maintained by the transaction disclosure counsel an accurate log of all individuals or departments that contributed to the Disclosure

Document, including what sections such individuals or department prepared or reviewed. The Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure shall also be responsible for maintaining all certifications on behalf of DPWG.

3. The Financing Group shall confirm to and advise DPWG that each section of and all financial and operating information contained in the Disclosure Document has been reviewed by an appropriate person, as evidenced by the written material described in 2. above (which shall constitute the “audit trail” referenced in Section 22.4106(a)(4) of the Municipal Code). Of particular import is that the “Appendix A” and other information concerning the City be compared for accuracy against the City’s Audited Financials.
4. Where appropriate, the Financing Group may exercise the authority granted to DPWG under Municipal Code section 22.4111 to require information, assurances or certifications from officers and employees of the City, related entities or other entities. Any issues related to obtaining such information, assurances or certifications shall be referred to DPWG. Any issues related to obtaining information from parties outside the City, including consultants, shall also be referred to DPWG.

C. Responsibilities of Contributors. A Contributor shall assist in reviewing and preparing the Disclosure Document using his or her knowledge of the City and by discussing the Disclosure Document with other members of the department in an attempt to ensure the accuracy of the information and to determine whether any other information should be discussed or disclosed. Once a Contributor is notified of his or her need to participate in preparing a Disclosure Document, the Contributor and the Contributor’s department director shall cooperate with Financing Group and DPWG requests. Contributors who provide information incorporated into a Disclosure Document shall provide assurances to his or her department director as to the accuracy of such information and the Contributor’s participation shall be noted in the director’s certification to DPWG.

D. Review and Certification by Department Directors. With respect to those Disclosure Documents described in subsection A. of Section 3.1, the directors or management of relevant City departments and entities, or appropriate designees, shall participate in the activities of the Financing Group to ensure that information provided by or concerning the operational responsibilities of the departments or entities is accurate and complete. The departments and entities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Department of Finance (Exhibit D)
2. Real Estate Assets Department (Exhibit D)
3. Debt Management Department (Exhibit D)

-
4. Risk Management Department (Exhibit D)
 5. Transportation Department (Exhibit D)
 6. Stormwater Department (Exhibit D)
 7. San Diego City Employees' Retirement System (Exhibit D)
 8. Office of the City Attorney (Exhibit E)
 9. Public Utilities Department (Exhibit D)

The Financing Group or DPWG may request certifications from any other department, entity or related entity as needed. Certifications must be provided by department or entity directors or management and not designees unless there are extenuating circumstances such as illness or absence. Certifications shall be addressed to DPWG.

- E. Review by Chief Financial Officer. The Chief Financial Officer shall review the Disclosure Document in full to identify any material difference in presentation of financial material from the Audited Financials, any misstatement or omission in any sections that contain descriptions of information prepared by or of interest to the Chief Financial Officer. Any comments on the Disclosure Document shall timely be sent to the Financing Group. The Chief Financial Officer shall certify to DPWG that information presented in the Disclosure Document is consistent with the Audited Financials. (Exhibit F).

Section 4.4. Review of the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. The City's Audited Financials are prepared at the direction of the City Comptroller. The City Comptroller shall require certifications from the director or management of any department or entity providing information for inclusion in the Audited Financials where the City Comptroller considers such information material. Departments and entities providing such certifications may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Department of Risk Management
2. Environmental Services Department
3. Public Utilities Department
4. Transportation Department
5. Stormwater Department
6. Real Estate Assets Department
7. San Diego City Employees' Retirement System

8. Office of the City Attorney

In the event that the City Comptroller determines that any department or entity not specifically identified above is providing material information for inclusion in the Audited Financials, the City Comptroller shall require certification from such department or entity. Certifications shall be addressed to the Chief Financial Officer and shall generally follow the form of Exhibit L.

