

## NEW ISSUE

In the opinion of Bond Counsel, interest on the Bonds will be exempt from personal income taxes imposed by the State of New York or any political subdivision thereof, including the City, and assuming continuing compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, as described herein, interest on the Bonds will not be includable in the gross income of the owners thereof for Federal income tax purposes. See "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Tax Exemption" herein for further information.

# **\$250,000,000** **The City of New York**

## **General Obligation Bonds, Fiscal 1999 Series I**

Dated: Date of Delivery

Due: April 15, as shown below

The Bonds will be issued as registered bonds. The Bonds will be registered in the nominee name of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York, which will act as securities depository for the Bonds.

Interest on the Bonds will be payable semiannually, beginning October 15, 1999. The Bonds can be purchased in principal amounts of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof. Other terms of the Bonds including redemption provisions are described herein.

The Bonds due in 2010, 2011, 2013 through 2018, 2024 and 2029 will be insured by MBIA Insurance Corporation.

<u>Maturity</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Maturity</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Yield</u>
2001	\$ 4,165,000	4 %	3.58%	2012	\$ 7,620,000	5¼%	4.83%
2002	4,325,000	4	3.70	2013	8,020,000	5¼	4.70
2003	4,500,000	4	3.75	2014	8,445,000	5¼	4.78
2004	5,475,000	4	3.90	2015	8,885,000	5¼	4.86
2005	5,695,000	4	4.05	2016	9,350,000	5¼	4.91
2006	5,920,000	4.10	4.15	2017	9,845,000	4¾	5.00
2007	6,165,000	4.20	4.25	2018	10,310,000	4¾	4.95
2008	6,425,000	4¼	4.35	2019	10,800,000	5	5.05
2009	6,695,000	4¾	4.45	2020	11,340,000	5	5.05
2010	6,985,000	4¾	4.45	2021	11,905,000	5	5.05
2011	7,295,000	4½	4.55				

\$39,410,000 5% Term Bonds due April 15, 2024 Priced to Yield 5.12%

\$50,425,000 5% Term Bonds due April 15, 2029 Priced to Yield 5.17%

The Bonds are offered subject to prior sale, when, as and if issued by the City and accepted by the original purchasers, subject to the approval of the legality of the Bonds by Brown & Wood LLP, New York, New York, Bond Counsel to the City, and to certain other conditions. Certain legal matters in connection with the preparation of this Official Statement will be passed upon for the City by Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, New York, New York. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the original purchasers by Rogers & Wells LLP, New York, New York. It is expected that the Bonds will be available for delivery in New York, New York, on or about April 21, 1999.

No dealer, broker, salesperson or other person has been authorized by the City to give any information or to make any representations in connection with the Bonds or the matters described herein, other than those contained in this Official Statement, and, if given or made, such other information or representations must not be relied upon as having been authorized by the City. This Official Statement does not constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of the Bonds by any person in any jurisdiction in which it is unlawful for such person to make such offer, solicitation or sale. The information and expressions of opinion contained herein are subject to change without notice, and neither the delivery of this Official Statement, nor any sale made hereunder, shall, under any circumstances, create any implication that there has been no change in the matters described herein since the date hereof. This Official Statement is submitted in connection with the sale of the Bonds referred to herein and may not be reproduced or used, in whole or in part, for any other purpose. The original purchasers may offer and sell Bonds to certain dealers and others at prices lower than the offering prices stated on the inside Cover Page hereof. The offering prices may be changed from time to time by the original purchasers. No representations are made or implied by the City or the original purchasers as to any offering of any derivative instruments.

The factors affecting the City's financial condition are complex. This Official Statement should be considered in its entirety and no one factor considered less important than any other by reason of its location herein. Where agreements, reports or other documents are referred to herein, reference should be made to such agreements, reports or other documents for more complete information regarding the rights and obligations of parties thereto, facts and opinions contained therein and the subject matter thereof.

**OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>		<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT .....	1	SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS .....	27
SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS .....	3	1994-1998 Summary of Operations .....	28
1999-2003 Financial Plan .....	3	Forecast of 1999 Results .....	29
The State .....	4	SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN .....	30
SECTION II: THE BONDS .....	5	Actions to Close the Remaining Gaps .....	32
General .....	5	Assumptions .....	32
Payment Mechanism .....	5	Certain Reports .....	42
Enforceability of City Obligations .....	5	Long-Term Capital and Financing Program .....	44
Certain Covenants and Agreements .....	6	Seasonal Financing Requirements .....	48
Use of Proceeds .....	6	SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS .....	49
Redemption .....	6	Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities ...	49
Optional Redemption .....	6	Municipal Assistance Corporation Indebtedness .....	55
Mandatory Redemption .....	7	Public Benefit Corporation Indebtedness .....	55
Bond Insurance .....	7	SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION .....	57
Bond Certificates .....	9	Pension Systems .....	57
SECTION III: GOVERNMENT AND FINANCIAL CONTROLS .....	11	Litigation .....	58
Structure of City Government .....	11	Tax Exemption .....	61
City Financial Management, Budgeting and Controls .....	12	Ratings .....	62
SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES .....	16	Legal Opinions .....	63
Real Estate Tax .....	16	Reoffering by the Original Purchasers .....	63
Other Taxes .....	19	Continuing Disclosure Undertaking .....	63
Miscellaneous Revenues .....	20	Financial Advisor .....	65
Unrestricted Intergovernmental Aid .....	21	Further Information .....	65
Federal and State Categorical Grants .....	21	APPENDIX A—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS .....	A-1
SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES .....	23	APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS .....	B-1
Expenditures for City Services .....	23	APPENDIX C—FORM OF LEGAL OPINION .....	C-1
Employees and Labor Relations .....	24	APPENDIX D—SPECIMEN INSURANCE POLICY .....	D-1
Capital Expenditures .....	25		

**IN CONNECTION WITH THIS OFFERING, THE ORIGINAL PURCHASERS MAY OVER-ALLOT OR EFFECT TRANSACTIONS WHICH STABILIZE OR MAINTAIN MARKET PRICES OF THE BONDS AT LEVELS ABOVE THOSE WHICH MIGHT OTHERWISE PREVAIL IN THE OPEN MARKET. SUCH STABILIZING, IF COMMENCED, MAY BE DISCONTINUED AT ANY TIME.**

**IN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION INVESTORS MUST RELY ON THEIR OWN EXAMINATION OF THE CITY AND THE TERMS OF THE OFFERING, INCLUDING THE MERITS AND RISKS INVOLVED. THESE SECURITIES HAVE NOT BEEN RECOMMENDED BY ANY FEDERAL OR STATE SECURITIES COMMISSION OR REGULATORY AUTHORITY. FURTHERMORE, THE FOREGOING AUTHORITIES HAVE NOT CONFIRMED THE ACCURACY OR DETERMINED THE ADEQUACY OF THIS DOCUMENT. ANY REPRESENTATION TO THE CONTRARY IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE.**

# OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

This Official Statement provides certain information concerning The City of New York (the "City") in connection with the sale of \$250,000,000 aggregate principal amount of the City's General Obligation Bonds, Fiscal 1999 Series I (the "Bonds") to be issued to the original purchasers of the Bonds in accordance with the City's Notice of Sale dated April 7, 1999. Reference is made to the Notice of Sale for the terms and conditions of sale and delivery of the Bonds to the original purchasers thereof.

## INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Bonds will be general obligations of the City for the payment of which the City will pledge its faith and credit. All real property subject to taxation by the City will be subject to the levy of *ad valorem* taxes, without limitation as to rate or amount, to pay the principal of, applicable redemption premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds.

The City, with a population of approximately 7.4 million, is an international center of business and culture. Its non-manufacturing economy is broadly based, with the banking and securities, life insurance, communications, publishing, fashion design, retailing and construction industries accounting for a significant portion of the City's total employment earnings. Additionally, the City is a leading tourist destination. Manufacturing activity in the City is conducted primarily in apparel and printing.

For each of the 1981 through 1998 fiscal years, the City had an operating surplus, before discretionary and other transfers, and achieved balanced operating results as reported in accordance with then applicable generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP"), after discretionary and other transfers. See "SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS—1994-1998 Summary of Operations." The City has been required to close substantial gaps between forecast revenues and forecast expenditures in order to maintain balanced operating results. There can be no assurance that the City will continue to maintain balanced operating results as required by New York State law without tax or other revenue increases or reductions in City services or entitlement programs, which could adversely affect the City's economic base.

As required by law, the City prepares a four-year annual financial plan, which is reviewed and revised on a quarterly basis and which includes the City's capital, revenue and expense projections and outlines proposed gap-closing programs for years with projected budget gaps. The City's current financial plan projects a surplus in the 1999 and 2000 fiscal years, before discretionary transfers, and budget gaps for each of the 2001, 2002 and 2003 fiscal years. This pattern of current year surplus operating results and projected subsequent year budget gaps has been consistent through the entire period since 1982, during which the City has achieved surplus operating results, before discretionary transfers, for each fiscal year. For information regarding the current financial plan, as well as subsequent developments, see "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS" and "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN." The City is required to submit its financial plans to the New York State Financial Control Board (the "Control Board"). For further information regarding the Control Board, see "SECTION III: GOVERNMENT AND FINANCIAL CONTROLS—City Financial Management, Budgeting and Controls—*Financial Control Board Oversight*."

The City depends on aid from the State of New York (the "State") both to enable the City to balance its budget and to meet its cash requirements. There can be no assurance that there will not be reductions in State aid to the City from amounts currently projected; that interim appropriations that have been enacted will be extended until the State budget is adopted or that, in future years, State budgets will be adopted by the April 1 statutory deadline, or interim appropriations will be enacted; or that any such reductions or delays will not have adverse effects on the City's cash flow or expenditures. See "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS—The State." In addition, the Federal budget negotiation process could result in a reduction or a delay in the receipt of Federal grants which could have additional adverse effects on the City's cash flow or revenues. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions," and "—Certain Reports."

The Mayor is responsible for preparing the City's financial plan, including the City's current financial plan for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years (the "1999-2003 Financial Plan" or "Financial Plan"). The City's projections set forth in the Financial Plan are based on various assumptions and contingencies which are uncertain and which may not materialize. Such assumptions and contingencies are described throughout this Official Statement and include the condition of the regional and local economies, the provision of State and Federal aid and the impact on City revenues and expenditures of any future Federal or State policies affecting the City.

Implementation of the Financial Plan is dependent upon the City's ability to market its securities successfully. The City's program for financing capital projects for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 contemplates the issuance of \$7.3 billion of general obligation bonds, \$5.4 billion of bonds to be issued by the New York City Transitional Finance Authority (the "Finance Authority") and \$2.5 billion of bonds to be issued by the Tobacco Settlement Asset Securitization Corporation ("TSASC") and paid from revenues received pursuant to a settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies. The Finance Authority and TSASC were created to assist the City in financing its capital program while keeping City indebtedness within the forecast level of the constitutional restrictions on the amount of debt the City is authorized to incur. If TSASC is not able to issue \$2.5 billion of bonds, the City will need to find another source of financing or substantially curtail or halt its capital program. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—ASSUMPTIONS—*Revenue Assumptions*—4. Miscellaneous Revenues" and "SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—*Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness*" and "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation." In addition, the City issues revenue and tax anticipation notes to finance its seasonal working capital requirements. The success of projected public sales of City bonds and notes, New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority ("Water Authority") bonds and Finance Authority and other bonds will be subject to prevailing market conditions. The City's planned capital and operating expenditures are dependent upon the sale of its general obligation bonds and notes, as well as Water Authority, Finance Authority and TSASC bonds. Future developments concerning the City and public discussion of such developments, as well as prevailing market conditions, may affect the market for outstanding City general obligation bonds and notes.

The City Comptroller and other agencies and public officials, from time to time, issue reports and make public statements which, among other things, state that projected revenues and expenditures may be different from those forecast in the City's financial plans. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Certain Reports."

The factors affecting the City's financial condition and the Bonds described throughout this Official Statement are complex and are not intended to be summarized in this Introductory Statement. This Official Statement should be read in its entirety.

## SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

### 1999-2003 Financial Plan

For the 1998 fiscal year, the City had an operating surplus, before discretionary and other transfers, and achieved balanced operating results, after discretionary and other transfers, in accordance with GAAP. The 1998 fiscal year is the eighteenth year that the City has achieved an operating surplus, before discretionary and other transfers, and balanced operating results, after discretionary and other transfers.

On January 28, 1999, the City released the Financial Plan for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, which relates to the City and certain entities which receive funds from the City. The Financial Plan is a modification to the financial plan submitted to the Control Board on June 26, 1998 (the "June Financial Plan"), as modified in November 1998. The Financial Plan projects revenues and expenditures for the 1999 and 2000 fiscal years balanced in accordance with GAAP, and projects gaps of \$1.4 billion, \$1.6 billion and \$1.2 billion for the 2001 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively.

Changes since adoption of the City's Expense Budget for the 1999 fiscal year in June 1998, prior to the June Financial Plan, include: (i) an increase in projected tax revenues of \$744 million, \$322 million, \$252 million and \$147 million in fiscal years 1999 through 2002, respectively; (ii) \$300 million, \$250 million and \$300 million of projected resources in fiscal years 2000 through 2002, respectively, from the receipt by the City of funds from the settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies; (iii) a delay in the assumed collection of \$350 million of projected rent payments for the City's airports in fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2001; (iv) anticipated proceeds from the proposed sale of the Coliseum in fiscal year 2000 totaling \$345 million; and (v) net increases in spending of \$367 million, \$412 million and \$417 million in fiscal years 2000 through 2002, including spending for education initiatives, employee fringe benefit costs, Medicaid and other agency programs. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan includes a proposed discretionary transfer in the 1999 fiscal year of \$1.6 billion to pay debt service due in fiscal year 2000, for budget stabilization purposes, and a proposed discretionary transfer in fiscal year 2000 to pay debt service due in fiscal year 2001 totaling \$345 million.

In addition, the Financial Plan sets forth gap-closing actions to eliminate a previously projected gap for the 2000 fiscal year and to reduce projected gaps for fiscal years 2001 through 2003. The gap-closing actions for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years include: (i) additional agency actions totaling \$286 million, \$591 million, \$392 million, \$369 million and \$357 million for fiscal years 1999 through 2003, respectively; (ii) additional Federal actions of \$190 million in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, which include the proposed restoration of \$50 million of Federal revenue sharing and \$140 million of increased Federal Medicaid aid in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003; and (iii) additional State actions totaling approximately \$300 million in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, including Medicaid cost containment initiatives proposed in the Governor's Executive Budget for State fiscal year 1999-2000 and proposed by the City, which would reduce expenditures by the City by approximately \$200 million in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, and proposals by the City that the State enact tort reform legislation, increase revenue sharing payments and expand State funding for low income uninsured children. The Financial Plan also reflects a proposed tax reduction program totaling \$338 million, \$410 million, \$461 million and \$473 million in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, including the elimination of the City's sales tax on all clothing as of December 1, 1999 and the extension of current tax reductions for owners of cooperative and condominium apartments starting in fiscal year 2000, which are subject to State legislative approval, reduction of the commercial rent tax commencing in fiscal year 2000, and a \$100 million annual tax reduction program, to be based on the advice of a tax reform task force, starting in fiscal year 2000.

The Financial Plan assumes: (i) approval by the Governor and the State Legislature of the extension of the 14% personal income tax surcharge, which is scheduled to expire on December 31, 1999, and which is projected to provide revenue of \$175 million, \$536 million, \$540 million and \$548 million in the 2000 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively; (ii) collection of projected rent payments for the City's airports, totaling \$365 million, \$185 million and \$155 million in the 2001 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively, a substantial portion of which may depend on the successful completion of negotiations with The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (the "Port Authority") or the enforcement of the City's rights under the existing leases through pending legal action; (iii) State and Federal approval of the State and Federal gap-closing actions proposed by the City in the Financial Plan; and (iv) receipt of the tobacco settlement funds providing revenues or expenditure offsets in

annual amounts ranging between \$250 million and \$300 million. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—Revenue Assumptions—4. Miscellaneous Revenues." It can be expected that the Financial Plan will engender public debate which will continue through the time the budget is scheduled to be adopted in June 1999, and that there will be proposals to increase spending and reject Medicaid cost containment proposals in the Financial Plan. Accordingly, the Financial Plan may be changed by the time the budget for fiscal year 2000 is adopted. The Financial Plan provides no additional wage increases for City employees after their contracts expire in fiscal years 2000 and 2001. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—Expenditure Assumptions—1. Personal Service Costs." In addition, the economic and financial condition of the City may be affected by various financial, social, economic and political factors which could have a material effect on the City.

It is expected that the City's Executive Budget for fiscal year 2000 will be released by the end of April, 1999, and that the Executive Budget will include an updated revenue and expenditure forecast.

### **The State**

The State Financial Plan for the 1998-1999 fiscal year projects balance on a cash basis for the 1998-1999 fiscal year, with a closing balance in the General Fund of \$799 million, after reserving a projected \$1.79 billion surplus for use in future years. The Governor's Executive Budget projects balance on a cash basis for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, with a closing balance in the General Fund of \$2.5 billion, including a projected reserve of \$1.79 billion for use in fiscal years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. The Legislature and the State Comptroller will review the Governor's Executive Budget and are expected to comment on it. There can be no assurance that the Legislature will enact the Executive Budget into law, or that the State's adopted budget projections will not differ materially and adversely from the projections set forth in the Executive Budget. Depending on the amount of State aid provided to localities, and whether the Medicaid cost containment initiatives proposed in the Executive Budget are approved by the State, the City might be required to make substantial additional changes in its Financial Plan. The State budget for the State's 1999-2000 fiscal year was not adopted by the statutory deadline of April 1, 1999. However, legislation making interim appropriations has been enacted. A prolonged delay in the adoption of the State's budget beyond the statutory April 1 deadline without continuing interim appropriations could delay the projected receipt by the City of State aid.

The State Financial Plan for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, which reflects the 1999-2000 Executive Budget, contains projections of a potential imbalance in the 2000-2001 fiscal year of \$1.14 billion and in the 2001-2002 fiscal year of \$2.07 billion, assuming implementation of the 1999-2000 Executive Budget recommendations, the application of the \$1.79 billion reserve fund and implementation of \$500 million of unspecified efficiency initiatives and other actions in each of the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 fiscal years, respectively. The Executive Budget identifies various risks, including either a financial market or broader economic correction during the period, which could adversely affect these projections. For further information concerning the State, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions."

## SECTION II: THE BONDS

### General

The Bonds will be general obligations of the City issued pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the State and the New York City Charter (the "City Charter") and in accordance with bond resolutions of the Mayor and a certificate of the Deputy Comptroller for Public Finance. The Bonds will mature and bear interest as described on the inside cover page of this Official Statement and will contain a pledge of the City's faith and credit for the payment of the principal of, redemption premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds. All real property subject to taxation by the City will be subject to the levy of *ad valorem* taxes, without limitation as to rate or amount, to pay the principal of, redemption premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds.

### Payment Mechanism

Pursuant to the New York State Financial Emergency Act For The City of New York (the "Financial Emergency Act" or the "Act"), a general debt service fund (the "General Debt Service Fund" or the "Fund") has been established for City bonds and certain City notes. Pursuant to the Act, payments of the City real estate tax must be deposited upon receipt in the Fund, and retained under a statutory formula, for the payment of debt service (with exceptions for debt service, such as principal of seasonal borrowings, that is set aside under other procedures). The statutory formula has in recent years resulted in retention of sufficient real estate taxes to comply with the City Covenants (as defined in "SECTION II: THE BONDS—Certain Covenants and Agreements"). If the statutory formula does not result in retention of sufficient real estate taxes to comply with the City Covenants, the City will comply with the City Covenants either by providing for early retention of real estate taxes or by making cash payments into the Fund. The principal of and interest on the Bonds will be paid from the Fund until the Act expires on July 1, 2008, and thereafter from a separate fund maintained in accordance with the City Covenants. Since its inception in 1978, the Fund has been fully funded at the beginning of each payment period.

If the Control Board determines that retentions in the Fund are likely to be insufficient to provide for the debt service payable therefrom, it must require that additional real estate tax revenues be retained or other cash resources of the City be paid into the Fund. In addition, the Control Board is required to take such action as it determines to be necessary so that the money in the Fund is adequate to meet debt service requirements.

### Enforceability of City Obligations

As required by the State Constitution and applicable law, the City pledges its faith and credit for the payment of the principal of and interest on all City indebtedness. Holders of City debt obligations have a contractual right to full payment of principal and interest at maturity. If the City fails to pay principal or interest, the holder has the right to sue and is entitled to the full amount due, including interest to maturity at the stated rate and at the rate authorized by law thereafter until payment. Under the General Municipal Law, if the City fails to pay any money judgment, it is the duty of the City to assess, levy and cause to be collected amounts sufficient to pay the judgment. Decisions indicate that judicial enforcement of statutes such as this provision in the General Municipal Law is within the discretion of a court. Other judicial decisions also indicate that a money judgment against a municipality may not be enforceable against municipal property devoted to public use.

The rights of the owners of Bonds to receive interest, principal and redemption premium, if any, from the City could be adversely affected by a restructuring of the City's debt under Chapter 9 of the Federal Bankruptcy Code. No assurance can be given that any priority of holders of City securities (including the Bonds) to payment from money retained in the Fund or from other sources would be recognized if a petition were filed by or on behalf of the City under the Federal Bankruptcy Code or pursuant to other subsequently enacted laws relating to creditors' rights; such money might then be available for the payment of all City creditors generally. Judicial enforcement of the City's obligation to make payments into the Fund, of the obligation to retain money in the Fund, of the rights of holders of bonds and notes of the City to money in the Fund, of the obligations of the City under the City Covenants and of the State under the State Covenant and the State Pledge and Agreement (in each case, as defined in "—Certain Covenants and Agreements") may be within the discretion of a court. For further

information concerning rights of owners of Bonds against the City, see “SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities.”

**Certain Covenants and Agreements**

The City will covenant that: (i) a separate fund or funds for the purpose of paying principal of and interest on bonds and interest on notes of the City (including required payments into, but not from, City sinking funds) shall be maintained by an officer or agency of the State or by a bank or trust company; and (ii) not later than the last day of each month, there shall be on deposit in a separate fund or funds an amount sufficient to pay principal of and interest on bonds and interest on notes of the City due and payable in the next succeeding month. The City currently uses the debt service payment mechanism described above to perform these covenants. The City will further covenant in the Bonds to comply with the financial reporting requirements of the Act, as in effect from time to time, and to limit its issuance of bond anticipation notes as required by the Act, as in effect from time to time.

The State pledges and agrees in the Financial Emergency Act that the State will not take any action that will impair the power of the City to comply with the covenants described in the preceding paragraph (the “City Covenants”) or any right or remedy of any owner of the Bonds to enforce the City Covenants (the “State Pledge and Agreement”). The City will include in the Bonds the covenant of the State (the “State Covenant”) to the effect, among other things, that the State will not substantially impair the authority of the Control Board in specified respects. The City will covenant to make continuing disclosure with respect to the Bonds (the “Undertaking”) as summarized below under “SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Continuing Disclosure Undertaking.” In the opinion of Bond Counsel, the enforceability of the City Covenants, the Undertaking, the State Pledge and Agreement and the State Covenant may be subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors’ rights heretofore or hereafter enacted and may also be subject to the exercise of the State’s police powers and of judicial discretion in appropriate cases. The City Covenants, the Undertaking, the State Pledge and Agreement and the State Covenant shall be of no force and effect with respect to any Bond if there is a deposit in trust with a bank or trust company of sufficient cash or cash equivalents to pay when due all principal of, applicable redemption premium, if any, and interest on such Bond.

**Use of Proceeds**

The proceeds from the sale of the Bonds will be used for various municipal capital purposes. For further information concerning the City’s capital projects, see “SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES—Capital Expenditures” and “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Long-Term Capital and Financing Program.” Certain expenses of the City incurred in connection with the issuance and sale of the Bonds, preliminary costs of surveys, maps, plans, estimates and hearings in connection with capital improvements and costs incidental to such improvements may be included in the above purposes.

**Redemption**

Thirty days’ notice shall be given to the holders of Bonds to be redeemed prior to maturity. The City may select the dates, amounts, rates and maturities of Bonds for redemption in its sole discretion. On and after any redemption date, interest will cease to accrue on the Bonds called for redemption.

**Optional Redemption**

The Bonds will be subject to redemption at the option of the City on or after April 15, 2009, in whole or in part, by lot within each description, on any date at the following redemption prices, plus accrued interest to the date of redemption:

<u>Redemption Dates</u>	<u>Redemption Price as Percentage of Par</u>
April 15, 2009 through April 14, 2010 .....	101 %
April 15, 2010 through April 14, 2011 .....	100½
April 15, 2011 and thereafter .....	100



**Mandatory Redemption**

The Bonds identified below are Term Bonds subject to mandatory redemption, by lot within each stated maturity, on each date at a redemption price equal to the principal amount thereof, plus accrued interest, without premium, in the amounts set forth below:

<u>April 15</u>	<u>Principal Amount to be Redeemed (In Thousands)</u>	
	<u>2024 Maturity</u>	<u>2029 Maturity</u>
2022 .....	\$12,500	
2023 .....	13,125	
2024 .....	13,785*	
2025 .....		\$ 9,125
2026 .....		9,580
2027 .....		10,060
2028 .....		10,565
2029 .....		11,095*

\* Stated maturity

At the option of the City, there shall be applied to or credited against any of the required amounts the principal amount of any such Term Bonds that have been defeased, purchased or redeemed and not previously so applied or credited.

Defeased Term Bonds shall at the option of the City no longer be entitled, but may be subject, to the provisions thereof for mandatory redemption.

**Bond Insurance**

The following information pertaining to MBIA Insurance Corporation (“MBIA”) has been supplied by MBIA. The City makes no representation as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information or as to the absence of material adverse changes in such information subsequent to the dates indicated. Summaries of or references to the insurance policy to be issued by MBIA are made subject to all the detailed provisions thereof to which reference is hereby made for further information and do not purport to be complete statements of any or all of such provisions. See “APPENDIX D—SPECIMEN INSURANCE POLICY.”

The Bonds due in 2010, 2011, 2013 through 2018, 2024 and 2029 will be insured by MBIA (the “MBIA Insured Bonds”).

The MBIA policy unconditionally and irrevocably guarantees the full and complete payment required to be made by or on behalf of the City to the City’s Fiscal Agent or its successor of an amount equal to (i) the principal of (either at the stated maturity or by an advancement of maturity pursuant to a mandatory sinking fund payment) and interest on, the MBIA Insured Bonds as such payments shall become due but shall not be so paid (except that in the event of any acceleration of the due date of such principal by reason of mandatory or optional redemption or acceleration resulting from default or otherwise, other than any advancement of maturity pursuant to a mandatory sinking fund payment, the payments guaranteed by the MBIA policy shall be made in such amounts and at such times as such payments of principal would have been due had there not been any such acceleration); and (ii) the reimbursement of any such payment which is subsequently recovered from any owner of the MBIA Insured Bonds pursuant to a final judgment by a court of competent jurisdiction that such payment constitutes an avoidable preference to such owner within the meaning of any applicable bankruptcy law (a “Preference”).

The MBIA policy does not insure against loss of any prepayment premium which may at any time be payable with respect to any MBIA Insured Bond. The MBIA policy does not, under any circumstance, insure against loss relating to: (i) optional or mandatory redemptions (other than mandatory sinking fund redemptions); (ii) any payments to be made on an accelerated basis; (iii) payments of the purchase price of MBIA Insured Bonds upon tender by an owner thereof; or (iv) any Preference relating to (i) through (iii) above. The MBIA policy also does not insure against nonpayment of principal of or interest on the MBIA Insured Bonds resulting from the insolvency, negligence or any other act or omission of the City’s Fiscal Agent or any other paying agent for the MBIA Insured Bonds.

Upon receipt of telephonic or telegraphic notice, such notice subsequently confirmed in writing by registered or certified mail, or upon receipt of written notice by registered or certified mail, by MBIA from the City’s Fiscal Agent or any owner of a MBIA Insured Bond the payment of an insured amount for which is then due, that such required payment has not been made, MBIA on the due date of such payment or within one

business day after receipt of notice of such nonpayment, whichever is later, will make a deposit of funds, in an account with State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A., in New York, New York, or its successor, sufficient for the payment of any such insured amounts which are then due. Upon presentment and surrender of such MBIA Insured Bonds or presentment of such other proof of ownership of the MBIA Insured Bonds, together with any appropriate instruments of assignment to evidence the assignment of the insured amounts due on the MBIA Insured Bonds as are paid by MBIA, and appropriate instruments to effect the appointment of MBIA as agent for such owners of the MBIA Insured Bonds in any legal proceeding related to payment of insured amounts on the Insured MBIA Bonds, such instruments being in a form satisfactory to State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A., State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A. shall disburse to such owners or the City's Fiscal Agent payment of the insured amounts due on such MBIA Insured Bonds, less any amount held by the City's Fiscal Agent for the payment of such insured amounts and legally available therefor.

MBIA is the principal operating subsidiary of MBIA Inc., a New York Stock Exchange listed company (the "Company"). The Company is not obligated to pay the debts of or claims against MBIA. MBIA is domiciled in the State of New York and licensed to do business in and subject to regulation under the laws of all 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands of the United States and the Territory of Guam. MBIA has two European branches, one in the Republic of France and the other in the Kingdom of Spain. New York has laws prescribing minimum capital requirements, limiting classes and concentrations of investments and requiring the approval of policy rates and forms. State laws also regulate the amount of both the aggregate and individual risks that may be insured, the payment of dividends by MBIA, changes in control and transactions among affiliates. Additionally, MBIA is required to maintain contingency reserves on its liabilities in certain amounts and for certain periods of time.

As of December 31, 1997, MBIA had admitted assets of \$5.3 billion (audited), total liabilities of \$3.5 billion (audited), and total capital and surplus of \$1.8 billion (audited) determined in accordance with statutory accounting practices prescribed or permitted by insurance regulatory authorities. As of December 31, 1998, MBIA had admitted assets of \$6.5 billion (audited), total liabilities of \$4.2 billion (audited), and total capital and surplus of \$2.3 billion (audited) determined in accordance with statutory accounting practices prescribed or permitted by insurance regulatory authorities.

Furthermore, copies of MBIA's year end financial statements prepared in accordance with statutory accounting practices are available without charge from MBIA. A copy of the Annual Report on Form 10-K of the Company is available from MBIA or the Securities and Exchange Commission. The address of MBIA is 113 King Street, Armonk, New York 10504. The telephone number of MBIA is (914) 273-4545.

The Company is actively managing a high-priority Year 2000 ("Y2K") program. The Company has established an independent Y2K testing lab in its Armonk headquarters, with a committee of business unit managers overseeing the project. The Company has a budget of \$1.13 million for its 1998-2000 Y2K efforts. Expenditures are proceeding as anticipated, and the Company does not expect the project budget to materially exceed this amount. The Company has initiated a comprehensive Y2K plan that includes assessment, remediation, testing and contingency planning. This plan covers "mission-critical" internally developed systems, vendor software, hardware and certain third-party entities through which the Company conducts its business. Testing to date indicates that functions critical to the financial guarantee business, both domestic and international, were Y2K-ready as of December 31, 1998. Additional testing will continue throughout 1999.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's") rates the financial strength of MBIA "Aaa".

Standard & Poor's Ratings Services, a division of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. ("Standard & Poor's"), rates the financial strength of MBIA "AAA".

Fitch IBCA, Inc. (formerly known as Fitch Investors Service, L.P.) ("Fitch") rates the financial strength of MBIA "AAA".

Each rating of MBIA should be evaluated independently. The ratings reflect the respective rating agency's current assessment of the creditworthiness of MBIA and its ability to pay claims on its policies of insurance. Any further explanation as to the significance of the above ratings may be obtained only from the applicable rating agency.

The above ratings are not recommendations to buy, sell or hold the MBIA Insured Bonds, and such ratings may be subject to revision or withdrawal at any time by the rating agencies. Any downward revision or withdrawal of any of the above ratings may have an adverse effect on the market price of the MBIA Insured Bonds. MBIA does not guarantee the market price of the MBIA Insured Bonds nor does it guarantee that the ratings on the MBIA Insured Bonds will not be revised or withdrawn.

This policy is not covered by the Property/Casualty Insurance Security Fund specified in Article 76 of the New York Insurance Law.

## **Bond Certificates**

### *Book-Entry Only System*

The Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), New York, New York, will act as securities depository for the Bonds. Reference to the Bonds under the caption "Bond Certificates" shall mean all Bonds that are deposited with DTC from time to time. The Bonds will be issued as fully-registered bonds registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC's partnership nominee) and deposited with DTC.

DTC is a limited-purpose trust company organized under the New York Banking Law, a "banking organization" within the meaning of the New York Banking Law, a member of the Federal Reserve System, a "clearing corporation" within the meaning of the New York Uniform Commercial Code, and a "clearing agency" registered pursuant to the provisions of Section 17A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. DTC holds securities that its direct participants ("Direct Participants") deposit with DTC. DTC also facilitates the settlement among Participants of securities transactions, such as transfers and pledges, in deposited securities through electronic computerized book-entry changes in Participants' accounts, thereby eliminating the need for physical movement of securities certificates. Direct Participants include securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, clearing corporations, and certain other organizations. DTC is owned by a number of its Direct Participants and by the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the American Stock Exchange, Inc., and the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Access to the DTC system is also available to others such as securities brokers and dealers, banks and trust companies that clear through or maintain a custodial relationship with a Direct Participant, either directly or indirectly ("Indirect Participants"). The Rules applicable to DTC and its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

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

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

Conveyance of notices and other communications by DTC to Direct Participants, by Direct Participants to Indirect Participants, and by Direct Participants and Indirect Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by arrangements among them, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time.

Neither DTC nor Cede & Co. will consent or vote with respect to Bonds. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an omnibus proxy (the "Omnibus Proxy") to the City as soon as possible after the record date. The Omnibus Proxy assigns Cede & Co.'s consenting or voting rights to those Direct Participants to whose accounts the Bonds are credited on the record date (identified in a listing attached to the Omnibus Proxy).

Redemption notices shall be sent to Cede & Co. If less than all of the Bonds within a maturity are being redeemed, DTC's practice is to determine by lot the amount of the interest of each Direct Participant in such maturity to be redeemed.

Principal and interest payments on the Bonds will be made to DTC. DTC's practice is to credit Direct Participants' accounts on the payment date in accordance with their respective holdings shown on DTC's records unless DTC has reason to believe that it will not receive payment on the payment date. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name", and will be the

responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC, the Fiscal Agent, or the City, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Payment of principal and interest to DTC is the responsibility of the City or the Fiscal Agent, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants shall be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners shall be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

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

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

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

No assurance can be given by the City that DTC will make prompt transfer of payments to the Participants or that Participants will make prompt transfer of payments to Beneficial Owners. The City is not responsible or liable for payment by DTC or Participants or for sending transaction statements or for maintaining, supervising or reviewing records maintained by DTC or Participants.

For every transfer and exchange of the Bonds, the Beneficial Owners may be charged a sum sufficient to cover any tax, fee or other charge that may be imposed in relation thereto.

DTC management is aware that some computer applications, systems, and the like for processing data ("Systems") that are dependent upon calendar dates, including dates before, on and after January 1, 2000, may encounter "Year 2000 problems." DTC has informed its Participants and other members of the financial community (the "Industry") that it has developed and is implementing a program so that its Systems, as the same relate to the timely payment of distributions (including principal and income payments) to securityholders, book-entry deliveries, and settlement of trades within DTC ("DTC Services"), continue to function appropriately. This program includes a technical assessment and a remediation plan, each of which is complete. Additionally, DTC's plan includes a testing phase, which is expected to be completed within appropriate time frames.

However, DTC's ability to perform properly its services is also dependent upon other parties, including, but not limited to issuers and their agents, as well as third party vendors from whom DTC licenses software and hardware, and third party vendors on whom DTC relies for information or the provision of services, including telecommunication and electrical utility service providers, among others. DTC has informed the Industry that it is contacting (and will continue to contact) third party vendors from whom DTC acquires services to: (i) impress upon them the importance of such services being Year 2000 compliant; and (ii) determine the extent of their efforts for Year 2000 remediation (and, as appropriate, testing) of their services. In addition, DTC is in the process of developing such contingency plans as it deems appropriate.

According to DTC, the foregoing information with respect to DTC has been provided to the Industry for informational purposes only and is not intended to serve as a representation, warranty, or contract modification of any kind.

Unless otherwise noted, certain of the information contained in this subsection "Book-Entry-Only System" has been extracted from information furnished by DTC. Neither the City nor the Underwriters make any representation as to the completeness or the accuracy of such information or as to the absence of material adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

#### *Discontinuance of the Book-Entry Only System*

In the event that the book-entry only system is discontinued, the City will authenticate and make available for delivery replacement Bonds in the form of registered certificates. In addition, the following provisions would apply: principal of the Bonds and redemption premium, if any, will be payable in lawful money of the United States of America to the registered owners thereof on the maturity date of the Bonds in immediately available funds at the office of the Fiscal Agent, The Chase Manhattan Bank: if by hand, The Chase Manhattan Bank, Chase Capital Markets Fiduciary Services—Money Market Operations, 55 Water Street, Room 234, North Building, New York, New York; if by mail, The Chase Manhattan Bank, c/o Chase Bank of Texas, N.A., P.O. Box 219052, Dallas, TX 75221-9052, or any successor fiscal agent designated by the City, and interest on the Bonds will be payable by wire transfer or by check mailed to the respective addresses of the registered owners thereof as shown on the registration books of the City as of the close of business on the last business day of the calendar month immediately preceding the applicable interest payment date.

## SECTION III: GOVERNMENT AND FINANCIAL CONTROLS

### Structure of City Government

The City of New York is divided into five counties, which correspond to its five boroughs. The City, however, is the only unit of local government within its territorial jurisdiction with authority to levy and collect taxes, and is the unit of local government primarily responsible for service delivery. Responsibility for governing the City is currently vested by the City Charter in the Mayor, the City Comptroller, the City Council, the Public Advocate and the Borough Presidents.

- The Mayor.* Rudolph W. Giuliani, the Mayor of the City, took office on January 1, 1994 and was elected for a second term commencing January 1, 1998. The Mayor is elected in a general election for a four-year term and is the chief executive officer of the City. The Mayor has the power to appoint the commissioners of the City's various departments. The Mayor is responsible for preparing and administering the City's annual Expense and Capital Budgets (as defined below) and financial plan. The Mayor has the power to veto local laws enacted by the City Council, but such a veto may be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the Council. The Mayor has powers and responsibilities relating to land use and City contracts and all residual powers of the City government not otherwise delegated by law to some other public official or body. The Mayor is also a member of the Control Board.
- The City Comptroller.* Alan G. Hevesi, the Comptroller of the City, took office on January 1, 1994 and was elected for a second term commencing January 1, 1998. The City Comptroller is elected in a general election for a four-year term and is the chief fiscal officer of the City. The City Comptroller has extensive investigative and audit powers and responsibilities which include keeping the financial books and records of the City. The City Comptroller's audit responsibilities include a program of performance audits of City agencies in connection with the City's management, planning and control of operations. In addition, the City Comptroller is required to evaluate the Mayor's budget, including the assumptions and methodology used in the budget. The Office of the City Comptroller is responsible under the City Charter and pursuant to State Law and City investment guidelines for managing and investing City funds for operating and capital purposes. The City Comptroller is also a member of the Control Board and is a trustee, the custodian and the delegated investment manager of the City's five pension systems. The investments of those pension system assets, aggregating approximately \$85 billion, are made pursuant to the directions of the respective boards of trustees.
- The City Council.* The City Council is the legislative body of the City and consists of the Public Advocate and 51 members elected for four-year terms who represent various geographic districts of the City. Under the Charter, the City Council must annually adopt a resolution fixing the amount of the real estate tax and adopt the City's annual Expense Budget and Capital Budget (as defined below). The City Council does not, however, have the power to enact local laws imposing other taxes, unless such taxes have been authorized by State legislation. The City Council has powers and responsibilities relating to franchises and land use and as provided by State law.
- The Public Advocate.* Mark Green, the Public Advocate, took office on January 1, 1994 and was elected for a second term commencing January 1, 1998. The Public Advocate is elected in a general election for a four-year term. The Public Advocate may preside at meetings of the City Council without voting power, except in the case of a tie vote. The Public Advocate is first in the line of succession to the Mayor in the event of the disability of the Mayor or a vacancy in the office. The Public Advocate appoints a member of the City Planning Commission and has various responsibilities relating to, among other things, monitoring the activities of City agencies, the investigation and resolution of certain complaints made by members of the public concerning City agencies and ensuring appropriate public access to government information and meetings.
- The Borough Presidents.* Each of the City's five boroughs elects a Borough President who serves for a four-year term concurrent with other City elected officials. The Borough Presidents consult with the Mayor in the preparation of the City's annual Expense Budget and Capital Budget. Five percent of discretionary increases proposed by the Mayor in the Expense Budget and, with certain exceptions, five percent of the appropriations supported by funds over which the City has substantial discretion proposed

by the Mayor in the Capital Budget, must be based on appropriations proposed by the Borough Presidents. Each Borough President also appoints one member to the BOE and has various responsibilities relating to, among other things, reviewing and making recommendations regarding applications for the use, development or improvement of land located within the borough, monitoring and making recommendations regarding the performance of contracts providing for the delivery of services in the borough, and overseeing the coordination of a borough-wide public service complaint program.