Section 4.5. Review of Disclosure Documents other than Official Statements and Audited Financials. The following procedures shall apply to those Disclosure Documents that are not addressed in Section 4.3 or Section 4.4:

- A. Notify DPWG. The person or department preparing the applicable Disclosure Document (the “Preparer”) shall inform DPWG of the (i) expected completion date of the Disclosure Document and (ii) the expected or required dissemination date of the Disclosure Document.
- B. Involvement of Deputy City Attorney. The Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, in consultation with the City’s outside disclosure counsel as necessary, shall assist the Preparer to:
 - 1. identify material information that should be disclosed;
 - 2. identify other persons that may have material information or knowledge of any information omitted from such Disclosure Document; and
 - 3. determine when the Disclosure Document is final and ready for review by DPWG.
- C. Prepare Source List. The Preparer shall keep a list of individuals or groups that have contributed to the preparation of the Disclosure Document and a list of sources from which the information summarized or updated in the Disclosure Document was derived.

Article V
Approval Process

Section 5.1. General. DPWG shall review and approve the form and content of each Disclosure Document. To the extent feasible, DPWG should act through consensus decision-making. If DPWG is unable to reach consensus, any dissenting opinion shall be reflected in the certificate of DPWG. Those Disclosure Documents that (A) (i) the City is contractually obligated to file with EMMA if determined to be a material event or as a result of the failure to file the required annual financial information and (ii) contain no discretionary content (e.g., rating changes) or (B) are changes made to a Preliminary Official Statement to create a final Official Statement that do no more

than reflect the pricing of the applicable bonds (e.g., offering prices, interest rates, aggregate principal amount, principal amount per maturity, and other similar terms), may be filed with EMMA upon the approval of the City's outside disclosure counsel and the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure. DPWG may so designate other approvals, as appropriate. DPWG may also approve Disclosure Documents via email after initial reviews are conducted via telephone or in person.

Section 5.2. Review of the Official Statements by Disclosure Group for Approval. The Financing Group shall submit any Disclosure Document described in Section 4.3 (Official Statements) to DPWG when (i) it has completed all the updates, and source documentation finalized as described in Section 4.3, and (ii) in its best judgment, the Disclosure Document is in substantially final form. The Financing Group shall present the Official Statement to DPWG to ensure the disclosures are accurate and complete. If necessary, documents may be submitted in parts.

DPWG shall evaluate the Disclosure Document for accuracy and have the opportunity to ask questions of the Financing Group and of any Contributor or other person who reviewed or drafted any section of the Disclosure Document. DPWG may send the Disclosure Document back to the Financing Group for revisions. DPWG shall timely provide the Financing Group with any comments or questions on the Disclosure Document or the associated financing.

Section 5.3. Submission of Official Statements to Mayor and City Attorney. Except of Disclosure Documents for Related Entities for which there is presented no financial or operating information of the City, DPWG shall submit any Disclosure Document described in Section 4.3 to the Mayor and City Attorney when, in its best judgment, (i) the Disclosure Document is in substantially final form and (ii) DPWG has complied with these Procedures. Such submission shall be by means of the transmittal letter attached as Exhibit H.

The Mayor and the City Attorney shall meet with the Financing Group and DPWG at a mutually convenient time, and may ask questions of the Financing Group, DPWG, any Contributor, and any other person who reviewed or prepared any section of the Disclosure Document. The Mayor or City Attorney may send the Disclosure Document back to the Financing Group for revisions. Upon satisfaction with the Disclosure Document, the Mayor and City Attorney shall execute the certifications required by Section 22.4112(a) of the Municipal Code, in the form attached as Exhibit I, and provide a copy to DPWG.

Section 5.4. Chief Financial Officer Certification. Except for Disclosure Documents of Related Entities for which there is presented no financial or operating information of the City, upon satisfaction with a Disclosure Document described in Section 4.3 or in subsection F. of Section 3.1, the Chief Financial Officer shall execute the certification required by 22.0707(b) of the Municipal Code, in the form attached as Exhibit J, and provide a copy to DPWG. With respect to each fiscal year's Audited Financials, the Chief Financial Officer shall execute the certification required by 22.0707(a) of the Municipal Code, in the form attached as Exhibit K, and provide a copy to DPWG.

Section 5.5. Submission of Official Statements to City Council for Approval. As part of the docketing process, DPWG shall submit any Disclosure Document described in Section 4.3 to the City Council for approval together with the certifications from the Mayor, the City Attorney, and the Chief Financial Officer promptly after the receipt of such certifications. The approval of

such a Disclosure Document by the City Council shall be docketed on the adoption agenda and shall not be approved as a consent item. The City Council shall undertake such review as deemed necessary by the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure and the City's outside disclosure counsel to fulfill the City Council's responsibilities under applicable federal and state securities laws.

Section 5.6. Approval of Disclosure Documents other than Official Statements. Any Disclosure Document shall be submitted to DPWG for approval when the Preparer, the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, and the City's outside disclosure counsel believe such Disclosure Document is ready for dissemination.

DPWG shall evaluate the Disclosure Document for accuracy and completeness, and have the opportunity to ask questions of the Preparer or any other person who reviewed or drafted any section of the Disclosure Document. DPWG may send the Disclosure Document back to the Preparer for revisions. DPWG shall communicate to the Preparer any comments or questions on the Disclosure Document or the associated financing in a timely manner.

Section 5.7. Review and Approval of Private Placements or Direct Loan Instruments. If City staff, in consultation with the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure and outside disclosure counsel, determines that there are disclosure requirements related to proposed City (or related entity) borrowings to be done on a private placement or direct loan basis, DPWG shall review such borrowings to (i) ensure that adequate processes have been implemented to enable the purchaser to conduct due diligence on the project; (ii) determine if there is a disclosure document or annual reporting requirements; and (iii) ensure, if appropriate, that there are adequate controls in place restricting the transfers of such securities. If DPWG finds that there are disclosure requirements, they shall undertake the review required by Section 4.2. For any privately placed transaction determined to involve such disclosure requirements, DPWG shall be provided with the final staff report describing the issue and such other documents as DPWG shall request.

Article VI

Timelines for Review

Section 6.1. Timeline for Review of Official Statements. The timeline for any particular bond financing for which a Disclosure Document as described in subsections A. or G. of Section 3.1 will vary depending on the financing timeline for the bond issuance, funding needs, and market conditions as determined by Debt Management in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, provided that sufficient time is allowed to fully comply with these Procedures.

Section 6.2. Timeline for Review of Disclosure Documents other than Official Statements. The timeline for preparing any particular Disclosure Document will be determined by the DPWG from time to time.

Article VII

Training Policy

Section 7.1. Training Sessions.

-
- A. Employees with responsibility for collecting or analyzing information that may be material to the preparation of a Disclosure Document shall attend disclosure training sessions conducted by the City's outside disclosure counsel, with the assistance of the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, and the Director of Debt Management. New employees shall review the video of such a session within three months of their first day of employment. Such training sessions shall include education on the City's disclosure obligations under applicable federal and state securities laws and their responsibilities and potential liabilities regarding such obligations. Such training sessions may be conducted in person or by video.
 - B. The determination as to whether a class of employee or specific individual employees or groups of employees shall receive such training shall be made by the Chief Financial Officer or the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, as appropriate. DPWG may also require training for a particular employee or employees not otherwise specified.
 - C. Separate training sessions shall be conducted by the City's outside disclosure counsel, with the assistance of the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure, for the Mayor and City Council members.

Article VIII

Document Retention Policies

Section 8.1. Official Statements.

- A. Materials retained. In addition to closing transcripts, which shall be maintained by Debt Management, DPWG shall retain in a central depository, for a period of five years from the date of delivery of the securities referenced in a Disclosure Document described in subsections A. or G. of Section 3.1, executed copies of any certifications or logs prepared according to these Procedures and the following materials:
 - 1. the executed copies of the letters, requests, and certifications required pursuant to these procedures;
 - 2. the information and related sources referenced in the materials described in 1. above;
 - 3. any written certification or opinions executed by a City official relating to disclosure matters if such certifications are not contained in the closing transcript.
- B. Materials not retained. DPWG shall not retain after the date of delivery of the related securities drafts of any materials.