The City Charter provides that no person shall be eligible to be elected to or serve in the office of Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough President or Council member if that person has previously held such office for two or more full consecutive terms, unless one full term or more has elapsed since that person last held such office. This Charter provision applies to terms of office commencing on or after January 1, 1994.

### **City Financial Management, Budgeting and Controls**

The Mayor is responsible under the City Charter for preparing the City's annual expense and capital budgets (as adopted, the "Expense Budget" and the "Capital Budget," respectively, and collectively, the "Budgets") and for submitting the Budgets to the City Council for its review and adoption. The Expense Budget covers the City's annual operating expenditures for municipal services, while the Capital Budget covers expenditures for capital projects, as defined in the City Charter. Operations under the Expense Budget must reflect the aggregate expenditure limitations contained in financial plans.

The City Council is responsible for adopting the Expense Budget and the Capital Budget. Pursuant to the City Charter, the City Council may increase, decrease, add or omit specific units of appropriation in the Budgets submitted by the Mayor and add, omit or change any terms or conditions related to such appropriations. The City Council is also responsible, pursuant to the City Charter, for approving modifications to the Expense Budget and adopting amendments to the Capital Budget beyond certain latitudes allowed to the Mayor under the City Charter. However, the Mayor has the power to veto any increase or addition to the Budgets or any change in any term or condition of the Budgets approved by the City Council, which veto is subject to an override by a two-thirds vote of the City Council, and the Mayor has the power to implement expenditure reductions subsequent to adoption of the Expense Budget in order to maintain a balanced budget. In addition, the Mayor has the power to determine the non-property tax revenue forecast on which the City Council must rely in setting the property tax rates for adopting a balanced City budget.

#### *Office of Management and Budget*

The Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"), with a staff of approximately 300 professionals, is the Mayor's primary advisory group on fiscal issues and is also responsible for the preparation, monitoring and control of the City's Budgets and four-year financial plans. In addition, the City prepares a Ten-Year Capital Strategy.

State law requires the City to maintain its Expense Budget balanced when reported in accordance with GAAP. In addition to the City's annual Expense and Capital Budgets, the City prepares a four-year financial plan which encompasses the City's revenue, expenditure, cash flow and capital projections. All Covered Organizations, as hereinafter defined, are also required to maintain budgets that are balanced when reported in accordance with GAAP. From time to time certain Covered Organizations have had budgets providing for operations on a cash basis but not balanced under GAAP.

To assist in achieving the goals of the financial plan and budget, the City reviews its financial plan periodically and, if necessary, prepares modifications to incorporate actual results and revisions to projections and assumptions to reflect current information. The City's revenue projections are continually reviewed and periodically updated with the benefit of discussions with a panel of private economists analyzing the effects of changes in economic indicators on City revenues and information from various economic forecasting services. The City conforms aggregate expenditures to the limitations contained in the financial plan.

### *Office of the Comptroller*

The City Comptroller is the City's chief fiscal officer and is responsible under the City Charter for reviewing and commenting on the City's Budgets and financial plans, including the assumptions and methodologies used in their preparation. The City Comptroller, as an independently elected public official, is required to report annually to the City Council on the state of the City's economy and finances and periodically to the Mayor and the City Council on the financial condition of the City and to make recommendations, comments and criticisms on the operations, fiscal policies and financial transactions of the City. Such reports, among other things, have differed with certain of the economic, revenue and expenditure assumptions and projections in the City's financial plans and Budgets. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Certain Reports."

The Office of the Comptroller, with a professional staff of approximately 620, establishes the City's accounting and financial reporting practices and internal control procedures. The City Comptroller is also responsible for the preparation of the City's annual financial statements, which, since 1978, have been required to be reported in accordance with GAAP.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller for the 1997 fiscal year, which includes, among other things, the City's financial statements for the 1997 fiscal year, has received the Government Finance Officers Association award of the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting, the eighteenth consecutive year the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller has won such award.

All contracts for goods and services requiring the expenditure of City moneys must be registered with the City Comptroller. No contract can be registered unless funds for its payment have been appropriated by the City Council or otherwise authorized. The City Comptroller also prepares vouchers for payments for such goods and services and cannot prepare a voucher unless funds are available in the Budgets for its payment.

The City Comptroller is also required by the City Charter to audit all City agencies and has the power to audit all City contracts. The Office of the Comptroller conducts both financial and management audits and has the power to investigate corruption in connection with City contracts or contractors.

The Mayor and City Comptroller are responsible for the issuance of City indebtedness. The City Comptroller oversees the payment of such indebtedness and is responsible for the custody of certain sinking funds.

### *Financial Reporting and Control Systems*

Since 1978, the City's financial statements have been required to be audited by independent certified public accountants and to be presented in accordance with GAAP. The City has completed eighteen consecutive fiscal years with a General Fund surplus when reported in accordance with then applicable GAAP.

Both OMB and the Office of the Comptroller utilize financial monitoring, reporting and control systems, including the Integrated Financial Management System and a comprehensive Capital Projects Information System, which provide comprehensive current and historical information regarding the City's financial condition. This information, which is independently evaluated by each office, provides a basis for City action required to maintain a balanced budget and continued financial stability.

The City's operating results and forecasts are analyzed, reviewed and reported on by each of OMB and the Office of the Comptroller as part of the City's overall system of internal control. Internal control systems are reviewed regularly, and the City Comptroller requires an annual report on internal control and accountability from each agency. Comprehensive service level and productivity targets are formulated and monitored for each agency by the Mayor's Office of Operations and reported publicly in a semiannual management report.

The City has developed and utilizes a cash forecasting system which forecasts its daily cash balances. This enables the City to predict more accurately its short-term borrowing needs and maximize its return on the investment of available cash balances. Monthly statements of operating revenues and expenditures, capital revenues and expenditures and cash flow are reported after each month's end, and major variances from the financial plan are identified and explained.

City funds held for operation and capital purposes are managed by the Office of the City Comptroller, with specific guidelines as to investment vehicles. The City does not invest such funds in leveraged products or use reverse repurchase agreements. The City invests primarily in obligations of the United States Government, its agencies and instrumentalities, and repurchase agreements with primary dealers. The repurchase agreements are collateralized by United States Government treasuries, agencies and instrumentalities, held by the City's custodian bank and marked to market daily.

More than 95% of the aggregate assets of the City's five defined benefit pension systems are managed by outside managers, supervised by the Office of the City Comptroller, and the remainder is held in cash or managed by the City Comptroller. Allocations of investment assets are determined by each fund's board of trustees. As of November 30, 1998 aggregate pension assets were allocated approximately as follows: 58% U.S. equities; 30% U.S. fixed income; 11% international equities; 0% international fixed income; and 1% cash.

#### *Year 2000*

The year 2000 presents potential operational problems for computerized data files and computer programs which may recognize the year 2000 as the year 1900, resulting in possible system failures or miscalculations. In November 1996, the City's Year 2000 Project Office was established to develop a project methodology, coordinate the efforts of City agencies, review plans and oversee implementation of year 2000 projects. At that time, the City also evaluated the capabilities of the City's Integrated Financial Management System and Capital Projects Information System, which are the City's central accounting, budgeting and payroll systems, identified the potential impact of the year 2000 on these systems, and developed a plan to replace these systems with a new system which is expected to be year 2000 compliant prior to December 31, 1999. The City has also performed an assessment of its other mission-critical and high priority computer systems in connection with making them year 2000 compliant, and the City's agencies have developed and begun to implement both strategic and operational plans for non-compliant application systems. In addition, the City Comptroller is conducting audits of the progress of City agencies in achieving year 2000 compliance. The Financial Plan includes \$132.7 million, and the City's capital budget includes \$170.6 million for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years for the year 2000 project. While these efforts may involve additional costs beyond those assumed in the Financial Plan, the City believes, based on currently available information, that such additional costs will not be material.

The City's goal is to complete remediation or replacement of all mission-critical and high priority systems before or during the 1999 calendar year in sufficient time for testing to be completed by the end of the 1999 calendar year. Review of system requirements, and procurement of necessary replacement or enhanced systems, have been ongoing for several years. The Mayor's Office of Operations has stated that work has been completed, and all or part of the necessary testing has been performed, on approximately 54% of the mission-critical and high priority systems of Mayoral agencies. Problems may be identified during the remediation process that could result in delays, the City's computer systems may not all be year 2000 compliant in a timely manner and there could be an adverse impact on City operations or revenues as a result. The City is in the process of developing contingency plans for all mission-critical and high priority systems of Mayoral agencies, if such systems are not year 2000 compliant by pre-determined dates. The City is also in the process of contacting its significant third party vendors, including State and Federal Governments, regarding the year 2000 issue and the status of their compliance. Year 2000 compliance by third parties is not within the City's control, and therefore the City cannot assure the timing of such efforts or that there will not be any adverse effects on the City resulting from any failure of these third parties to achieve year 2000 compliance.

The foregoing represents a "year 2000 readiness disclosure" for purposes of the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act.

#### *Financial Emergency Act*

The Financial Emergency Act requires that the City submit to the Control Board, at least 50 days prior to the beginning of each fiscal year (or on such other date as the Control Board may approve), a financial plan for the City and certain State governmental agencies, public authorities or public benefit corporations ("PBCs") which receive or may receive monies from the City directly, indirectly or contingently (the "Covered Organizations") covering the four-year period beginning with such fiscal year. The BOE, the New York City Transit Authority and the Manhattan and Bronx Surface Transit Operating Authority (collectively, "New York City Transit" or "NYCT"), New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation ("HHC") and the New York City Housing



Authority (the "Housing Authority" or "HA") are examples of Covered Organizations. The Act requires that the City's four-year financial plans conform to a number of standards. Unless otherwise permitted by the Control Board under certain conditions, the City must prepare and balance its budget covering all expenditures other than capital items so that the results of such budget will not show a deficit when reported in accordance with GAAP. Provision must be made, among other things, for the payment in full of the debt service on all City securities. The budget and operations of the City and the Covered Organizations must be in conformance with the financial plan then in effect.

From 1975 to June 30, 1986, the City was subject to a Control Period, as defined in the Financial Emergency Act, which was terminated upon the satisfaction of the statutory conditions for termination, including the termination of all Federal guarantees of obligations of the City, a determination by the Control Board that the City had maintained a balanced budget in accordance with GAAP for each of the three immediately preceding fiscal years and a certification by the State and City Comptrollers that sales of securities by or for the benefit of the City satisfied its capital and seasonal financing requirements in the public credit markets and were expected to satisfy such requirements in the 1987 fiscal year. With the termination of the Control Period, certain Control Board powers were suspended including, among others, its power to approve or disapprove certain contracts (including collective bargaining agreements), long-term and short-term borrowings, and the four-year financial plan and modifications thereto of the City and the Covered Organizations. After the termination of the Control Period but prior to the statutory expiration date of the Financial Emergency Act on July 1, 2008, the City is still required to develop a four-year financial plan each year and to modify the plan as changing circumstances require. During this period, the Control Board will also continue to have certain review powers and must reimpose a Control Period upon the occurrence or substantial likelihood and imminence of the occurrence of any one of certain events specified in the Act. These events are (i) failure by the City to pay principal of or interest on any of its notes or bonds when due or payable, (ii) the existence of a City operating deficit of more than \$100 million, (iii) issuance by the City of notes in violation of certain restrictions on short-term borrowing imposed by the Act, (iv) any violation by the City of any provision of the Act which substantially impairs the ability of the City to pay principal of or interest on its bonds or notes when due and payable or its ability to adopt or adhere to an operating budget balanced in accordance with the Act, or (v) joint certification by the State and City Comptrollers that they could not at that time make a joint certification that sales of securities in the public credit market by or for the benefit of the City during the immediately preceding fiscal year and the current fiscal year satisfied its capital and seasonal financing requirements during such period and that there is a substantial likelihood that such securities can be sold in the general public market from the date of the joint certification through the end of the next succeeding fiscal year in amounts that will satisfy substantially all of the capital and seasonal financing requirements of the City during such period in accordance with the financial plan then in effect.

#### *Financial Review and Oversight*

The Control Board, with the Office of the State Deputy Comptroller ("OSDC"), reviews and monitors revenues and expenditures of the City and the Covered Organizations. In addition, the Municipal Assistance Corporation for The City of New York ("MAC") was organized to provide financing assistance for the City and to exercise certain review functions with respect to the City's finances, and the Independent Budget Office (the "IBO") has been established pursuant to the City Charter to provide analysis to elected officials and the public on relevant fiscal and budgetary issues affecting the City.

The Control Board is required to: (i) review the four-year financial plan of the City and of the Covered Organizations and modifications thereto; (ii) review the operations of the City and the Covered Organizations, including their compliance with the financial plan; and (iii) review long-term and short-term borrowings and certain contracts, including collective bargaining agreements, of the City and the Covered Organizations. The requirement to submit four-year financial plans and budgets for review was in response to the severe financial difficulties and loss of access to the credit markets encountered by the City in 1975. The Control Board must reexamine the financial plan on at least a quarterly basis to determine its conformance to statutory standards.

The ex officio members of the Control Board are the Governor of the State of New York (Chairman); the Comptroller of the State of New York; the Mayor of The City of New York; and the Comptroller of The City of New York. In addition, there are three private members appointed by the Governor. The Executive Director of the Control Board is appointed jointly by the Governor and the Mayor. The Control Board is assisted in the exercise of its responsibilities and powers under the Financial Emergency Act by the State Deputy Comptroller.

## SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES

The City derives its revenues from a variety of local taxes, user charges and miscellaneous revenues, as well as from Federal and State unrestricted and categorical grants. State aid as a percentage of the City's revenues has remained relatively constant over the period from 1980 to 1998, while unrestricted Federal aid has been sharply reduced. The City projects that local revenues will provide approximately 67.4% of total revenues in the 1999 fiscal year while Federal aid, including categorical grants, will provide 12.2%, and State aid, including unrestricted aid and categorical grants, will provide 20.4%. Adjusting the data for comparability, local revenues provided approximately 60.6% of total revenues in 1980, while Federal and State aid each provided approximately 19.7%. A discussion of the City's principal revenue sources follows. For information regarding assumptions on which the City's revenue projections are based, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions." For information regarding the City's tax base, see "APPENDIX A—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS."

### Real Estate Tax

The real estate tax, the single largest source of the City's revenues, is the primary source of funds for the City's General Debt Service Fund. The City expects to derive approximately 36.1% of its total tax revenues and 21.1% of its total revenues for the 1999 fiscal year from the real estate tax. For information concerning tax revenues and total revenues of the City for prior fiscal years, see "SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS—1994-1998 Summary of Operations."

The State Constitution authorizes the City to levy a real estate tax without limit as to rate or amount (the "debt service levy") to cover scheduled payments of the principal of and interest on indebtedness of the City. However, the State Constitution limits the amount of revenue which the City can raise from the real estate tax for operating purposes (the "operating limit") to 2.5% of the average full value of taxable real estate in the City for the current and the last four fiscal years less interest on temporary debt and the aggregate amount of business improvement district charges subject to the 2.5% tax limitation. The table below sets forth the percentage of the debt service levy to the total levy. The City Council has adopted a distinct tax rate for each of the four categories of real property established by State legislation.

**COMPARISON OF REAL ESTATE TAX LEVIES, TAX LIMITS AND TAX RATES**

Fiscal Year	Total Levy(1)	Levy Within Operating Limit	Debt Service Levy(2)	Percent of Debt Service Levy to Total Levy	Operating Limit	Percent of Levy Within Operating Limit to Operating Limit(3)	Rate Per \$100 of Full Valuation(4)	Average Tax Rate Per \$100 of Assessed Valuation
				(Dollars in Millions)				
1995 . . . .	\$7,889.8	\$5,547.7	\$2,275.9	28.8%	\$13,380.2	41.5%	1.14%	\$10.37
1996 . . . .	7,871.4	5,182.3	2,609.8	33.2	8,633.4	60.0	1.88	10.37
1997 . . . .	7,835.1	4,933.3	2,827.4	36.1	7,857.3	62.8	2.14	10.37
1998 . . . .	7,890.4	5,928.5	1,872.9	23.7	7,599.7	78.0	2.27	10.37
1999 . . . .	8,099.3	6,307.9	1,776.5	21.9	7,170.3	88.0	2.56	10.37

(1) As approved by the City Council.

(2) The debt service levy includes a portion of the total reserve for uncollected real estate taxes.

(3) The increase in the percentage between fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 1999 was primarily due to the discretionary transfers, for accounting purposes, in the 1997 and 1998 fiscal years to pay debt service due in the 1998 and 1999 fiscal years, respectively, which reduced the amount of the debt service levy in the 1998 and 1999 fiscal years and, as a result, increased the amount of the total levy utilized for operating purposes.

(4) Full valuation is based on the special equalization ratios (discussed below) and the billable assessed valuation. Special equalization ratios and full valuations are revised periodically as a result of surveys by the State Board of Real Property Services.

### Assessment

The City has traditionally assessed real property at less than market (full) value. The State Board of Real Property Services (the "State Board") is required by law to determine annually the relationship between taxable assessed value and market value which is expressed as the "special equalization ratio." The special equalization ratio is used to compute full value for the purpose of measuring the City's compliance with the operating limit and general debt limit. For a discussion of the City's debt limit, see "SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness." The ratios are calculated by using the most recent market value surveys available and a projection of market value based on

recent survey trends, in accordance with methodologies established by the State Board from time to time. Ratios, and therefore full values, may be revised when new surveys are completed. The ratios and full values used to compute the 1998 fiscal year operating limit and general debt limit which are shown in the table below, have been established by the State Board and include the results of the calendar year 1994 market value survey. These estimates of full value established by the State Board do not fully reflect the downturn in the real estate market in prior years. For fiscal year 1999 the five-year average full valuation, which includes the results of the calendar year 1996 market value survey, falls to \$289.5 billion. For information concerning litigation asserting that the special equalization ratios calculated by the State Board in the 1991 calendar year violate State law because they substantially overestimate the full value of City real estate for the purposes of calculating the operating limit for the 1992 fiscal year, and that the City's real estate tax levy for operating purposes in the 1992 fiscal year exceeded the State Constitutional limit, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes."

**BILLABLE ASSESSED AND FULL VALUE OF TAXABLE REAL ESTATE(1)**

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Billable Assessed Valuation of Taxable Real Estate(2)</u>	+	<u>Special Equalization Ratio</u>	=	<u>Full Valuation(2)</u>
1995 .....	\$76,202,446,309		0.2785		\$273,617,401,469
1996 .....	76,029,436,876		0.2775		273,979,952,706
1997 .....	75,668,457,434		0.2643		286,297,606,636
1998 .....	76,188,390,641		0.2559		297,727,200,629
1999 .....	78,239,325,754		0.2477		315,863,244,869
			Average:		289,497,081,262

- (1) Also assessed by the City, but excluded from the computation of taxable real estate, are various categories of property exempt from taxation under State law. For the 1999 fiscal year, the billable assessed value of real estate categorized by the City as exempt is \$63.2 billion, or 44.6% of the \$140.9 billion billable assessed value of all real estate (taxable and exempt).
- (2) Figures for 1995 to 1999 are based on estimates of the special equalization ratio which are revised annually. These figures are derived from official City Council Tax Resolutions adopted with respect to the 1999 fiscal year. These figures differ from the assessed and full valuation of taxable real estate reported in the Annual Financial Report of the City Comptroller, which excludes veterans' property subject to tax for school purposes (approximately \$200 million in each year) and is based on estimates of the special equalization ratio which are not revised annually.

State law provides for the classification of all real property in the City into one of four statutory classes. Class one primarily includes one-, two- and three-family homes; class two includes certain other residential property not included in class one; class three includes most utility real property; and class four includes all other real property. The total tax levy consists of four tax levies, one for each class. Once the tax levy is set for each class, the tax rate for each class is then fixed annually by the City Council by dividing the levy for such class by the billable assessed value for such class.

Assessment procedures differ for each class of property. For fiscal year 1999, class one was assessed at approximately 8% of market value and classes two, three and four were each assessed at 45% of market value. In addition, individual assessments on class one parcels cannot increase by more than six percent per year or twenty percent over a five-year period. Market value increases and decreases for most of class two and all of class four are phased in over a period of five years. Increases in class one market value in excess of applicable limitations are not phased in over subsequent years. There is also no phase in for class three property.

Class two and class four real property have three assessed values: actual, transition and billable. Actual assessed value is established for all tax classes without regard to the five-year phase-in requirement applicable to most class two and all class four properties. The transition assessed value reflects this phase-in. Billable assessed value is the basis for tax liability, and is the lower of the actual or transition assessment.

The share of the total levy that can be borne by each class is regulated by the provisions of the Real Property Tax Law. Each class's share of the total tax levy is updated annually to reflect new construction, demolition, alterations or changes in taxable status and is subject to limited adjustment to reflect market value changes among the four classes. Fiscal year 1999 tax rates were set on June 8, 1998, and reflect a 5% limitation on the market value adjustment for 1999. State law limits the increases in any class's share over the previous year due to changes in market values to 5%. Increases in class shares below 5% must be legislatively approved by the State. Subsequently, on June 19, 1998, the State legislature authorized the City to limit the 1999 fiscal year increase to 2.5% in any class's share. The tax rates were amended on November 17, 1998 to reflect this 2.5% limit. For fiscal year 1999, the average tax rate is held at the current rate of \$10.37 per \$100 of assessed value, though individual class tax rates have changed from the prior year level.

Recent changes to the Real Property Tax Law will allow taxpayers to use sales prices to challenge the equality of assessments. This change, effective January 1, 1998, may result in significant refund exposure and reduce the City's real estate tax revenue accordingly.

City real estate tax revenues may be reduced in future fiscal years as a result of tax refund claims asserting overvaluation, inequality of assessment and illegality. For a discussion of various proceedings challenging assessments of real property for real estate tax purposes, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes." For further information regarding the City's potential exposure in certain of these proceedings, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note I. LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS—Judgments and Claims."

The State Board annually certifies various class ratios and class equalization rates relating to the four classes of real property in the City. "Class ratios", which are determined for each class by the State Board by calculating the ratio of assessed value to market value, are used in real property tax certiorari proceedings involving allegations of inequality of assessments. The City believes that the State Board overestimated market values for class two and class four properties in calculating the class ratios for the 1991 and 1992 assessment rolls and has commenced proceedings challenging these class ratios. A lowering of the market value determination by the State Board for classes two and four would raise the class ratios and could result in a reduction in tax refunds issued as a result of tax certiorari proceedings. For further information regarding the City's proceeding, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes."

#### *Trend in Taxable Assessed Value*

During the decade prior to fiscal year 1993, real property tax revenues grew substantially. Because State law provides for increases in assessed values of most properties to be phased into property tax bills over five-year periods, billable assessed values continued to grow and real property tax revenue increased through fiscal year 1993 even as market values declined during the local recession.

For the 1994 and 1995 fiscal years, billable assessed valuation declined, by 1.3% and 2.8%, respectively. The bulk of the decline was due to continued weakness in class four. For the 1996 fiscal year, billable assessed valuation in total was essentially unchanged from the prior year (a decline of 0.2%), as the rate of decline in class four slowed and slight increases in the valuations of the other classes offset the class four decline. For the 1996 fiscal year, actual assessed valuation increased by 0.8%, the first improvement since fiscal year 1991. Billable assessed valuation for 1996 was essentially unchanged at \$75.9 billion. Fiscal year 1997 actual assessed valuation on the final assessment roll increased by 0.1% or \$86 million, while billable assessed valuation decreased by 0.5% or \$356 million from fiscal year 1996 to \$75.5 billion. For the 1998 fiscal year, actual assessed valuation increased by 1.6% or \$1.3 billion while billable assessed valuation increased by 0.7% to \$76.0 billion, the first increase since 1993. For the 1999 fiscal year, billable assessed valuation rose by \$2.0 billion to \$78.0 billion. The Department of Finance has released the tentative assessment roll for fiscal year 2000, in which billable assessed valuation rose by \$3.87 billion to \$81.6 billion. After accounting for adjustments from the Tax Commission and other actions, it is estimated that the final assessment roll for fiscal year 2000, to be released in May, will be \$500 million lower than the tentative assessment roll. Billable assessed valuations are forecast to exceed local inflation through the 2002 fiscal year following continued growth in market values.

#### *Collection of the Real Estate Tax*

Real estate tax payments are due each July 1 and January 1. Recent changes to the real property tax law expanded the eligibility for quarterly tax payments by owners of class one and class two properties assessed at \$80,000 or less, up from the previous \$40,000, and cooperatives whose individual units on average are valued at \$80,000 or less, up from the previous \$40,000, which are paid in quarterly installments on July 1, October 1, January 1 and April 1. The new provisions will apply to installments of real property tax becoming due and payable on or after July 1, 1998. Since July 1, 1991, an annual interest rate of 9% compounded daily is imposed upon late payments on properties for which the annual tax bill does not exceed \$2,750 except in the case of (i) any parcel with respect of which the real property taxes are held in escrow and paid by a mortgage escrow agent and (ii) parcels consisting of vacant or unimproved land. Since July 1, 1991, an interest rate of 18% compounded daily is imposed upon late payments on all other properties. These interest rates are set annually.

The City primarily uses two methods to enforce the collection of real estate taxes. The City is authorized to sell real property tax liens on class one properties which are delinquent for at least three years and class two, three and four properties which are delinquent for at least one year. The City Council voted to extend such authority until December 31, 1999. In addition, the City is entitled to foreclose delinquent tax liens by *in rem* proceedings after one year of delinquency with respect to properties other than one- and two-family dwellings and condominium apartments for which the annual tax bills do not exceed \$2,750, as to which a three-year delinquency rule is in effect.

The real estate tax is accounted for on a modified accrual basis. Revenue accrued is limited to prior year payments received, offset by refunds made, within the first two months of the following fiscal year. In deriving the real estate tax revenue forecast, a reserve is provided for cancellations or abatements of taxes and for nonpayment of current year taxes owed and outstanding as of the end of the fiscal year.

The following table sets forth the amount of delinquent real estate taxes (owed and outstanding as of the end of the fiscal year of levy) for each of the fiscal years indicated. Delinquent real estate taxes do not include real estate taxes subject to cancellation or abatement under various exemption or abatement programs. Delinquent real estate taxes generally increase during a recession and when the real estate market deteriorates. Delinquent real estate taxes generally decrease as the City's economy and real estate market recover.

In June 1994, the City sold to Tax Collections Trust, a Delaware trust, the City's delinquent real property tax receivables outstanding as of May 31, 1994 for \$201 million plus a residual interest in the receivables. In April 1995, the City sold to Asset Securitization Cooperative Corporation, a California cooperative corporation, the City's delinquent real property tax receivables outstanding as of April 1, 1995 for \$223 million, with the City retaining a residual interest in the receivables. In fiscal years 1996, 1997 and 1998, the City sold to separate business trusts real property tax liens for which the City received net proceeds of approximately \$169 million, \$52 million and \$23 million, respectively. The City is expected to receive net proceeds of \$161 million from the lien sale in fiscal year 1999. Amounts shown in the table below exclude the proceeds of tax receivables and tax lien sales.

**REAL ESTATE TAX COLLECTIONS AND DELINQUENCIES  
(In Millions)**

Fiscal Year	Tax Levy(1)	Tax Collections on Current Year Levy(2)	Tax Collections as a Percentage of Tax Levy	Prior Year (Delinquent Tax) Collections	Refunds(3)	Cancellations, Net Credits, Abatements, Exempt Property Restored and Shelter Rent	Delinquent as of End of Fiscal Year(4)	Delinquency as a Percentage of Tax Levy	Receivable Lien Sale(5)
1992 . . . .	\$8,318.8	\$7,748.4	93.1%	\$193.7	\$(124.3)	\$(200.2)	\$(370.2)	4.45%	\$ —
1993 . . . .	8,392.5	7,766.1	92.5	227.7	(107.2)	(215.2)	(411.2)	4.90	—
1994 . . . .	8,113.2	7,520.3	92.7	223.1	(199.1)	(189.5)	(403.4)	4.97	200.6
1995 . . . .	7,889.8	7,377.4	93.5	210.8	(162.4)	(130.8)	(381.6)	4.84	223.1
1996 . . . .	7,871.4	7,306.9	92.8	240.6	(399.7)	(275.5)	(289.1)	3.67	169.1
1997 . . . . .	7,835.1	7,371.3	94.1	146.8	(279.0)	(179.4)	(284.4)	3.63	51.5
1998 . . . . .	7,890.4	7,414.2	94.0	148.2	(345.6)	(199.1)	(267.9)	3.51	22.5
1999(6) . .	8,099.3	7,526.0	92.9	140.0	(268.0)	(289.8)	(283.5)	3.50	161.0

(1) As approved by the City Council.

(2) Quarterly collections on current year levy. Amounts for fiscal years 1994, 1995 and 1996 are adjusted to eliminate the effects of the 1994 and 1995 sales of delinquent tax receivables.

(3) Includes repurchases of defective tax liens amounting to \$7.6 million, \$0.5 million and \$8.0 million in the 1997, 1998 and 1999 fiscal years, respectively.

(4) These figures include taxes due on certain publicly owned property and exclude delinquency on shelter rent and exempt property restored in the 1995, 1996 and 1997 fiscal years.

(5) Net of reserve for defective liens.

(6) Forecast.

**Other Taxes**

The City expects to derive 63.9% of its total tax revenues for the 1999 fiscal year from a variety of taxes other than the real estate tax, such as: (i) the 4% sales and compensating use tax, in addition to the State 4¼% sales and use tax imposed by the State upon receipts from retail sales of tangible personal property and certain services in the City; (ii) the personal income tax on City residents and the earnings tax on non-residents; (iii) a general corporation tax levied on the income of corporations doing business in the City; (iv) a banking corporation tax imposed on the income of banking corporations doing business in the City; and (v) the State-imposed stock transfer tax. While the economic effect of the stock transfer tax was eliminated as of October 1, 1981, the City's revenue loss is, to some extent, mitigated by State payments to a stock transfer tax incentive fund.

For local taxes other than the real property tax, the City may adopt and amend local laws for the levy of local taxes to the extent authorized by the State. This authority can be withdrawn, amended or expanded by State legislation. Without State authorization, the City may locally impose property taxes to fund general operations in an amount not to exceed 2½% of property values in the City as determined under a State mandated formula. In

addition, the State cannot restrict the City's authority to levy and collect real estate taxes in excess of the 2½% limitation in the amount necessary to pay principal of and interest on City indebtedness. For further information concerning the City's authority to impose real property taxes, see "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Real Estate Tax." Payments by the State to the City of sales tax and stock transfer tax revenues are subject to appropriation by the State and are made available first to MAC for payment of MAC debt service, reserve fund requirements and operating expenses, with the balance, if any, payable to the City.

Revenues from taxes other than the real property tax, including Audits and Criminal Justice Fund, in the 1998 fiscal year have increased by \$1.164 billion or approximately 9.7% from the 1997 fiscal year. The following table sets forth, by category, revenues from taxes, other than the real property tax, for each of the City's 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
	(In Millions)				
Personal Income(1) .....	\$ 3,530	\$ 3,591	\$ 3,908	\$ 4,361	\$ 5,117
General Corporation .....	1,193	1,079	1,209	1,478	1,551
Banking Corporation .....	497	250	361	360	515
Unincorporated Business Income .....	382	379	496	561	671
Sales .....	2,451	2,588	2,714	2,912	3,052
Commercial Rent(2) .....	629	624	531	374	358
Real Property Transfer .....	149	167	175	215	288
Mortgage Recording .....	134	170	147	185	232
Utility .....	208	197	214	215	223
All Other(3) .....	622	593	628	695	705
Audits .....	570	601	657	651	458
Total .....	<u>\$10,365</u>	<u>\$10,239</u>	<u>\$11,040</u>	<u>\$12,007</u>	<u>\$13,171</u>

(1) Personal Income Tax includes \$200 million of Criminal Justice Fund revenues in fiscal year 1994, \$167 million in fiscal year 1995, \$185 million in fiscal year 1996, \$90 million in fiscal year 1997 and \$185 million in fiscal year 1998 and excludes \$16 million paid to the Finance Authority.

(2) Commercial Rent reflects legislation providing for various credit and exemptions which reduced collections.

(3) All Other includes, among others, the stock transfer tax, New York City Off-Track Betting Corporation ("OTB") net revenues, cigarette, beer and liquor taxes, the hotel tax and the automobile use tax.

### Miscellaneous Revenues

Miscellaneous revenues include revenue sources such as charges collected by the City for the issuance of licenses, permits and franchises, interest earned by the City on the investment of City cash balances, tuition and fees at the Community Colleges, reimbursement to the City from the proceeds of water and sewer rates charged by the New York City Water Board (the "Water Board") for costs of delivery of water and sewer services and paid to the City by the Water Board for its lease interest in the water and sewer system, rents collected from tenants in City-owned property and from the Port Authority with respect to airports, and the collection of fines. The following table sets forth amounts of miscellaneous revenues for each of the City's 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
	(In Millions)				
Licenses, Permits and Franchises .....	\$ 225	\$ 222	\$ 237	\$ 245	\$ 273
Interest Income .....	82	95	112	160	199
Charges for Services .....	389	396	415	428	435
Water and Sewer Payments .....	718	738	731	775	823
Rental Income .....	133	127	139	143	151
Fines and Forfeitures .....	369	417	417	491	468
Other .....	659	722	683	807	486
Total .....	<u>\$2,575</u>	<u>\$2,717</u>	<u>\$2,734</u>	<u>\$3,049</u>	<u>\$2,835</u>

Effective on July 1, 1985, fees and charges collected from the users of the water and sewer system of the City became revenues of the Water Board, a public benefit corporation all of the members of which are appointed by the Mayor. The Water Board currently holds a long-term leasehold interest in the water and sewer system pursuant to a lease between the Water Board and the City.

Other miscellaneous revenues for the 1994 fiscal year include \$81 million being made available to the City by the municipal labor unions from surplus funds in the Stabilization Funds to offset the cost of the January 1993 labor settlement. In addition, fire officers and superior police officers agreed to transfer \$72 million to the City from the Variable Supplements Fund. Other miscellaneous revenues for the 1995 fiscal year include \$200 million from the recovery of prior year FICA overpayments and \$120 million from the sale of upstate jails to the State. Other miscellaneous revenues for fiscal year 1996 include an increase of \$170 million resulting from actions at HHC, a one-time collection of \$28 million from HFA and \$55 million from the recovery of prior year FICA overpayments. Other miscellaneous revenues for fiscal year 1997 include a \$250 million payment from the MTA and \$207 million from the sale of WNYC. Other miscellaneous revenues for fiscal year 1998 includes \$84 million from the sale of the United Nations Plaza Hotel.

**Unrestricted Intergovernmental Aid**

Unrestricted Federal and State aid has consisted primarily of per capita aid from the State government. These funds, which are not subject to any substantial restriction as to their use, are used by the City as general support for its Expense Budget. State general revenue sharing (State per capita aid) is allocated among the units of local government by statutory formulas which take into account the distribution of the State’s population and the full valuation of taxable real property. In recent years, however, such allocation has been based on prior year levels in lieu of the statutory formula. For a further discussion of unrestricted State aid, see “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—Revenue Assumptions—5. Unrestricted Intergovernmental Aid”.

The following table sets forth amounts of unrestricted Federal and State aid received by the City in each of its 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
	(In Millions)				
State Per Capita Aid .....	\$300	\$325	\$369	\$322	\$327
State Shared Taxes(1) .....	27	16	17	6	16
Other(2) .....	<u>340</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>279</u>
Total .....	<u>\$667</u>	<u>\$603</u>	<u>\$621</u>	<u>\$654</u>	<u>\$622</u>

(1) State Shared Taxes are taxes which are levied by the State, collected by the State and which, pursuant to aid formulas determined by the State Legislature, are returned to various communities in the State. Beginning on April 1, 1982, these payments were replaced by funds appropriated pursuant to the Consolidated Local Highway Assistance Program, known as “CHIPS”.

(2) Included in the 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998 fiscal years are \$105 million, \$126 million, \$121 million, \$133 million and \$153 million, respectively, of aid associated with the partial State takeover of long-term care Medicaid costs.

**Federal and State Categorical Grants**

The City makes certain expenditures for services required by Federal and State mandates which are then wholly or partially reimbursed through Federal and State categorical grants. State categorical grants are received by the City primarily in connection with City welfare, education, higher education, health and mental health expenditures. The City also receives substantial Federal categorical grants in connection with the Federal Community Development (“Community Development”) and the Job Training and Partnership Act (“JTPA”). The Federal government also provides the City with substantial public assistance, social service and education grants as well as reimbursement for all or a portion of certain costs incurred by the City in maintaining programs in a number of areas, including housing, criminal justice and health. All City claims for Federal and State grants are subject to subsequent audit by Federal and State authorities. The City provides a reserve for disallowances resulting from these audits which could be asserted in subsequent years. Federal grants are also subject to audit under the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996. For a further discussion of Federal and State categorical grants and recent welfare legislation, see “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—Revenue Assumptions—6. Federal and State Categorical Grants.”

The following table sets forth amounts of Federal and State categorical grants received by the City for each of the City's 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
	(In Millions)				
<b>Federal</b>					
JTPA .....	\$ 106	\$ 108	\$ 105	\$ 95	\$ 90
Community Development(1) .....	264	281	279	264	255
Welfare .....	2,321	2,318	2,241	2,284	2,344
Education .....	882	857	887	929	1,014
Other .....	<u>387</u>	<u>442</u>	<u>682</u>	<u>561</u>	<u>589</u>
Total .....	<u>\$3,960</u>	<u>\$4,006</u>	<u>\$4,194</u>	<u>\$4,133</u>	<u>\$4,292</u>
<b>State</b>					
Welfare .....	\$1,897	\$1,984	\$1,720	\$1,672	\$1,580
Education .....	3,380	3,769	3,746	3,908	4,155
Higher Education .....	134	125	118	121	125
Health and Mental Health.....	207	235	241	254	269
Other .....	<u>285</u>	<u>317</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>243</u>
Total .....	<u>\$5,903</u>	<u>\$6,430</u>	<u>\$6,079</u>	<u>\$6,264</u>	<u>\$6,372</u>

(1) Amounts represent actual funds received and may be lower or higher than the appropriation of funds actually provided by the Federal government for the particular fiscal year due either to underspending or the spending of funds carried forward from prior fiscal years.



## SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES

### Expenditures for City Services

Three types of governmental agencies provide public services within the City's borders and receive financial support from the City. One category is the mayoral agencies established by the City Charter which include, among others, the Police, Fire and Sanitation Departments. Another is the independent agencies which are funded in whole or in part through the City Budgets but which have greater independence in the use of appropriated funds than the mayoral agencies. Included in this category are certain Covered Organizations such as HHC, the Transit Authority and the BOE. A third category consists of certain PBCs which were created to finance the construction of housing, hospitals, dormitories and other facilities and to provide other governmental services in the City. The legislation establishing this type of agency contemplates that annual payments from the City, appropriated through its Expense Budget, may or will constitute a substantial part of the revenues of the agency. Included in this category is, among others, the City University Construction Fund ("CUCF"). For information regarding expenditures for City services, see "SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS—1994-1998 Summary of Operations."

Federal and State laws require the City to provide certain social services for needy individuals and families who qualify for such assistance. In October 1996, Aid to Families with Dependent Children ("AFDC") was replaced by the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families ("TANF") block grant. The State began receiving TANF funds in December 1996. TANF funds are supplemented by City and State contributions.