Section 8.2. Disclosure Documents other than Official Statements. DPWG shall retain in a central depository, for a period of five years from the date the respective Disclosure Document is published, posted, or otherwise made publicly available:

1. the final version of the Disclosure Document,
2. all transmittal letters, requests, and certifications relating to information in the Disclosure Document,
3. the information and related sources referenced in the materials described in 2. above.

DPWG shall not retain the drafts of any such materials.

Article IX *Confidential Submissions*

Section 9.1. Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure. The City shall encourage City employees to contact the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure with any disclosure questions or concerns. To the extent permitted by law, upon the employee's request, the Deputy City Attorney for Finance and Disclosure shall keep the employee's identity confidential.

Section 9.2. Fraud Hotline. Anonymous submissions related to disclosure matters may also be made through the fraud hotline maintained by the City Auditor, if appropriate.

Article X *Annual Review*

Section 10.1. Annual Review. DPWG shall conduct an annual evaluation of these Disclosure Controls and Procedures and also prepare an annual report of the activities undertaken by DPWG during the year, in accordance with the procedures and the dates established by Section 22.4107 of the Municipal Code.

Article XI *Suspensions*

Section 11.1. Other than the review and approval by the Mayor and the City Council, if the DPWG determines that any provisions of these Disclosure Controls and Procedures should not be applicable to a particular Disclosure Document, the DPWG may suspend that provision for that purpose.

Exhibits

- A. List of Related Entities
- B. Related Entity Letter
- C. Request for Information from Contributors
- D. Certification by Department Director to DPWG
- E. Certification by City Attorney's Office Regarding Litigation
- F. Certification by Chief Financial Officer to DPWG
- G. Transmittal of Official Statement by Financing Group to DPWG
- H. Transmittal of Official Statement by Disclosure Group to Mayor and City Attorney
- I. Certifications by City Attorney and Mayor
- J. Certification by Chief Financial Officer Regarding Official Statements
- K. Certification by Chief Financial Officer Regarding Audited Financials
- L. Certification by Department Director to the CFO Regarding Audited Financials

Related Entities

Assessment District 4096 (Piper Ranch Business Park)

Community Facilities District No. 2 (Santaluz)

Community Facilities District No. 3 (Liberty Station)

Community Facilities District No. 4 (Black Mountain Ranch Villages)

Convention Center Expansion Financing Authority

Otay Mesa Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority

Public Facilities Financing Authority of the City of San Diego Reassessment District No. 1999-1

Reassessment District No. 2003-1

City as Successor Agency to Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego

San Diego Facilities and Equipment Leasing Corporation

San Diego Housing Authority

San Diego Housing Commission

San Diego Tobacco Revenue Funding Corporation

Related Entity Letter

Pursuant to Municipal Code §22.4101 *et seq.* (Code), the Disclosure Practices Working Group (Group) has the responsibility to review the form and content of information disclosed by the City in connection with securities issued by Related Entities (as defined in the Code). Accordingly, in order to fulfill such responsibility, you must submit this letter for approval by the Group, and you understand and agree that you will not docket the Preliminary Official Statement or other offering document for consideration by the City Council prior to submitting this letter to the Group.

You have received this letter because [name of issuer] is a Related Entity of the City. Please advise, by checking the appropriate box below, whether you are in receipt of any information of the type referenced in the preceding paragraph.

- ☐ We did not request, and did not receive, any information from a City employee that we intend to include in the Preliminary Official Statement or other offering document that is being prepared in connection with the securities being offered by [name of Related Entity].
- ☐ We received information from [name of City employee], a copy of which is attached, which we intend to include in the Preliminary Official Statement that is being prepared in connection with the securities being offered by [name of Related Entity]. We understand and acknowledge that we are not authorized to include this information in such Preliminary Official Statement or any other disclosure document until we receive written authorization from a representative of the Group to include such information.