In August 1997, the State Welfare Reform Act of 1997 was signed into law creating the TANF funded Family Assistance program and the Safety Net Assistance program which replaced Home Relief. The Family Assistance program provides benefits for households with minor children subject, in most cases, to a five-year limit. The Safety Net Assistance program provides benefits for adults without minor children, families who have reached the Family Assistance time limit and others, including certain immigrants, who are ineligible for Family Assistance but are eligible for public assistance. Cash assistance benefits under the Safety Net Assistance program are subject to time and eligibility limits, with recipients who reach the time limit or fail to satisfy eligibility requirements receiving non-cash assistance. The cost of Safety Net Assistance is borne equally by the City and the State. Under the State Welfare Reform Act of 1997, the City must achieve recipient work quotas and have all able-bodied recipients working after receiving assistance for two years, which could require the City to provide additional funding for workfare and day care.

The City also provides funding for many other social services such as day care, foster care, family planning, services for the elderly and special employment services for welfare recipients some of which are mandated, and may be wholly or partially subsidized, by either the Federal or State government. For further information regarding recent welfare legislation, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—*Revenue Assumptions*—6. Federal and State Categorical Grants."

The City's elementary and secondary school system is operated under the general supervision of the BOE, with considerable authority over elementary and junior high schools also exercised by the 32 Community School Boards. The BOE is responsible to the State on policy issues and to the City on fiscal matters. The number of pupils in the school system for the 1999 fiscal year is estimated to be 1,094,509. Actual enrollment in fiscal years 1994 through 1998 has been 1,016,728, 1,034,235, 1,057,344, 1,075,605 and 1,084,451, respectively. Between fiscal years 1996 and 1998, the percentage of the City's total budget allocated to the BOE has remained relatively stable at approximately 26.4%; in fiscal year 1999 the percentage of the City's total budget allocated to the BOE is projected to be 29.3%. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—*Expenditure Assumptions*—2. Other Than Personal Service Costs—*Board of Education*." The City's system of higher education, consisting of its Senior Colleges and Community Colleges, is operated under the supervision of City University of New York ("CUNY"). The City is projected to provide approximately 32.1% of the costs of the Community Colleges in the 1999 fiscal year. The State has full responsibility for the costs of operating the Senior Colleges, although the City is required initially to fund these costs.

The City administers health services programs for the care of the physically and mentally ill and the aged. HHC maintains and operates the City's eleven municipal acute care hospitals, five long-term care facilities, seven free standing diagnostic and treatment centers, many hospital-based and neighborhood clinics and a health maintenance organization. HHC is funded primarily by third party reimbursement collections from Medicare and Medicaid and by payments from Bad Debt/Charity Care Pools.

Medicaid provides basic medical assistance to needy persons. The City is required by State law to furnish medical assistance through Medicaid to all City residents meeting eligibility requirements established by the

State. The State has assumed 81.2% of the non-Federal share of long-term care costs, all of the costs of providing medical assistance to the mentally disabled, and 53.1% of the non-Federal share of Medicaid costs for clients enrolled in managed care plans. The Federal government pays approximately 50% of Medicaid costs for Federally eligible recipients.

The City's expense budget has increased during the five-year period ended June 30, 1998, due to, among other factors, the costs of labor settlements, debt service costs and the impact of inflation on various other than personal service costs.

## Employees and Labor Relations

### Employees

The following table presents the number of full-time employees of the City, including the mayoral agencies, the BOE and CUNY, at the end of each of the City's 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
Education .....	88,639	88,340	85,959	87,969	93,365
Police(1) .....	45,652	43,040	43,589	46,830	46,864
Social Services, Homeless and Children's Services .....	26,013	23,948	23,604	23,061	22,952
City University Community Colleges .....	4,071	3,579	3,581	3,667	3,720
Environmental Protection and Sanitation .....	16,046	15,258	15,313	14,624	14,820
Fire(2) .....	15,871	15,649	15,703	15,693	15,709
All Other .....	<u>50,491</u>	<u>47,486</u>	<u>47,320</u>	<u>45,108</u>	<u>45,019</u>
Total .....	<u>246,783</u>	<u>237,300</u>	<u>235,069</u>	<u>236,952</u>	<u>242,449</u>

(1) For comparison purposes, fiscal year 1994 has been restated to include the Transit Authority and Housing Authority Police Departments.

(2) For comparison purposes, fiscal years 1994 and 1995 have been restated to include the impact of the Emergency Medical Service ("EMS") merger with the New York City Fire Department.

The following table presents the number of full-time employees of certain Covered Organizations, as reported by such Organizations, at the end of each of the City's 1994 through 1998 fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
Transit Authority(1) .....	44,949	44,954	42,802	42,687	43,303
Housing Authority(1) .....	13,837	13,820	14,273	14,170	15,029
HHC(2) .....	<u>44,195</u>	<u>39,243</u>	<u>37,527</u>	<u>36,336</u>	<u>34,252</u>
Total(3) .....	<u>102,981</u>	<u>98,017</u>	<u>94,602</u>	<u>93,193</u>	<u>92,584</u>

(1) For comparison purposes, fiscal years 1994 and 1995 have been restated to exclude the Transit Authority and Housing Authority Police Departments.

(2) In fiscal year 1996, EMS merged with the New York City Fire Department.

(3) The definition of "full-time employees" varies among the Covered Organizations and the City.

The foregoing tables include persons whose salaries or wages are paid by certain public employment programs, principally programs funded under the JTPA, which support employees in non-profit and State agencies as well as in the mayoral agencies and the Covered Organizations.

### Labor Relations

Substantially all of the City's full-time employees are members of labor unions. Under applicable law, the City may not make unilateral changes in wages, hours or working conditions under any of the following circumstances: (i) during the period of negotiations between the City and a union representing municipal employees concerning a collective bargaining agreement; (ii) if an impasse panel is appointed, then during the period commencing on the date on which such panel is appointed and ending sixty days thereafter or thirty days after it submits its report, whichever is sooner, subject to extension under certain circumstances to permit completion of panel proceedings; or (iii) during the pendency of an appeal to the Board of Collective Bargaining. Although State law prohibits strikes by municipal employees, strikes and work stoppages by employees of the City and the Covered Organizations have occurred.

The terms of future wage settlements could be determined through the impasse procedure in the New York City Collective Bargaining Law, which can impose a binding settlement. Legislation passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor on December 18, 1998 places collective bargaining matters relating to police and firefighters, including impasse proceedings, under the jurisdiction of the State Public Employment Relations

Board (“PERB”), instead of the New York City Office of Collective Bargaining (“OCB”). OCB considers wage levels of municipal employees in similar cities in the United States in reaching its determinations, while PERB’s determinations take into account wage levels in both private and public employment in comparable communities, particularly within the State. In addition, PERB can impose a settlement on the parties for a period not longer than two years, unlike OCB which can impose longer settlements. For these reasons, among others, PERB jurisdiction could result in labor settlements which could impose higher costs on the City than those reached under existing procedures.

For information regarding the City’s most recently negotiated collective bargaining settlement, as well as assumptions with respect to the cost of future labor settlements and related effects on the 1999-2003 Financial Plan, see “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—*Expenditure Assumptions*—1. Personal Service Costs.”

#### *Pensions*

The City maintains a number of pension systems providing benefits for its employees and employees of various independent agencies (including certain Covered Organizations). For further information regarding the City’s pension systems and the City’s obligations thereto, see “SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Pension Systems.”

#### **Capital Expenditures**

The City makes substantial capital expenditures to reconstruct, rehabilitate and expand the City’s infrastructure and physical assets, including City mass transit facilities, sewers, streets, bridges and tunnels, and to make capital investments that will improve productivity in City operations. For additional information regarding the City’s infrastructure, physical assets and capital program, see “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Long-Term Capital and Financing Program” and “APPENDIX A—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS.”

The City utilizes a three-tiered capital planning process consisting of the Ten-Year Capital Strategy (previously, the Ten-Year Capital Plan), the Four-Year Capital Program and the current-year Capital Budget. The Ten-Year Capital Strategy, which is published once every two years in conjunction with the Executive Budget, is a long-term planning tool designed to reflect fundamental allocation choices and basic policy objectives. The Four-Year Capital Program translates mid-range policy goals into specific projects. The Capital Budget defines for each fiscal year specific projects and the timing of their initiation, design, construction and completion.

On January 28, 1999, the City published a preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 (the “Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy”). The Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy totaled \$48.1 billion, of which approximately 96% would be financed with City funds. See “SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—*Limitations on the City’s Authority to Contract Indebtedness*.” The Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy provides \$6.2 billion for the BOE for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. See “SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN.” The Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy also assumes that the Wicks Law will be repealed by the State Legislature, and that the City will achieve savings of \$1.9 billion over the ten-year period due to increased capital program efficiency once the law is repealed.

The Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy includes: (i) \$13.0 billion to construct new schools and improve existing educational facilities; (ii) \$9.4 billion for improvements to the water and sewer system; (iii) \$4.6 billion for expanding and upgrading the City’s housing stock; (iv) \$3.0 billion for reconstruction or resurfacing of City streets; (v) \$1.4 billion for continued City-funded investment in mass transit; (vi) \$5.0 billion for the continued reconstruction and rehabilitation of all four East River bridges and 290 other bridge structures; (vii) \$1.6 billion to expand current jail capacity; and (viii) \$2.0 billion for construction and improvement of court facilities.

Those programs in the Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy financed with City funds are currently expected to be funded primarily from the issuance of general obligation bonds issued by the City, revenue bonds issued by the Water Authority and the Finance Authority and bonds issued by TSASC which will be paid from revenues received pursuant to a settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies. Debt service on such general obligation bonds is paid out of the City’s operating revenues, debt service on Water Authority bonds is paid out of water and sewer system revenues and debt service on Finance Authority bonds is paid out of personal income taxes. From time to time in the past, during recessionary periods when operating revenues have come under increasing pressure, capital funding levels have been reduced from those previously contemplated in

order to reduce debt service costs. For information concerning the City's long-term financing program for capital expenditures, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Long-Term Capital and Financing Program."

The City's capital expenditures, including expenditures funded by State and Federal grants, totaled \$18.8 billion during the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years. City-funded expenditures, which totaled \$17.1 billion during the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years, have been financed through the issuance of bonds by the City, the Finance Authority, the Water Authority, HHC and the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York ("DASNY"). The following table summarizes the major categories of capital expenditures in the past five fiscal years.

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(In Millions)					
Education .....	\$ 722	\$ 875	\$ 807	\$ 614	\$1,228	\$ 4,246
Environmental Protection .....	616	705	1,004	978	765	4,068
Transportation .....	423	444	554	537	589	2,547
Transit Authority(1) .....	221	150	218	202	246	1,037
Housing .....	387	292	246	269	235	1,429
Hospitals .....	163	137	104	83	71	558
Sanitation .....	151	114	131	213	116	725
All Other(2) .....	660	977	732	963	850	4,182
Total Expenditures(3) .....	<u>\$3,343</u>	<u>\$3,694</u>	<u>\$3,796</u>	<u>\$3,859</u>	<u>\$4,100</u>	<u>\$18,792</u>
City-funded Expenditures(4) .....	<u>\$3,301</u>	<u>\$3,224</u>	<u>\$3,413</u>	<u>\$3,569</u>	<u>\$3,631</u>	<u>\$17,138</u>

(1) Excludes the Transit Authority's non-City portion of the MTA's Capital Program.

(2) All Other includes, among other things, parks, correction facilities, public structures and equipment.

(3) Total Expenditures for the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years include City, State and Federal funding and represent amounts which include an accrual for work-in-progress. The figures for the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years are derived from the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller.

(4) City-funded Expenditures do not include accruals, but represent actual cash disbursements occurring during the fiscal year.

In October 1997, the City issued a condition assessment and a proposed maintenance schedule for the major portion of its assets and asset systems which have a replacement cost of \$10 million or more and a useful life of at least ten years, as required by the City Charter. For information concerning a report which sets forth the recommended capital investment to bring certain identified assets of the City to a state of good repair, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Long-Term Capital and Financing Program."

## SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

The City's General Purpose Financial Statements and the auditors' opinion thereon are presented in "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS." Further details are set forth in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1998, which is available for inspection at the Office of the Comptroller. For a summary of the City's significant accounting policies, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note A." For a summary of the City's operating results for the previous five fiscal years, see "SECTION VI: FINANCIAL OPERATIONS—1994-1998 Summary of Operations."

Except as otherwise indicated, all of the financial data relating to the City's operations contained herein, although derived from the City's books and records, are unaudited. In addition, the City's independent certified public accountants have not compiled or examined, or applied agreed upon procedures to, the forecast of 1999 results or the Financial Plan.

The estimates and projections contained in this Section and elsewhere herein are based on, among other factors, evaluations of historical revenue and expenditure data, analyses of economic trends and current and anticipated Federal and State legislation affecting the City's finances. The City's financial projections are based upon numerous assumptions and are subject to certain contingencies and periodic revisions which may involve substantial change. Consequently, the City makes no representation or warranty that these estimates and projections will be realized.

## 1994-1998 Summary of Operations

The following table sets forth the City's results of operations for its 1994 through 1998 fiscal years in accordance with GAAP.

The information regarding the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years has been derived from the City's audited financial statements and should be read in conjunction with the notes accompanying this table and the City's 1997 and 1998 financial statements included in "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS." The 1994 through 1996 financial statements are not separately presented herein. For further information regarding the City's revenues and expenditures, see "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES" and "SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES."

	Fiscal Year (1)				
	Actual				
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
	(In Millions)				
Revenues and Transfers					
Real Estate Tax(2)	\$ 7,773	\$ 7,474	\$ 7,100	\$ 7,291	\$ 7,239
Other Taxes(3)(4)	10,365	10,239	11,040	12,007	13,171
Miscellaneous Revenues	2,575	2,717	2,734	3,049	2,835
Other Categorical Grants	128	143	343	379	412
Unrestricted Federal and State Aid(3)	667	603	621	654	622
Federal Categorical Grants	3,960	4,006	4,194	4,133	4,292
State Categorical Grants	5,903	6,430	6,079	6,264	6,372
Less: Disallowances Against Categorical Grants	(19)	(21)	(40)	(36)	(14)
Total Revenues and Transfers(5)	<u>\$31,352</u>	<u>\$31,591</u>	<u>\$32,071</u>	<u>\$33,741</u>	<u>\$34,929</u>
Expenditures and Transfers					
Social Services	\$ 8,030	\$ 8,112	\$ 7,902	\$ 7,749	\$ 7,785
Board of Education	7,561	7,863	7,835	8,085	8,812
City University	353	348	348	354	364
Public Safety and Judicial	3,846	4,121	4,446	4,727	4,946
Health Services	1,620	1,737	1,829	1,448	1,553
Pensions	1,274	1,273	1,356	1,319	1,409
Debt Service(3)(6)	2,136	2,320	2,512	4,184	2,934
MAC Debt Service Funding(3)(6)	354	29	132	264	773
All Other(6)	6,173	5,783	5,706	5,606	6,348
Total Expenditures and Transfers(5)	<u>\$31,347</u>	<u>\$31,586</u>	<u>\$32,066</u>	<u>\$33,736</u>	<u>\$34,924</u>
Surplus(6)	<u>\$ 5</u>	<u>\$ 5</u>	<u>\$ 5</u>	<u>\$ 5</u>	<u>\$ 5</u>

- (1) The City's results of operations refer to the City's General Fund revenues and transfers reduced by expenditures and transfers. The revenues and assets of PBCs included in the City's audited financial statements do not constitute revenues and assets of the City's General Fund, and, accordingly, the revenues of such PBCs, other than net OTB revenues, are not included in the City's results of operations. Expenditures required to be made by the City with respect to such PBCs are included in the City's results of operations. For further information regarding the particular PBCs included in the City's financial statements, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note A."
- (2) Real Estate Tax for the 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997 fiscal years includes \$147.5 million, \$147 million, \$146 million and \$223 million, respectively, of Criminal Justice Fund revenues. Real Estate Tax for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998 also includes \$201 million and \$223 million from the sale of the City's delinquent tax receivables and \$169 million, \$52 million and \$23 million from the sale of real property tax liens, respectively.
- (3) Revenues includes amounts paid and expected to be paid to MAC by the State from sales tax receipts, stock transfer tax receipts and State per capita aid otherwise payable by the State to the City. Pursuant to State statute, these revenues flow directly from the State to MAC, and flow to the City only to the extent not required by MAC for debt service, reserve fund requirements and for operating expenses. The City includes such revenues as City revenues and reports the amount retained by MAC from such revenues as "MAC Debt Service Funding," although the City has no control over the statutory application of such revenues to the extent MAC requires them. City "Debt Service" includes, and "MAC Debt Service Funding" is reduced by, payments by the City of debt service on City obligations held by MAC. Personal income taxes for the 1994 through 1998 fiscal years include \$200 million, \$167 million, \$185 million, \$90 million and \$185 million of Criminal Justice Fund revenues, respectively, and excludes \$16 million in fiscal year 1998 paid to the Finance Authority. "Debt Service" does not include debt service on Finance Authority obligations in fiscal year 1998.
- (4) Other Taxes includes transfers of net OTB revenues. For further information regarding the City's revenues from Other Taxes, see "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Other Taxes."
- (5) Total Revenues and Transfers and Total Expenditures and Transfers exclude Inter-Fund Revenues.
- (6) The General Fund surplus is the surplus after discretionary and other transfers and expenditures. The City had General Fund operating surpluses of \$2.086 billion, \$1.367 billion, \$229 million, \$71 million and \$72 million before discretionary and other transfers and expenditures for the 1998, 1997, 1996, 1995 and 1994 fiscal years, respectively. Discretionary and other transfers are included in Debt Service, MAC Debt Service Funding and for transit subsidies in All Other.

### Forecast of 1999 Results

The following table compares the forecast for the 1999 fiscal year contained in the Expense Budget adopted in June, 1998, prior to the financial plan submitted to the Control Board on June 26, 1998 (the "June 1998 Forecast") with the Financial Plan published on January 28, 1999 (the "January 1999 Forecast"). These forecasts were prepared on a basis consistent with GAAP. For information regarding recent developments, see "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS."

	June 1998 Forecast	January 1999 Forecast	Increase (Decrease) from June 1998 Forecast
(In Millions)			
<b>REVENUES</b>			
Taxes			
General Property Tax .....	\$ 7,626	\$ 7,527	\$ (99)(1)
Other Taxes .....	11,925	12,817	892 (2)
Tax Audit Revenue .....	558	508	(50)
Miscellaneous Revenues .....	3,226	3,342	116
Unrestricted Intergovernmental Aid .....	565	606	41
Other Categorical Grants .....	302	325	23 (3)
Inter-Fund Revenues .....	271	270	(1)
Less: Intra-City Revenues .....	(723)	(760)	(37)
Disallowances Against Categorical Grants .....	(15)	(15)	0
Total City Funds .....	\$23,735	\$24,620	\$ 885
Federal Categorical Grants .....	3,968	4,227	259 (3)
State Categorical Grants .....	6,381	6,757	376 (3)
Total Revenues .....	<u>\$34,084</u>	<u>\$35,604</u>	<u>\$1,520</u>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>			
Personal Services .....	\$18,390	\$18,649	\$ 259 (4)
Other Than Personal Services .....	14,542	14,746	204 (5)
Debt Service .....	906	1,290	384 (6)
Budget Stabilization Account .....	300	1,579	1,279 (7)
MAC Debt Service Funding .....	469	0	(469)(6)
General Reserve .....	200	100	(100)
Total Expenditures .....	<u>\$34,807</u>	<u>\$36,364</u>	<u>\$1,557</u>
Less: Intra-City Expenses .....	(723)	(760)	(37)
Total Expenditures .....	<u>\$34,084</u>	<u>\$35,604</u>	<u>\$1,520</u>
<b>SURPLUS</b> .....	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>

- (1) The decrease in General Property Tax resulted from a re-estimate of the reserve for uncollectibles, which increased the reserve by \$88 million, an increase in the refund estimate of \$38 million, and a reduction in collections from prior year delinquencies of \$33 million, offset by an increase in lien sale proceeds (net) of \$60 million.
- (2) The increase in Other Taxes resulted from increases in the personal income tax of \$525 million, business taxes of \$22 million, the sales tax of \$50 million, real estate transaction taxes of \$224 million and all other taxes of \$71 million.
- (3) The increases in Federal, State and Other Categorical Grants resulted primarily from budget modifications increasing such grants that were processed during the fiscal year, offset by reductions to reflect revenues based on actual expenditures.
- (4) The increase in Personal Services is primarily due to approximately \$100 million of increased pension costs and increased spending in the Police Department for overtime and new hiring and in the Sanitation Department for recycling.
- (5) The increase in Other Than Personal Services is primarily due to approximately \$204 million of increased BOE spending and \$94 million of increased social services spending and \$318 million in Federal, State and Other Categorical budget modifications processed from July to October, offset by a reduction in prior payables of \$300 million and in miscellaneous budget expenditures of \$198 million.
- (6) The aggregate net decrease in Debt Service and MAC Debt Service Funding is primarily due to reductions in debt service resulting from lower interest costs and short-term borrowing savings. Debt Service does not include debt service on Finance Authority obligations.
- (7) The increase in the Budget Stabilization Account is due to a projected discretionary transfer to the General Debt Service Fund in the 1999 fiscal year for Debt Service due in fiscal year 2000.

## SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN

The following table sets forth the City's projected operations on a basis consistent with GAAP for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years as contained in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan. This table should be read in conjunction with the accompanying notes, "Actions to Close the Gaps" and "Assumptions," below. For information regarding recent developments, see "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS."

	1999-2003				
	Fiscal Years(1)(2)				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
	(In Millions)				
<b>REVENUES</b>					
Taxes					
General Property Tax(3) .....	\$ 7,527	\$ 7,843	\$ 8,186	\$ 8,568	\$ 9,047
Other Taxes(3)(4) .....	12,817	12,049	12,232	12,562	13,120
Tax Audit Revenue .....	508	490	482	472	472
Tax Reduction Program(5) .....	0	(338)	(410)	(461)	(473)
Miscellaneous Revenues(6) .....	3,342	4,051	3,776	3,700	3,566
Unrestricted Intergovernmental Aid .....	606	565	564	564	564
Anticipated Federal Actions .....	0	65	65	65	65
Other Categorical Grants .....	325	301	286	284	284
Less: Intra-City Revenues .....	(760)	(732)	(732)	(732)	(732)
Disallowances Against Categorical Grants .....	(15)	(15)	(15)	(15)	(15)
Total City Funds .....	\$24,350	\$24,279	\$24,434	\$25,007	\$25,898
Inter-Fund Revenues(7) .....	270	281	280	280	280
Total City Funds and Inter-Fund Revenues .....	\$24,620	\$24,560	\$24,714	\$25,287	\$26,178
Federal Categorical Grants .....	4,227	3,941	3,867	3,827	3,805
State Categorical Grants .....	6,757	6,963	7,010	7,049	7,056
Total Revenues .....	\$35,604	\$35,464	\$35,591	\$36,163	\$37,039
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>					
Personal Service(8) .....	\$18,649	\$19,448	\$19,470	\$19,388	\$19,407
Other Than Personal Service .....	14,746	14,563	14,879	15,260	15,490
Debt Service .....	1,290	1,229	2,739	3,199	3,351
Budget Stabilization Account(9) .....	1,579	345	0	0	0
MAC Debt Service Funding(4) .....	0	411	476	488	490
General Reserve .....	100	200	200	200	200
Total Expenditures .....	\$36,364	\$36,196	\$37,764	\$38,535	\$38,938
Less: Intra-City Expenses .....	(760)	(732)	(732)	(732)	(732)
Net Total Expenditures .....	\$35,604	\$35,464	\$37,032	\$37,803	\$38,206
GAP TO BE CLOSED .....	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$(1,441)	\$(1,640)	\$(1,167)

(1) The four-year financial plan for the 1998 through 2001 fiscal years, as submitted to the Control Board on June 10, 1997, contained the following projections for the 1998-2001 fiscal years: (i) for 1998, total revenues of \$33.373 billion and total expenditures of \$33.373 billion; (ii) for 1999, total revenues of \$33.021 billion and total expenditures of \$34.801 billion with a gap to be closed of \$1.780 billion; (iii) for 2000, total revenues of \$33.561 billion and total expenditures of \$36.370 billion with a gap to be closed of \$2.809 billion; and (iv) for 2001, total revenues of \$34.392 billion and total expenditures of \$37.033 billion with a gap to be closed of \$2.641 billion.

The four-year financial plan for the 1997 through 2000 fiscal years, as submitted to the Control Board on June 21, 1996, contained the following projections for the 1997-2000 fiscal years: (i) for 1997, total revenues of \$32.981 billion and total expenditures of \$32.981 billion; (ii) for 1998, total revenues of \$32.155 billion and total expenditures of \$33.839 billion, with a gap to be closed of \$1.684 billion; (iii) for 1999, total revenues of \$32.310 billion and total expenditures of \$34.969 billion, with a gap to be closed of \$2.659 billion; and (iv) for 2000, total revenues of \$32.829 billion and total expenditures of \$36.250 billion with a gap to be closed of \$3.421 billion.

The four-year financial plan for the 1996 through 1999 fiscal years, as submitted to the Control Board on July 11, 1995, contained the following projections for the 1996-1999 fiscal years: (i) for 1996, total revenues of \$31.460 billion and total expenditures of \$31.460 billion; (ii) for 1997, total revenues of \$31.620 billion and total expenditures of \$32.508 billion, with a gap to be closed of \$.888 billion; (iii) for 1998, total revenues of \$32.055 billion and total

*(Footnotes continued on next page)*



(Footnotes continued from previous page)

expenditures of \$33.514 billion, with a gap to be closed of \$1.459 billion; and (iv) for 1999, total revenues of \$32.906 billion and total expenditures of \$34.344 billion with a gap to be closed of \$1.438 billion.

- (2) The Financial Plan combines the operating revenues and expenditures of the City, the BOE and CUNY. The Financial Plan does not include the total operations of HHC, but does include the City's subsidy to HHC and the City's share of HHC revenues and expenditures related to HHC's role as a Medicaid provider. Certain Covered Organizations and PBCs which provide governmental services to the City, such as the Transit Authority, are separately constituted and their revenues (other than net OTB revenues), are not included in the Financial Plan; however, City subsidies and certain other payments to these organizations are included. Revenues and expenditures are presented net of intra-City items, which are revenues and expenditures arising from transactions between City agencies.
- (3) General Property Tax includes \$153 million, \$43 million, \$37 million, \$34 million and \$29 million net revenue from the sale of real property tax liens in fiscal years 1999 through 2003, respectively, and property tax relief for owners of condominiums and co-operatives totaling \$156 million in the 1999 fiscal year. General Property Tax projections include the effects of the State Tax Relief Program ("STAR Program") which will reduce the property tax revenues by an estimated \$32 million in fiscal year 1999, \$87 million in fiscal year 2000, \$132 million in fiscal year 2001, \$176 million in fiscal year 2002 and \$176 million in fiscal year 2003. In addition, Other Taxes includes the effects of the STAR Program, which will reduce personal income taxes by an estimated \$85 million, \$228 million, \$376 million, \$504 million and \$534 million in fiscal years 1999 through 2003, respectively, and will increase Other Taxes by \$117 million, \$315 million, \$508 million, \$680 million and \$710 million in fiscal years 1999 through 2003, respectively, to be provided to the City by the State as reimbursement for the reduced property tax and personal income tax revenues resulting from the STAR Program.
- (4) Other Taxes includes amounts paid and expected to be paid to MAC by the State from sales tax receipts, stock transfer tax receipts and State per capita aid otherwise payable by the State to the City. Pursuant to State statute, these revenues flow directly from the State to MAC, and flow to the City only to the extent not required by MAC for debt service, reserve fund requirements and operating expenses. The City includes such revenues as City revenues and reports the amount retained by MAC from such revenues as "MAC Debt Service Funding", although the City has no control over the statutory application of such revenues to the extent MAC requires them. Estimates of City "Debt Service" include, and estimates of "MAC Debt Service Funding" are reduced by, anticipated payments by the City of debt service on City obligations held by MAC. Other Taxes includes transfers of net OTB revenues. Other Taxes also reflects, commencing on the 1999 fiscal year, the expiration of the 12.5% surcharge, but includes the assumed extension of the 14% personal income tax surcharge for subsequent fiscal years, and the base resident and non-resident rate schedule through tax year 2001. Personal income taxes will flow directly from the State to the Finance Authority, and flow to the City only to the extent not required by the Finance Authority for debt service, reserves and operating expenses. Sales taxes will flow directly from the State to the Finance Authority, after required payments are made to MAC, to the extent necessary to provide statutory coverage. Other Taxes does not include amounts that are expected to be paid to the Finance Authority totalling \$144 million, \$284 million, \$446 million, \$548 million and \$577 million in the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively. Estimates of Debt Service do not include debt service on Finance Authority obligations.
- (5) Tax Reduction Program includes the elimination of the City sales tax on all clothing as of December 1, 1999, and the extension of current tax reductions for owners of cooperative and condominium apartments starting in fiscal year 2000, both of which are subject to State legislative approval, reduction of the commercial rent tax commencing in fiscal year 2000, and a \$100 million annual tax reduction and reform program, to be based on the advice of a tax reform task force, starting in fiscal year 2000.
- (6) Miscellaneous Revenues reflects the receipt by the City of funds from the settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies. The Financial Plan contemplates the sale of the City's right to receive such funds to TSASC which will issue debt payable from such funds to finance approximately \$2.5 billion of capital projects. The Financial Plan currently reflects the debt service costs of financing these projects as though they were financed with City general obligation bonds. Once TSASC issues bonds, it will use a portion of the tobacco settlement funds to pay its debt service costs, and the City miscellaneous revenues and City debt service costs currently reflected in the Financial Plan will be reduced accordingly.
- (7) Inter-Fund Revenues represents General Fund expenditures, properly includable in the Capital Budget, made on behalf of the Capital Projects Fund pursuant to inter-fund agreements.
- (8) For an explanation of projected expenditures for personal service costs, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 Financial Plan—Assumptions—Expenditure Assumptions—1. PERSONAL SERVICE COSTS."
- (9) The Budget Stabilization Account includes projected discretionary transfers to the General Debt Service Fund in the 1999 fiscal year of \$1.6 billion for debt service due in fiscal year 2000 and in fiscal year 2000 of \$345 million for debt service due in fiscal year 2001.

Anticipated Federal Actions include additional Federal and State revenue sharing payments of \$65 million in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003. Various actions proposed in the Financial Plan are uncertain. See "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS." If these measures cannot be implemented, the City will be

required to take other actions to decrease expenditures or increase revenues to maintain a balanced financial plan. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Certain Reports" and "—Assumptions."

### **Actions to Close the Remaining Gaps**

In connection with the Financial Plan, the City has outlined a gap-closing program for fiscal years 2001, 2002 and 2003 to eliminate the respective \$1.4 billion, \$1.6 billion and \$1.2 billion projected budget gaps for such fiscal years. This program, which is not specified in detail, assumes for the 2001, 2002 and 2003 fiscal years, respectively, additional agency programs to reduce expenditures or increase revenues by \$600 million, \$675 million and \$500 million; additional Federal actions of \$310 million, \$350 million and \$225 million; additional State actions of \$431 million, \$515 million and \$342 million; and the availability of \$100 million, \$100 million and \$100 million of the General Reserve.

The City's projected budget gaps for the 2002 and 2003 fiscal years do not reflect the savings expected to result from the prior years' programs to close the gaps set forth in the Financial Plan. Thus, for example, recurring savings anticipated from the actions which the City proposes to take to balance the fiscal year 2001 budget are not taken into account in projecting the budget gaps for the 2002 and 2003 fiscal years.

Although the City has maintained balanced budgets in each of its last eighteen fiscal years and is projected to achieve balanced operating results for the 1999 and 2000 fiscal years, there can be no assurance that the gap-closing actions proposed in the Financial Plan can be successfully implemented or that the City will maintain a balanced budget in future years without additional State aid, revenue increases or expenditure reductions. Additional tax increases and reductions in essential City services could adversely affect the City's economic base.

### **Assumptions**

The 1999-2003 Financial Plan is based on numerous assumptions, including the condition of the City's and the region's economies and modest employment growth and the concomitant receipt of economically sensitive tax revenues in the amounts projected. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan is subject to various other uncertainties and contingencies relating to, among other factors, the extent, if any, to which wage increases for City employees exceed the annual wage costs assumed for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years; continuation of projected interest earnings assumptions for pension fund assets and current assumptions with respect to wages for City employees affecting the City's required pension fund contributions; the willingness and ability of the State to provide the aid contemplated by the Financial Plan and to take various other actions to assist the City; the ability of HHC, the BOE and other such agencies to maintain balanced budgets; the willingness of the Federal government to provide the amount of Federal aid contemplated in the Financial Plan; the impact on City revenues and expenditures of Federal and State welfare reform and any future legislation affecting Medicare or other entitlement programs; adoption of the City's budgets by the City Council in substantially the forms submitted by the Mayor; the ability of the City to implement cost reduction initiatives, and the success with which the City controls expenditures; the impact of conditions in the real estate market on real estate tax revenues; the City's ability to market its securities successfully in the public credit markets; and unanticipated expenditures that may be incurred as a result of the need to maintain the City's infrastructure. See "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS." Certain of these assumptions have been questioned by the City Comptroller and other public officials. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Certain Reports."

The State Financial Plan for the 1998-1999 fiscal year projects balance on a cash basis for the 1998-1999 fiscal year, with a closing balance in the General Fund of \$799 million, after reserving a projected \$1.79 billion surplus for use in future years. The Governor presented his 1999-2000 Executive Budget to the Legislature on January 27, 1999, which was subsequently amended by the Governor on February 12, 1999. The State Financial Plan for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, which reflects the 1999-2000 Executive Budget, projects balance on a cash basis for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, with a closing balance in the General Fund of \$2.5 billion, including a projected reserve of \$1.79 billion for use in fiscal years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. The Legislature and the State Comptroller will review the Governor's Executive Budget and are expected to comment on it. There can be no assurance that the Legislature will enact the Executive Budget into law, or that the State's adopted budget projections will not differ materially and adversely from the projections set forth in the Executive Budget.

Depending on the amount of State aid provided to localities, and whether the Medicaid cost containment initiatives proposed in the Executive Budget are approved by the State, the City might be required to make substantial additional changes in its Financial Plan.

The State Financial Plan contains projections of a potential imbalance in the 2000-2001 fiscal year of \$1.14 billion and in the 2001-2002 fiscal year of \$2.07 billion, assuming implementation of the 1999-2000 Executive Budget recommendations, the application of the \$1.79 billion reserve fund and implementation of \$500 million of unspecified efficiency initiatives and other actions in each of the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 fiscal years, respectively. The State has reached a tentative agreement with the Civil Service Employees Association ("CSEA") on a new four-year labor contract. If this agreement is ratified by CSEA and approved by the Legislature, and the terms of that contract applied to the entire Executive Branch workforce, the State estimates that the budget gaps would increase by \$275 million in 2000-2001 and \$475 million in 2001-2002. The Executive Budget identifies various risks, including either a financial market or broader economic correction during the period, which could adversely affect these projections.

In recent years, including this year, the State has failed to adopt a budget prior to the beginning of its fiscal year. A prolonged delay in the adoption of the State's budget beyond the statutory April 1 deadline without interim appropriations could delay the projected receipt by the City of State aid, and there can be no assurance that State budgets in future fiscal years will be adopted by the April 1 statutory deadline. The State's Annual Information Statement, updates and any supplements thereto, including the update dated February 9, 1999, as supplemented on February 18, 1999, may be obtained by contacting the Division of the Budget, State Capitol, Albany, New York 12224, Tel.: (518) 473-8705.

Standard & Poor's rates the State's general obligation bonds A, and Moody's rates the State's general obligation bonds A2. On August 28, 1997, Standard & Poor's revised its rating on the State's general obligation bonds from A- to A.

The projections and assumptions contained in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan are subject to revision which may involve substantial change, and no assurance can be given that these estimates and projections, which include actions which the City expects will be taken but which are not within the City's control, will be realized. For information regarding certain recent developments, see "SECTION I: RECENT FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS."

### *Revenue Assumptions*

#### 1. GENERAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The Financial Plan assumes that after noticeable improvements in the City's economy during calendar years 1997 and 1998, economic growth will slow, with local employment increasing modestly during fiscal years 2000 through 2003. This assumption is based on a slow recovery in the Asian and Latin American economies starting in fiscal year 2000 and continuing restrictive monetary policy. However, there can be no assurance that the economic projections assumed in the Financial Plan will occur or that the tax revenues projected in the Financial Plan to be received will be received in the amounts anticipated.

The following table presents a forecast of the key economic indicators for the calendar years 1998 through 2003. This forecast is based upon information available in January 1999.

**FORECAST OF KEY ECONOMIC INDICATORS**

<u>U.S. ECONOMY</u>	<u>Calendar Years</u>					
	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
<i>Economic Activity and Income</i>						
Real GDP (billions of 1992 dollars).....	7,542.8	7,748.7	7,904.3	8,066.2	8,216.8	8,391.1
Percent Change .....	3.8	2.7	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1
Pre-tax Corporate Profits (\$ billions) .....	720.6	715.9	688.1	696.0	724.9	765.8
Percent Change .....	(1.9)	(0.7)	(3.9)	1.1	4.2	5.6
Personal Income (\$ billions).....	7,123.8	7,451.4	7,764.2	8,084.7	8,419.1	8,796.6
Percent Change .....	5.0	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.5
Non-Agricultural Employment (millions) .....	125.8	127.7	129.3	130.7	131.8	133.1
Change From Prior Year .....	3.1	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.1	1.3
Unemployment Rate .....	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.9	5.3	5.5
CPI-All Urban (1982-84=100) .....	163.1	166.7	170.5	174.7	179.3	184.2
Percent Change .....	1.6	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.7
Wage Rate (\$ per year) .....	32,980	34,322	35,505	36,604	37,732	38,943
Percent Change .....	4.0	4.1	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.2
3-month Treasury Bill Rate .....	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Federal Funds Rate .....	5.4	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0
 <u>NEW YORK CITY ECONOMY</u>						
Personal Income (\$ billions).....	261.9	272.1	281.1	291.3	302.5	314.9
Percent Change .....	4.7	3.9	3.3	3.6	3.9	4.1
Non-Agricultural Employment (thousands) .....	3,491.1	3,546.6	3,566.6	3,594.4	3,611.8	3,630.2
Change From Prior Year .....	79.8	55.5	20.0	27.8	17.4	18.5
Real Gross City Product (billions of 1992 dollars) .....	343.4	351.7	354.9	360.5	367.5	374.9
Percent Change .....	4.6	2.4	0.9	1.6	2.0	2.0
Wage Rate (\$ per year) .....	51,233	53,208	54,849	56,556	58,646	60,843
Percent Change .....	4.6	3.9	3.1	3.1	3.7	3.7
CPI-All Urban NY-NJ Area (1982-84=100).....	173.7	177.6	181.9	186.5	191.7	197.1
Percent Change .....	1.7	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.8	2.8

Source: OMB model for the City economy.

## 2. REAL ESTATE TAX

Projections of real estate tax revenues are based on a number of assumptions, including, among others, assumptions relating to the tax rate, the assessed valuation of the City's taxable real estate, the delinquency rate, debt service needs, a reserve for uncollectible taxes and the operating limit. See "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Real Estate Tax."

The delinquency rate for the 1998 fiscal year was 3.50%. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan projects delinquency rates of 3.50%, 3.43%, 3.30%, 3.20% and 3.10%, respectively, for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years. For information concerning the delinquency rates for prior years, see "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Real Estate Tax—*Collection of the Real Estate Tax*". For a description of proceedings seeking real estate tax refunds from the City, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—*Taxes*."

## 3. OTHER TAXES

The following table sets forth amounts of revenues (net of refunds) from taxes other than the real estate tax projected to be received by the City in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan. The amounts set forth below include projected tax program revenues and exclude the Criminal Justice Fund and audit revenues.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
	(In Millions)				
Personal Income(1) .....	\$ 5,028	\$ 4,313	\$ 4,214	\$ 4,173	\$ 4,417
General Corporation .....	1,426	1,309	1,254	1,301	1,365
Banking Corporation .....	367	353	403	415	432
Unincorporated Business Income .....	592	586	622	665	698
Sales(2) .....	3,220	3,235	3,269	3,346	3,459
Commercial Rent(3) .....	347	350	366	377	395
Real Property Transfer .....	390	344	335	345	354
Mortgage Recording .....	383	306	313	320	328
Utility .....	249	231	232	217	218
All Other(4) .....	815	1,022	1,224	1,403	1,454
Total .....	<u>\$12,817</u>	<u>\$12,049</u>	<u>\$12,232</u>	<u>\$12,562</u>	<u>\$13,120</u>

(1) Personal Income does not include \$144 million, \$284 million, \$446 million, \$548 million and \$577 million of personal income tax revenues projected to be paid to the Finance Authority for debt service in the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively. Personal Income includes revenues which would be generated by extension of the 14% personal income tax surcharge beyond calendar year 1999 which results in revenues aggregating to \$181 million, \$560 million, \$574 million and \$621 million in the 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 fiscal years, respectively, and which requires enactment of State legislation. Personal Income reflects the expiration of the 12.5% personal income tax surcharge for fiscal years 1999 through 2003. These projections include the effects of the State funded STAR Program, which will reduce personal income tax revenues by an estimated \$85 million, \$228 million, \$376 million, \$504 million and \$534 million in the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively. The State will reimburse the City for such reduced revenues.

(2) Sales includes amounts for MAC debt service of \$411 million, \$476 million, \$488 million and \$490 million in the 2000 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively.

(3) Commercial Rent excludes amounts dedicated to the New York City Sports Facilities Corporation of \$96 million, \$194 million, \$289 million and \$303 million in the 2000 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively.

(4) All Other includes, among others, stock transfer tax, OTB net revenues, cigarette, beer and liquor taxes, the hotel tax and the automobile use tax. Stock transfer tax is \$114 million in each of the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years. All Other also includes \$117 million, \$315 million, \$508 million, \$680 million and \$710 million in fiscal years 1999 through 2003, respectively, to be provided to the City by the State as reimbursement for the reduced property tax and personal income tax revenues resulting from the STAR Program.

The 1999-2003 Financial Plan reflects the following assumptions regarding projected baseline revenues from Other Taxes: (i) with respect to personal income tax revenues, slower income growth commencing in the 1999 fiscal year, reflecting moderation in securities industry profits and a decline in the growth of capital gains realizations in calendar year 1999; (ii) with respect to the general corporation tax, a slowdown in the outlook for the securities industry and the economy in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 and the impact of limited liability company legislation which will reduce the number of corporate entities subject to the general corporation tax over time; (iii) with respect to the banking corporation tax, a decline in the liability estimate in fiscal year 1999, reflecting a slowdown in securities activities and loan growth; (iv) with respect to the unincorporated business tax, moderation in securities industry profits starting in fiscal 1999 and the impact of limited liability company legislation which will increase the number of unincorporated entities subject to the unincorporated business tax over time; (v) with respect to the sales tax, a slowdown in the economy in the 1999 fiscal year and wage income and economic growth in calendar year 2000; (vi) with respect to the mortgage recording and real property transfer taxes, growth in fiscal year 1999 reflecting increased activity in the commercial and residential real estate markets, with moderating growth thereafter; and (vii) with respect to the commercial rent tax, continuing declines in the 1999 fiscal year and modest growth in fiscal year 2000 resulting from a reduction in the base rent subject to the tax, offset by continuing improvement in occupancy and rental rates, and increased growth in the 2001 fiscal

year and thereafter due to assumed continued strength in Manhattan commercial real estate. The 1999-2002 Financial Plan also assumes the timely extension by the State Legislature of the current rate structures for the non-resident earnings tax, for the resident personal income tax, for the general corporation tax, for the two special sales taxes and for the cigarette tax. Legislation extending the general corporation tax, the two special sales taxes and the cigarette tax to December 31, 1999 has been enacted. Legislation extending the 14% personal income tax surcharge to December 31, 1999 was also enacted. In addition, legislation has been enacted extending the current rate structure for the non-resident earnings tax and the resident personal income tax to December 31, 1999. On December 31, 1999, a lower rate schedule for the resident personal income tax with a maximum rate of 1.61% is to become effective, unless the current rate schedule is extended, as has been the case since 1989. The rate schedule for the resident personal income tax is scheduled to further decline to a maximum rate of 1.48% on January 1, 2001. The Financial Plan assumes the timely extension of the current maximum rate of 3.4% for the resident personal income tax. The Financial Plan reflects that the 12.5% personal income tax surcharge has not been renewed.

#### 4. MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

The following table sets forth amounts of miscellaneous revenues projected to be received by the City in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
	(In Millions)				
Licenses, Permits and Franchises .....	\$ 275	\$ 276	\$ 275	\$ 276	\$ 276
Interest Income .....	131	110	107	109	110
Charges for Services .....	425	419	414	414	414
Water and Sewer Payments(1) .....	834	799	813	778	778
Rental Income .....	108	103	443	259	224
Fines and Forfeitures .....	470	491	490	485	485
Other .....	339	1,121	502	647	547
Intra-City Revenues .....	<u>760</u>	<u>732</u>	<u>732</u>	<u>732</u>	<u>732</u>
Total .....	<u>\$3,342</u>	<u>\$4,051</u>	<u>\$3,776</u>	<u>\$3,700</u>	<u>\$3,566</u>

(1) Received from the Water Board. For further information regarding the Water Board, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Long-Term Capital and Financing Program."

The 1999-2003 Financial Plan projects that aggregate miscellaneous revenues categories will remain relatively stable with offsetting increases and declines. Rental Income in the 2001 through 2003 fiscal years includes \$365 million, \$185 million and \$155 million from the Port Authority as rent payments for the City's airports, of which \$350 million, \$170 million and \$140 million in the 2001 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively, is currently the subject of a dispute with the Port Authority.

In an arbitration against the Port Authority, the City has asserted that it is owed additional rent under the John F. Kennedy International and LaGuardia airports lease. The City contends, among other things, that, in determining the amount of rent due to the City, the Port Authority has erroneously excluded from the calculation of gross revenue the amounts of passenger facility charges ("PFCs") which the Port Authority has collected since 1992 (the "PFC claim"), and erroneously included in the calculation of operation and maintenance expense certain general and administrative, indirect and other expenses. In denying a stay application brought by the Port Authority, the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court held on June 27, 1996 that the City's claims must be arbitrated and that the PFC claim does not raise any issue of Federal law so long as any additional rent to be paid on the claim would be paid from funds other than PFCs. On November 20, 1996, the Chief Counsel of the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") issued a letter, at the Port Authority's request, stating that it was the FAA's position that under Federal law the sums of PFCs collected by the Port Authority could not be included in the determination of rent. On January 21, 1997, the Chief Counsel stated in a letter to the City's Corporation Counsel that his prior letter was an "advisory opinion" that by its terms was not binding. If the City prevails on the PFC claim, the additional rent resulting from that claim would not be paid from PFCs; rather, such payment would be made from the Port Authority's consolidated operating funds.

The City is the plaintiff in litigation against the tobacco industry and its trade organizations. In addition, the City is a class member in a similar lawsuit by the State against the four largest cigarette companies and certain trade organizations. On December 23, 1998, the judge in the State lawsuit approved a settlement of that litigation under which the State and its political subdivisions would be paid approximately \$1 billion per year adjusted for inflation, but subject to a number of contingencies related to the sale of tobacco products and Federal actions. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Certain Reports." Pursuant to the settlement, the City would receive 26.670% of that amount. The City disputes such allocation and contends that it is entitled to a larger share. The City has appealed the allocation. Miscellaneous Revenues—Other reflects \$300 million, \$250 million, \$300 million and \$300 million of projected resources in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, from the receipt by the City of funds from the settlement of litigation with certain tobacco companies. In addition Miscellaneous Revenues—Other includes the receipt in fiscal year 2000 of \$345 million from the proposed sale of the Coliseum and \$100 million from the proposed sale of mortgages and other assets.

#### 5. UNRESTRICTED INTERGOVERNMENTAL AID

The following table sets forth amounts of unrestricted intergovernmental aid projected to be received by the City in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
	(In Millions)				
State Revenue Sharing .....	\$327	\$327	\$327	\$327	\$327
Other Aid .....	<u>279</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>237</u>
Total .....	<u>\$606</u>	<u>\$565</u>	<u>\$564</u>	<u>\$564</u>	<u>\$564</u>

The Other Aid category primarily consists of approximately \$158 million annually from aid associated with the State takeover of long-term care Medicaid costs, \$41 million annually from New York State audits, \$23 million annually in inter-governmental transfers, and \$48 million in prior year claims settlements.

The receipt of State Revenue Sharing funds could be affected by potential prior claims asserted by the State. For information concerning projected State budget gaps and the possible impact on State aid to the City, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions."

#### 6. FEDERAL AND STATE CATEGORICAL GRANTS

The following table sets forth amounts of Federal and State categorical grants projected to be received by the City in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
	(In Millions)				
<b>Federal</b>					
JTPA .....	\$ 121	\$ 123	\$ 123	\$ 123	\$ 123
Community Development(1) .....	288	255	255	255	255
Welfare .....	2,295	2,179	2,134	2,137	2,113
Education .....	976	940	940	940	940
Other .....	<u>547</u>	<u>444</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>372</u>	<u>374</u>
Total .....	<u>\$4,227</u>	<u>\$3,941</u>	<u>\$3,867</u>	<u>\$3,827</u>	<u>\$3,805</u>
<b>State</b>					
Welfare .....	\$1,537	\$1,470	\$1,445	\$1,445	\$1,430
Education .....	4,472	4,508	4,592	4,628	4,644
Higher Education .....	165	165	165	163	163
Health and Mental Health .....	281	269	268	267	267
Other .....	<u>302</u>	<u>551</u>	<u>540</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>552</u>
Total .....	<u>\$6,757</u>	<u>\$6,963</u>	<u>\$7,010</u>	<u>\$7,049</u>	<u>\$7,056</u>

(1) This amount represents the projected annual level of new funds. Unspent Community Development grants from prior fiscal years could increase the amount actually received.

The 1999-2003 Financial Plan assumes that all existing Federal and State categorical grant programs will continue, unless specific legislation provides for their termination or adjustment, and assumes increases in aid where increased costs are projected for existing grant programs. For information concerning projected State budget gaps and the possible impact on State aid to the City, see "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—

Assumptions.” As of January 31, 1999, approximately 13.26% of the City’s full-time employees (consisting of employees of the mayoral agencies and the BOE) were paid by JTPA funds, Community Development funds, water and sewer funds and from other sources not funded by unrestricted revenues of the City. In the 1999 fiscal year, the City will receive \$222.5 million from the Community Development Block grant. This is \$6.5 million less than the amount received in the 1998 fiscal year.

A major component of Federal categorical aid to the City is the Community Development program. Pursuant to Federal legislation, Community Development grants are provided to cities primarily to aid low and moderate income persons by improving housing facilities, parks and other capital improvements, by providing certain social programs and by promoting economic development. These grants are based on a formula that takes into consideration such factors as population, housing overcrowding and poverty.

The City’s receipt of categorical aid is contingent upon the satisfaction of certain statutory conditions and is subject to subsequent audits, possible disallowances and possible prior claims by the State or Federal governments. The general practice of the State and Federal governments has been to deduct the amount of any disallowances against the current year’s payment. Substantial disallowances of aid claims may be asserted during the course of the 1999-2003 Financial Plan. The amounts of such disallowances attributable to prior years declined from \$124 million in the 1977 fiscal year to \$1 million in the 1998 fiscal year. This decrease reflects favorable experience with the level of disallowances in recent years, which may not continue. As of June 30, 1998, the City had an accumulated reserve of \$182 million for future disallowances of categorical aid.

On August 5, 1997, the President signed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 into law. That act includes various tax reductions, reinstates SSI and Medicaid eligibility for some immigrants, adds significant funding for State Welfare to Work programs and reduces Medicaid Disproportionate Share payments. In May 1998, the President signed a \$216 billion six-year surface transportation plan, substantially increasing spending to repair roads and expand mass transit in the City.

On October 21, 1998 the President signed the Federal fiscal year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act, which provides funding for numerous key programs for the City. This legislation provides the City with additional funding for education, specifically in the areas of Title I, hiring new teachers and the Head Start program. This legislation also includes additional funding for Section 8 public housing vouchers and restores reductions to criminal justice block grant funding originally proposed in the President’s Federal fiscal year 1999 budget. Congress agreed to the social services block grant reduction proposed in the President’s budget at the \$1.909 billion level, representing a \$390 million nationwide reduction below the Federal fiscal year 1998 appropriation level.

On February 1, 1999 the President released the Executive Budget for fiscal year 2000, which proposed the elimination of criminal justice block grant funding. The President proposed increases in education funding in the areas of Title I Grants, special education programs, charter schools, and class size reduction. Increases were also proposed for child care and child abuse prevention and for Head Start and various housing programs including 100,000 new Section 8 vouchers. Consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, the President’s budget proposes increased funding for highways and mass transit.

*Expenditure Assumptions*

I. PERSONAL SERVICE COSTS

The following table sets forth projected expenditures for personal service costs contained in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan.

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
	(In Millions)				
Wages and Salaries .....	\$13,539	\$13,959	\$14,000	\$14,056	\$14,070
Pensions .....	1,495	1,370	1,216	933	804
Other Fringe Benefits .....	3,370	3,614	3,701	3,852	3,985
Reserve for Collective Bargaining(1) .....	245	505	553	547	548
Total .....	<u>\$18,649</u>	<u>\$19,448</u>	<u>\$19,470</u>	<u>\$19,388</u>	<u>\$19,407</u>

(1) The Reserve for Collective Bargaining provides funding for prospective labor settlements for all agencies.



The 1999-2003 Financial Plan projects that the authorized number of City-funded employees whose salaries are paid directly from City funds, as opposed to Federal or State funds or water and sewer funds, will increase from an estimated level of 210,889 on June 30, 1999 to an estimated level of 212,072 by June 30, 2003, before implementation of the gap-closing programs included in the Financial Plan.

Contracts with all of the City's municipal unions expired in the 1995 and 1996 fiscal years. The Financial Plan reflects the costs of the settlements and arbitration awards with the United Federation of Teachers ("UFT"), a coalition of unions headed by District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees ("District Council 37") and other bargaining units, which together represent approximately 98% of the City's workforce, and assumes that the City will reach agreement with its remaining municipal unions under terms which are generally consistent with such settlements and arbitration awards. These contracts are approximately five years in length and have a total cumulative net increase of 13%. Assuming the City reaches similar settlements with its remaining municipal unions, the cost of all settlements for all City-funded employees would total \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1999 and exceed \$2 billion thereafter. The Financial Plan provides no additional wage increases for City employees after their contracts expire in fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

The terms of wage settlements could be determined through the impasse procedure in the New York City Collective Bargaining Law, which can impose a binding settlement.

For a discussion of the City's pension costs, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Pension Systems" and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note R."

## 2. OTHER THAN PERSONAL SERVICE COSTS

The following table sets forth projected other than personal service ("OTPS") expenditures contained in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
	(In Millions)				
Administrative OTPS.....	\$ 7,928	\$ 7,757	\$ 7,999	\$ 8,218	\$ 8,310
Public Assistance .....	2,290	2,099	2,052	2,060	2,030
Medical Assistance (Excluding City Medicaid Payments to HHC) .....	2,330	2,372	2,437	2,537	2,650
HHC Support.....	741	756	772	790	809
Other .....	<u>1,457</u>	<u>1,579</u>	<u>1,619</u>	<u>1,655</u>	<u>1,691</u>
Total .....	<u>\$14,746</u>	<u>\$14,563</u>	<u>\$14,879</u>	<u>\$15,260</u>	<u>\$15,490</u>

Legislation has been passed by the State which prohibits the disposal of solid waste in any landfill located within the City after December 31, 2001. The Financial Plan includes the estimated costs of phasing out the use of landfills located within the City under the category OTPS-Other. A suit has been commenced against the City by private individuals under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act seeking to compel the City to take certain measures or, alternatively, to close the Fresh Kills landfill. If, as a result of such litigation, the City is required to close the landfill earlier than required by State legislation, the City could incur additional costs during the Financial Plan period. The New York City Recycling Law, Local Law No. 19 ("Local Law No. 19") for the year 1989, set targets for increasing the tonnage of solid waste that is recycled by the Department of Sanitation and its contractors. Pursuant to court order, the City is currently required to recycle 2,100 tons per day of solid waste and is required to recycle 3,400 tons per day by July 1999 and 4,250 tons per day by July 2001. The City is currently recycling slightly over 2,100 tons per day of solid waste. The City may seek to obtain amendments to Local Law No. 19 to modify this requirement. If the City is unable to obtain such amendments and is required to fully implement Local Law No. 19, the City may incur substantial costs.

### *Administrative OTPS and Energy*

The 1999-2003 Financial Plan contains estimates of the City's administrative OTPS expenditures for general supplies and materials, equipment and selected contractual services and estimates of energy costs in the 1999 fiscal year. Thereafter, to account for inflation, selected OTPS expenditures are projected to rise by approximately 2.4%, 2.5%, 2.6% and 2.6% in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively. However, it is assumed that the savings from a procurement initiative will offset the need for funding projected increases in OTPS expenditures that result from the accounting for inflation. Energy costs for each of the 2000 through 2003

fiscal years are assumed to rise at varying rates of inflation, with total energy expenditures projected at \$470 million in the 1999 fiscal year, rising to \$503 million in fiscal year 2003.

#### *Public Assistance*

The average number of persons receiving income benefits under public assistance programs is projected to be 719,044 per month in the 1999 fiscal year. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan projects that the average number of recipients will decrease by 11.51% in the 1999 fiscal year from the average number of recipients in the 1998 fiscal year. The Financial Plan assumes that public assistance grant levels will remain flat in the 1999 fiscal year. Of total public assistance expenditures in the City for the 1999 fiscal year, the City-funded portion is projected to be \$451.0 million, a decrease of 9.85% from the 1998 fiscal year, and is projected to continue to decrease to \$379.8 million in fiscal year 2003.

#### *Medical Assistance*

Medical assistance payments projected in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan consist of payments to voluntary hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, home care and physicians and other medical practitioners. The City-funded portion of medical assistance payments is estimated at \$2.242 billion for the 1999 fiscal year and is expected to increase to \$2.572 billion in fiscal year 2003. Such payments include, among other things, City-funded Medicaid payments, but exclude City-funded Medicaid payments to HHC, as discussed below. City Medicaid costs (including City-funded Medicaid payments to HHC) assumed in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan do not include 81.2% of the non-Federal share of long-term care costs which have been assumed by the State. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan projects savings of \$727 million in the 1999 fiscal year due to the State having assumed such costs, and projects such savings will increase to \$805 million in fiscal year 2003.

#### *Health and Hospitals Corporation*

HHC operates under its own section of the 1999-2003 Financial Plan as a Covered Organization. HHC's financial plan projects City-funded expenditures of \$741 million for the 1999 fiscal year, increasing to \$809 million in fiscal year 2003. The City-funded expenditures in the 1999 fiscal year include \$51 million for the care of prisoners and uniformed personnel, \$12 million of general City support, \$612 million for the City's share of Medicaid payments and \$65 million primarily for mental health services.

The Financial Plan projects a balanced budget in fiscal year 1999 and gaps of \$34 million, \$177 million, \$210 million and \$177 million for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively. Various actions taken by HHC to close or reduce projected budget gaps include various personnel initiatives and other expenditure reductions and management initiatives. Total receipts are projected to be \$3.246 billion in fiscal year 1999, decreasing to \$3.096 billion in fiscal year 2003. Total disbursements are projected to be \$3.3 billion in fiscal year 1999, decreasing to \$3.273 billion in fiscal year 2003. These projections assume: (i) collective bargaining increases in personal services and fringe benefits that correspond to the agreements reached with the coalition of unions of City employees; (ii) continued headcount reduction through attrition and other initiatives; (iii) a decrease in other than personal service costs of 0.5%, 1.0% and 1.0%, in fiscal years 2000 through 2002, respectively, with no change in fiscal year 2003; (iv) decreases in affiliation contracts costs of 2.6%, 2.9% and 1.5% in fiscal years 2000 through 2002, respectively, with no change in fiscal year 2003; and (v) Medicaid decreases of 6.3%, 0.3% and 5.9% in fiscal years 2000 through 2002, respectively, with an increase of 1.5% in fiscal year 2003. In addition, significant changes have been and may be made in Medicaid, Medicare and other third-party payor programs, which could have a material adverse impact on HHC's financial condition. For additional information concerning HHC, see "*—Certain Reports.*"

#### *Other*

The projections set forth in the 1999-2003 Financial Plan for OTPS-Other include the City's contributions to NYCT, the Housing Authority, CUNY and subsidies to libraries and various cultural institutions. They also include projections for the cost of future judgments and claims which are discussed below under "Judgments and Claims." In the past, the City has provided additional assistance to certain Covered Organizations which had exhausted their financial resources prior to the end of the fiscal year. No assurance can be given that similar additional assistance will not be required in the future.