Related Entity: _____

Authorized Officer: _____

Request for Information from Contributors

The Debt Management department of the City is requesting information from [department or division name] to be included in a detailed disclosure of the City's financial and operating data for an [official statement] [annual report] to be issued by the City in connection with [the sale of bonds or other securities] [federal annual reporting requirements for municipal securities]. This information will be disseminated publicly to the investing public, including bondholders, rating agencies, financial advisors and other members of the investment community.

Federal securities laws require that the information be complete, accurate, and in no way misleading. Please review carefully and critically the information you are providing to be certain, to the best of your knowledge after reasonable inquiry of the appropriate persons, that it is accurate, complete and not misleading. Please be certain that the source documentation is reliable and auditable, should any future inquiry arise. Please provide a copy of all source documentation. Please describe any exceptions or other caveats to the information you are providing.

Please review the information in its entirety, rather than simply updating that which has already been provided, to determine whether any material changes have occurred or if any new or additional information should be included to make the information you are providing not misleading and as complete and accurate as possible.

Please provide the information by no later than [X date], and please advise of any subsequent changes to such information through [Y date].

If you require additional information regarding this request for information, please contact_____, at x_____. Thank you for your assistance.

Certification from Department Director to DPWG

DPWG:

I am the [Department Director/Other Title] of the [Name of Department]. [Department Name] has provided information for the [type of Disclosure Document] for the [Name of Transaction] (“Disclosure Document”) and I, along with other individuals in [Department Name] are Contributors as that term is used in Disclosure Controls and Procedures. I, with the assistance of Contributors on my staff, have reviewed the information we have provided or which concerns my area of operational responsibility. Such assistance includes obtaining assurances from the Contributors as to their review and the information contributed. I understand that I am responsible for the information provided by my department. By this certification, I am representing to DPWG that the information provided by or concerning the [Name of Department] is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and complete. I hereby certify that the [Name of Department] has complied with the requirements of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures and that I have attended the federal securities law training seminar conducted by the City’s outside disclosure counsel or viewed a recorded version thereof. This certification is provided as of the date below. In the event of any material change to the information provided between the date of this certification and the scheduled delivery date for the bonds (X date), I shall promptly advise DPWG.

[Department Director/Title]

Contributors:

Certification from City Attorney's Office Regarding Litigation

DPWG:

The litigation section of the Disclosure Document has been reviewed by the appropriate attorneys, and the attached disclosure reflects all material current, pending or threatened litigation, and describes any material settlements or court orders. For purposes of this letter, the term “material” means (i) any litigation threatened, pending or commenced against the City seeking to prohibit, restrain or enjoin the issuance, sale or delivery of the Bonds, or contesting or affecting the validity or enforceability of, the pledge of revenue for, or the power of the City to issue, the Bonds, (ii) any litigation or pending regulatory action the potential exposure for which is greater than \$10,000,000. In the event of any material change to such information between the date of this letter and the scheduled delivery date for the bonds (X date), I shall immediately advise the DPWG.

Deputy City Attorney for Finance and
Disclosure

Certification of Chief Financial Officer to DPWG

DPWG:

I have reviewed the information in the [Official Statement/Offering Memorandum], including particularly the financial disclosures, and I have compared the financial disclosures in the Disclosure Document to the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. I have also read and understand the directions that were provided to me in the letter from the Financing Group. To the best of my knowledge, there are no misstatements or omissions in any sections of the Disclosure Document that contain descriptions of information prepared by or of interest to the Chief Financial Officer. In the event of any material change to the attached disclosure between the date of this letter and the scheduled delivery date for the bonds (X date), I shall immediately advise the Financing Group. [I have no comments. /My comments are attached.]

Chief Financial Officer

Transmittal of Official Statement by Financing Group to DPWG

DPWG:

The Financing Group has, with respect to the [Official Statement/Offering Memorandum], (i) performed the responsibilities set forth in subsection B. of Section 4.3 of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures, (ii) obtained all the approvals and source documentation described in said Section 4.3, copies of which are attached, and (iii) in our best judgment, the Disclosure Document is in substantially final form and ready for review by DPWG.

Representative of Financing Group

[Financing Group Members]

Transmittal of Official Statement by DPWG to Mayor and City Attorney

Mayor and City Attorney:

DPWG has reviewed and approved the [Official Statement/Offering Memorandum] in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 5.2 of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures. In the best judgment of DPWG, the Disclosure Document is in substantially final form and DPWG has complied with the Disclosure Controls and Procedures.

Representative of DPWG

[DPWG Members]

Certifications by City Attorney and Mayor

City Council:

I have reviewed the [description of Official Statement or Offering Memorandum], and I have met with and asked questions of the Financing Group, DPWG, any Contributor, any other person who reviewed or drafted any section of the [Official Statement/Offering Memorandum], and any other person that I thought necessary or appropriate. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the [Official Statement/Offering Memorandum] does not make any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

City Attorney/Mayor

Certification of Chief Financial Officer Regarding Official Statements

City Council:

I have reviewed the [description of Official Statement or Offering Memorandum] and compared the City's Audited Financials with the Disclosure Document. In addition, I have reviewed the Disclosure Document in full to identify any misstatement or omission in any sections that contain or omit descriptions of information prepared by or of interest to the Chief Financial Officer. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge:

1. the Disclosure Document fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations of the City;
2. the Disclosure Document does not make any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and
3. that the financial statements and other financial information from the City's Audited Financials included in such Disclosure Document, if any, fairly present in all material respects the financial condition and results of operations of the City as of, and for, the periods presented in the City's Audited Financials.

Chief Financial Officer

Certification of Chief Financial Officer Regarding Audited Financials

City Council:

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, as of the date of the Audited Financials:

1. the information contained in the [Fiscal Year] Audited Financials fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations of the City as of, and for, the periods presented in the Audited Financials; and
2. the Audited Financials do not make any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

Chief Financial Officer

Certification of Department Director to the CFO Regarding Audited Financials

Chief Financial Officer:

I am the [Department Director/Other Title] of the [Name of Department]. [Department Name] has provided information that is intended to be incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report ("Audited Financials"). I, with the assistance of individuals on my staff, have reviewed the information in the Audited Financials that we have provided or which concerns my area of operational responsibility. Such assistance includes obtaining assurances from individuals under my supervision as to their review and the accuracy of the information provided. I have also implemented procedures within my department to ensure the accuracy and completeness of such information. I understand that I am responsible for the information provided by my department. By this certification, I am representing to you that the information provided by or concerning the [Name of Department] is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and complete. I hereby certify that the [Name of Department] has complied with the requirements of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures and that I have attended the federal securities law training seminar conducted by the City's outside disclosure counsel or viewed a recorded version thereof.

I acknowledge that you will rely on this certification in connection with representations you will make to the City Council and to the City's independent auditors with respect to all information in the Audited Financials, including the information provided by my department. This certification is provided as of the date below. In the event of any material change to the information provided between the date of this certification and the expected completion date of the Audited Financials, I shall promptly advise you.

Dated: _____

[Director/Title]

APPENDIX E – GLOSSARY

Arbitrage

With respect to municipal bonds, arbitrage is the profit made from investing the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds in higher-yielding securities.

Assessment

A charge levied against a parcel of land for the benefit that is generated by the underlying improvement project, or in certain cases public services. The governing body of the entity levying the Assessment must make a finding of special benefit in order to validate this process.

Assessment District or Special District

A Special District is formed by a local government agency and includes property that will receive direct benefit from the construction of a new public improvement or, in certain cases, from the maintenance of existing public improvements.

Backloading

Debt repayment is scheduled with higher payments in the later part of the term.

California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC)

A California commission under the Office of the State Treasurer which acts as the State's clearing house for public debt issuances. It monitors and provides transparency on all public debt issued by state and local agencies.

Community Facilities District

A common and popular type of Special Tax district that can fund ongoing maintenance services, capital projects, or both. It is allowed under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 and California Government Code Section 53311 et seq.

Conduit Financing

A financing in which the proceeds of the issue are loaned to a nongovernmental borrower who then applies the proceeds for a project financing or, if permitted by federal tax law for a qualified 501(c)(3) bond, for working capital purposes.

Continuing Disclosure

The ongoing disclosure provided by an issuer or obligated person pursuant to a Continuing Disclosure Agreement to allow the broker-dealer/underwriter to comply with SEC Rule 15c2-12 and its subsequent amendments.

Debt Service

The total interest, principal and mandatory sinking fund payments due at any one time.

Debt Service Reserve Fund

An account from which monies may be drawn to pay debt service on an issue of bonds if pledged revenues and other amounts available to pay debt service are insufficient. The size of the debt

service reserve fund and investment of monies in the fund/account are subject to restrictions contained in Federal Tax law for tax-exempt bonds.

Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act

Financial reform legislation enacted by Congress in 2010 that amended various federal laws including the federal securities laws.

Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) System

The EMMA system created by the MSRB is a comprehensive, centralized online source for market transparency data, educational material about the municipal securities market, and free access to municipal disclosures. Effective July 1, 2009, EMMA became the single, official repository for continuing disclosure documents as a result of changes mandated by the SEC in December 2008.

Escrow Agent

With respect to a refunding performed more than 90 days prior to the bonds' call date, the commercial bank or trust company retained to hold the investments purchased with the proceeds of the refunding and, customarily, to use the amounts received from such investments to pay debt service on the refunded bonds as it becomes due. Once the bonds become callable, the Escrow Agent will then use the investment proceeds to pay the outstanding principal of the bonds.

Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)

A widely accepted set of rules, conventions, standards and procedures for reporting financial information, as established by the Financial Accounting Standards Board.

Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB)

A standard-setting body, associated with the Financial Accounting Foundation, which prescribes standard accounting practices for governmental units.

Joint Powers Authority

A public authority created by a joint exercise of powers agreement between any two or more governmental agencies. The authority may be given power to perform any function which both parties to the agreement are empowered to perform and which will be of benefit to both parties.

Municipal Standards Rulemaking Board (MSRB)

An independent self-regulatory organization established by the Securities Acts Amendments of 1975, which is charged with primary rulemaking authority over dealers, dealer banks, and brokers in municipal securities.

Rollover

Payment of maturing commercial paper with a new issue of commercial paper.

SEC Rule 15c2-12

An SEC rule governing the obligations of dealers regarding municipal securities disclosure under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (a federal securities legislation that provides regulation of the marketplace for securities).

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)

A federal agency which oversees and regulates stock, bond, and other financial markets.

Special Assessment

See "Assessment."

Special Tax

A financial charge that is calculated via some type of special tax formula (or Rate and Method of Apportionment, in the case of a Community Facilities District), and is levied annually on property for a defined period of years.

State and Local Government Series (SLGS)

SLGS is an acronym (pronounced "slugs") for a type of U.S. Treasury obligation, the complete name of which is United States Treasury Securities – State and Local Government Series. SLGS are special United States Government securities sold by the Treasury to states, municipalities and other local government bodies through individual subscription agreements. The interest rates and maturities of SLGS are arranged to comply with arbitrage restrictions imposed under Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code. SLGS are most commonly used for deposit in escrow in connection with the issuance of refunding bonds.

True Interest Cost (TIC)

A method of calculating bids for new issues of municipal securities that takes into consideration certain costs of issuance and the time value of money.

Underwriter Syndicate

A group of underwriters formed to purchase (underwrite) a new issue of municipal securities from the issuer and offer it for resale to the general public. The syndicate is organized for the purpose of sharing the risks of underwriting the issue, obtaining sufficient capital to purchase an issue and for broader distribution of the issue to the investing public. One of the underwriting firms will be designated as the syndicate manager or lead manager to administer the operations of the syndicate.

Verification Agent

A certified public accountant who verifies that sufficient funds are deposited into an escrow to implement the objectives of the refunding or financing plan.

Weighted Average Life

The average number of years it takes for each dollar in principal on a debt issuance to be repaid.