## *New York City Transit*

In January 1999, the City published a financial plan for NYCT covering its 1999 through 2003 fiscal years (the "NYCT Financial Plan"). NYCT's fiscal year coincides with the calendar year. The NYCT Financial Plan projects for 1999 revenues of \$4.0 billion and expenses of \$4.4 billion, leaving a budget gap of \$436 million. This gap will be offset by \$169.4 million in anticipated cash flow adjustments as well as funds made available from a \$266.9 million cash basis surplus in 1998. NYCT's cash basis budget for fiscal year 1999 is balanced. City assistance in 1999 to NYCT's operating budget is \$230 million, in addition to \$92.9 million in real estate tax revenue dedicated for NYCT's use.

For the 2000 through 2003 fiscal years, the NYCT Financial Plan forecasts budget gaps of \$154.7 million in 2000, \$226.3 million in 2001, \$245.8 million in 2002 and \$266.3 million in 2003, before implementation of cash flow adjustments and additional gap-closing actions. The out-year gaps are not required to be funded in the City's financial plans. The plan assumes that the gaps in the 2001 through 2003 fiscal years will be closed in part by increased user charges, productivity measures, reduced service levels, additional management actions or some combination of these actions.

In July 1996, the State Legislature approved, and the Governor subsequently signed into law, legislation authorizing a five-year \$11.9 billion capital plan for the MTA for 1995 through 1999 (the "1995-1999 Capital Program"), including approximately \$9 billion for NYCT. The 1995-1999 Capital Program is funded with Federal, State, and City capital funds, MTA bonds, and other MTA resources. The City has pledged \$1.3 billion towards the 1995-1999 Capital Program. The MTA Board approved the 1995-1999 Capital Program in November 1995, and has modified it a number of times since, most recently in December 1998. The 1995-1999 Capital Program was also submitted to the Capital Program Review Board (the "CPRB"), as State law requires, and was approved on July 11, 1997.

The 1995-1999 Capital Program supersedes the previous capital program for the period covering 1992-1996, which totaled \$9.56 billion in cost, with \$7.4 billion in projects for NYCT. The program for the years 1995 and 1996 experienced minimal changes in the 1995-1999 Capital Program, under the new five-year cycle. Under the old five-year cycle, there were two previous capital programs covering the periods 1987-1991 and 1982-1986.

There can be no assurance that all the necessary governmental actions for the MTA's future capital programs will be taken, that funding sources currently identified will not be reduced or eliminated, or that parts of the capital program, will not be delayed or reduced. If the MTA Capital Program is delayed or reduced, ridership and fare revenues may decline, which could, among other things, impair the MTA's ability to meet its operating expenses without additional assistance.

## *Board of Education*

The Stavisky-Goodman Act requires the City to allocate to the BOE an amount of funds from the total budget either equal to the average proportion of the total budget appropriated for the BOE in the three preceding fiscal years or an amount agreed upon by the City and the BOE. In the Financial Plan 29.32% of the City's budget is allocated to the BOE for the 1999 fiscal year, exceeding the amount required by the Stavisky-Goodman Act. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan assumes student enrollment to be 1,094,509, 1,104,441, 1,106,862, 1,108,569 and 1,107,928 in the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively.

### *Judgments and Claims*

In the fiscal year ended on June 30, 1998, the City expended \$386 million for judgments and claims. The 1999-2003 Financial Plan includes provisions for judgments and claims of \$391 million, \$418 million, \$432 million, \$454 million and \$473 million for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively. The City is a party to numerous lawsuits and is the subject of numerous claims and investigations. The City has estimated that its potential future liability on account of outstanding claims against it as of June 30, 1998 amounted to approximately \$3.5 billion. This estimate was made by categorizing the various claims and applying a statistical model, based primarily on actual settlements by type of claim during the preceding ten fiscal years, and by supplementing the estimated liability with information supplied by the City's Corporation Counsel. For further information regarding certain of these claims, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation."

In addition to the above claims, numerous real estate tax *certiorari* proceedings involving allegations of inequality of assessment, illegality and overvaluation are currently pending against the City. The City's 1998 Financial Statements include an estimate that the City's liability in the *certiorari* proceedings, as of June 30, 1998, could amount to approximately \$406 million. Provision has been made in the Financial Plan for estimated refunds of \$288 million, \$272 million, \$263 million, \$252 million and \$25 million for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years, respectively, which includes provision for repurchase of previously sold defective tax liens. For further information concerning these claims, certain remedial legislation related thereto and the City's estimates of potential liability, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes" and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note I."

### 3. DEBT SERVICE

Debt service estimates for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years include estimates of debt service costs on outstanding City bonds and notes and future debt issuances based on current and projected future market conditions.

### **Certain Reports**

From time to time, the Control Board staff, OSDC, the City Comptroller, the IBO and others issue reports and make public statements regarding the City's financial condition, commenting on, among other matters, the City's financial plans, projected revenues and expenditures and actions by the City to eliminate projected operating deficits. Some of these reports and statements have warned that the City may have underestimated certain expenditures and overestimated certain revenues and have suggested that the City may not have adequately provided for future contingencies. Certain of these reports have analyzed the City's future economic and social conditions and have questioned whether the City has the capacity to generate sufficient revenues in the future to meet the costs of its expenditure increases and to provide necessary services. It is reasonable to expect that reports and statements will continue to be issued and to engender public comment.

On February 25, 1999, the City Comptroller issued a report on the Financial Plan. With respect to the 1999 fiscal year, the report identified a possible surplus of between \$1.67 billion and \$1.75 billion, including \$1.58 billion in the budget stabilization account. With respect to fiscal years 2000 through 2003, the report identified baseline risks of between \$948 million and \$1.1 billion, \$931 million and \$1.8 billion, \$901 million and \$2.2 billion, and \$859 million and \$2.6 billion, respectively, depending upon whether the State approves the extension of the 14% personal income tax surcharge and whether the City incurs additional labor costs as a result of the expiration of labor contracts starting in fiscal year 2001 which, if settled at the current forecast level of inflation, would result in additional costs totaling \$375 million in fiscal year 2001, \$807 million in fiscal year 2002 and \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 2003. Additional risks identified in the report for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 include assumed payments from the Port Authority relating to the City's claim for back rentals, which are the subject of arbitration, State and Federal gap-closing actions proposed in the Financial Plan, possible increased overtime expenditures, the sale of the New York City Coliseum in fiscal year 2000 and the write-down of outstanding education aid receivables, exceeding \$100 million in each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003. The report noted that these risks may be partially offset in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003 by additional resources of between \$643 million and \$793 million, \$558 million and \$620 million, \$526 million and \$571 million and \$358 million and \$430 million in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, depending on the level of assumed tax revenues, which would result in a projected surplus of \$190 million or a projected gap of \$157 million in fiscal year 2000, including \$345 million in the budget stabilization account, and projected budget gaps, including

the gaps projected in the Financial Plan, of between \$1.8 billion and \$2.7 billion, \$2.0 billion and \$3.3 billion, and \$1.6 billion and \$3.5 billion in fiscal years 2001 through 2003, respectively. The report further noted that an area of concern is the projected growth in fiscal year 2000 of operating expenditures (which exclude State and Federal categorical aid and debt service) at twice the local inflation rate, and that the City is vulnerable to an economic downturn. In addition, the report noted that the City has not included any funding for new wage increases starting in fiscal year 2001 and that wage increases given to unionized employees at the rate of local inflation assumed in the Financial Plan would cost the City approximately \$375 million in fiscal year 2001, \$807 million in fiscal year 2002, and \$1.251 billion in fiscal year 2003. With respect to HHC, the report noted that the Governor's Executive Budget contains proposals, including the elimination of the trend factor and reduction of hospital and outpatient reimbursement rates, which, according to HHC, could negatively affect its revenues by about \$400 million annually.

On August 25, 1998, the City Comptroller issued a report reviewing the current condition of the City's major physical assets and the capital expenditures required to bring them to a state of good repair. The report estimated that the expenditure of approximately \$91.83 billion would be required over the next decade to bring the City's infrastructure to a systematic state of good repair and address new capital needs already identified, and that the City's current Ten-Year Capital Strategy, together with funding received from other sources, is projected to provide approximately \$52.08 billion. This represents the first time the Comptroller has issued such a report since May 1979. The capital need identified in the 1979 report was approximately two times greater than the actual capital expenditures for the period covered by that report. OMB notes that in the 1979 report, the Comptroller identified a capital need over seven times greater than the capital budget then proposed by the Mayor. The Comptroller's current report estimates a capital need of approximately twice the amount of the capital spending proposed by the Mayor.

The recent report noted that the City's ability to meet all capital obligations is limited by law, as well as funding capacity, and that the issue for the City is how best to set priorities and manage limited resources. The report stated that its analysis is not limited to assets valued over \$10 million. It is noted that the annual City capital asset condition survey as required by section 1110-a of the City Charter reviews items valued at \$10 million or more. The report also includes major systems like traffic signal systems, street lighting, the East River bridges and assets leased to the Transit Authority and the Water Board. The report's findings relate only to current infrastructure and do not address future capacity or technology needs. While the report indicates that the demands of the City's infrastructure outstrip the City's ability to pay for them, the report identifies several potential alternative methods for capital financing.

On February 24, 1999, the staff of the OSDC issued a report on the Financial Plan. The report concluded that the City is likely to end fiscal year 1999 with a \$161 million surplus, reflecting revenues which could exceed projections in the Financial Plan, in addition to the nearly \$1.6 billion surplus forecast in the Financial Plan and reflected in the Budget Stabilization Account. With respect to fiscal years 2000 through 2003, the report estimated budget gaps totaling \$509 million, \$2.3 billion, \$2.6 billion and \$2.0 billion, respectively. The principal risks identified in the report include (i) Federal and State gap-closing actions assumed in the Financial Plan; (ii) assumed payments from the Port Authority relating to the City's claim for back rentals, starting in the 2001 fiscal year, which are the subject of arbitration; (iii) greater than expected increases in health insurance costs; (iv) overtime costs exceeding those assumed in the Financial Plan by \$50 million in fiscal year 1999 and \$70 million in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively; and (v) State education aid owed from prior years, which exceeds \$100 million in each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003. The report also noted that potential future liabilities could result from possible changes in the investment earnings assumption or other assumptions affecting pension costs. In addition, the report noted that the City is vulnerable to an economic downturn, which could significantly reduce revenues and increase City pension contributions and public assistance case loads, and that the Financial Plan does not make any provision for (i) wage increases after the expiration of current contracts which, at projected local inflation rates, would increase the gaps by \$300 million, \$685 million and \$1.1 billion in fiscal years 2001 through 2003, respectively, (ii) the possibility that the 14% personal income tax surcharge will not be extended, or (iii) the possibility that projected resources from the settlement of the tobacco litigation will not be realized due to the Federal government's threat to claim a portion of the tobacco settlement, a reduction in the settlement if tobacco use declines, pressure to use more of the funds for other purposes, and the future solvency of some of the tobacco companies involved in the settlement.

In the report, the staff identified several adverse trends, including (i) increased staffing levels since June, 1997, primarily in the Police Department and BOE; (ii) increased debt service costs, which are projected to equal 19% of tax revenues in fiscal year 2002; (iii) projected spending which will increase at a rate which is greater than the inflation rate; and (iv) large budget gaps in fiscal years 2001 through 2003. The report also identified several other concerns. With respect to property taxes, the report noted that the City is supporting legislation that would prevent certain property owners from using actual sales of real property as evidence of whether an assessment is unequal, and that, if such legislation is not enacted, City officials feel that the City's liability in tax certiorari cases could increase substantially over current estimates. The report also noted that HHC is facing reductions in Medicare and Medicaid and increased costs of providing health care to the uninsured, and will face increasing competitive pressures in the near future when the State begins requiring most Medicaid recipients to enroll in managed care plans. Finally, with respect to the City's program to repair or replace computer systems to solve the Year 2000 problem, the report noted that an additional \$100 million may be required from the operating budget and that the City is behind schedule in its Year 2000 capital commitments.

On March 16, 1999, the staff of the Control Board issued a report reviewing the Financial Plan. The report noted that the City will end the 1999 fiscal year in balance. However, the report identified risks of \$711 million, \$858 million, \$928 million and \$796 million for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, which, when combined with the City's projected gaps, results in estimated gaps of \$711 million, \$2.3 billion, \$2.6 billion and \$2.0 billion for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, before making provision for any increased labor costs which may occur when the current contracts with City employees expire beginning in calendar year 2000. With respect to the 1999 fiscal year, the report noted the possibility that taxes could be \$230 million greater than forecast in the Financial Plan, but that overtime expenditures could be \$66 million greater than assumed in the Financial Plan. With respect to the subsequent fiscal years, the principal risks identified in the report include: (i) the possibility that the City may decide to fund the \$63 million annual cost of teachers' salary supplementation for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, which the State failed to fund in the 1999 fiscal year, and an additional risk of approximately \$100 million in each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003 for BOE resulting from the write-down of funds owed to BOE by the State which have been outstanding for ten or more years; (ii) the receipt of assumed rental payments from the Port Authority relating to the City's claim for back rents, which are the subject of arbitration; (iii) overtime expenditures which could be greater than assumed in the Financial Plan and (iv) Federal and State gap-closing actions assumed in the Financial Plan. The report noted that if the economy falters, the City would have to adjust its spending plans to account for falling revenues, in addition to the already existing structural budget gaps, and that the recent State labor settlement, which provides for raises of 11.46% over a four-year period, would, if applied to the City's work force, eventually raise the City's labor costs by over \$1.7 billion annually. Finally, the report noted that since June 1996 (i) the strong economy has allowed the City to reduce taxes, (ii) increased revenue estimates and lower interest rates have had a positive impact on the City's debt service expenditures, (iii) substantial savings have been generated by increased pension investment earnings, and (iv) there has been a modest increase in City-funded spending, compared to revenue growth, primarily in the areas of public safety and education.

On March 23, 1999, the IBO released a report providing its analysis of the Financial Plan. The report estimated potential gaps of \$15 million, \$2.3 billion, \$2.9 billion and \$2.9 billion for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively, which reflect, among other things, tax revenue and expenditure forecasts which exceed those in the Financial Plan, including salary increases for City employees totaling \$235 million, \$614 million and \$1.0 billion in fiscal years 2001 through 2003, respectively. The report noted that, in the event of an economic downturn, spending needs would increase at a time when revenues would be decreasing, which would make future budget gaps even larger.

### **Long-Term Capital and Financing Program**

The City makes substantial capital expenditures to reconstruct and rehabilitate the City's infrastructure and physical assets, including City mass transit facilities, sewers, streets, bridges and tunnels, and to make capital investments that will improve productivity in City operations.

The City utilizes a three-tiered capital planning process consisting of the Ten-Year Capital Strategy, the Four-Year Capital Plan and the current-year Capital Budget. The Ten-Year Capital Strategy is a long-term planning tool designed to reflect fundamental allocation choices and basic policy objectives. The Four-Year

Capital Program translates mid-range policy goals into specific projects. The Capital Budget defines specific projects and the timing of their initiation, design, construction and completion.

City-funded commitments, which were \$344 million in 1979, are projected to reach \$4.5 billion in 1999. City-funded expenditures, which more than tripled between fiscal years 1980 and 1985, are forecast at \$3.8 billion in the 1999 fiscal year; total expenditures are forecast at \$4.2 billion in 1999. For additional information concerning the City's capital expenditures and the Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy covering fiscal years 2000 through 2009, see "SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES—Capital Expenditures."

The following table sets forth the major areas of capital commitment projected for the 1999 through 2003 fiscal years. See "SECTION V: CITY SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES—Capital Expenditures." See "SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—*Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness.*"

#### 1999-2003 CAPITAL COMMITMENT PLAN

	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003	
	City Funds	All Funds	City Funds	All Funds	City Funds	All Funds	City Funds	All Funds	City Funds	All Funds
	(In Millions)									
Mass Transit(1) . . . . .	\$ 115	\$ 116	\$ 106	\$ 106	\$ 279	\$ 279	\$ 278	\$ 278	\$ 106	\$ 106
Roadway, Bridges . . . . .	579	770	1,060	1,210	722	760	610	778	723	797
Environmental Protection(2) . . . . .	1,359	1,391	1,726	1,866	1,738	1,808	1,474	1,499	823	823
Education . . . . .	1,420	1,420	1,002	1,002	1,524	1,524	1,105	1,105	1,318	1,318
Housing . . . . .	287	441	256	364	296	401	422	526	309	413
Sanitation . . . . .	63	63	201	215	318	318	181	181	165	165
City Operations/Facilities . . . . .	1,987	2,075	1,642	1,841	1,178	1,244	842	912	505	520
Economic and Port Development . . . . .	246	289	363	394	82	82	39	39	44	44
Reserve for Unattained Commitments . . . . .	(1,510)	(1,510)	(940)	(940)	(377)	(377)	62	62	315	315
Total Commitments(3) . . . . .	<u>\$4,546</u>	<u>\$5,056</u>	<u>\$5,417</u>	<u>\$6,059</u>	<u>\$5,760</u>	<u>\$6,038</u>	<u>\$5,012</u>	<u>\$5,379</u>	<u>\$4,308</u>	<u>\$4,500</u>
Total Expenditures(4) . . . . .	<u>\$3,752</u>	<u>\$4,169</u>	<u>\$3,767</u>	<u>\$4,179</u>	<u>\$4,051</u>	<u>\$4,489</u>	<u>\$4,875</u>	<u>\$5,308</u>	<u>\$4,991</u>	<u>\$5,370</u>

Note: Numbers may not tally due to rounding.

- (1) Excludes NYCT's non-City portion of the MTA's five-year Capital Program.
- (2) Includes water supply, water mains, water pollution control, sewer projects and related equipment.
- (3) Commitments represent contracts registered with the City Comptroller, except for certain projects which are undertaken jointly by the City and State. Totals may not add due to rounding.
- (4) Expenditures represent cash payments and appropriations planned to be expended for capital costs, excluding amounts for original issue discount.

The following table sets forth the City's planned sources and uses of City funds to be raised through issuances of long-term debt and transfers of monies from the City's General Fund during the City's 1999 through 2003 fiscal years as reflected in the Financial Plan.

**1999-2003 FINANCING PROGRAM**

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(In Millions)					
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS:</b>						
City General Obligation Bonds(1) .....	\$2,095	\$ 570	\$ 376	\$2,648	\$2,723	\$ 8,412
Finance Authority(2) .....	1,850	1,650	1,850	0	0	5,350
Tobacco Settlement Bonds(3) .....	0	625	625	625	625	2,500
Water Authority Financing(4) .....	694	845	1,128	1,499	1,581	5,747
DASNY HHC Financing(5) .....	295	0	0	0	0	295
DASNY Courts Financing(6) .....	0	0	204	281	281	765
Other Sources(7) .....	163	175	21	32	19	410
Total .....	<u>\$5,097</u>	<u>\$3,865</u>	<u>\$4,204</u>	<u>\$5,085</u>	<u>\$5,229</u>	<u>\$23,479</u>
<b>USES OF FUNDS:</b>						
City Capital Improvements(8) .....	\$3,753	\$3,767	\$4,051	\$4,874	\$4,991	\$21,436
City General Obligation Refinancing .....	1,158	0	0	0	0	1,158
Water Authority Refinancing .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reserve Funds and Other(9) .....	186	98	153	211	238	885
Total .....	<u>\$5,097</u>	<u>\$3,865</u>	<u>\$4,204</u>	<u>\$5,085</u>	<u>\$5,229</u>	<u>\$23,479</u>

Note: Numbers may not tally due to rounding.

- (1) The City has issued \$2.258 billion of general obligation bonds to date during fiscal year 1999, of which \$1.1 billion were for capital purposes and \$1.158 billion were for refunding purposes. The City expects to issue an additional \$500 million of general obligation bonds (including the Bonds) in fiscal year 1999 for capital purposes. This amount is \$663 million higher than the amount shown in the table, reflecting accelerated capital expenditures by the BOE.
- (2) The Finance Authority has issued \$1.5 billion of bonds to date during fiscal year 1999 for the City's capital improvement program. The Finance Authority expects to issue an additional \$500 million of bonds in fiscal year 1999, reflecting an acceleration (which is not shown in the table) of \$150 million of borrowing from fiscal year 2000.
- (3) Tobacco Settlement Bonds will not be indebtedness of the City.
- (4) Reflects Water Authority commercial paper and revenue bonds issued to date and expected to be issued to finance the water and sewer system's capital program, and includes reserve amounts. These figures do not include bonds which defease commercial paper.
- (5) DASNY has issued \$295 million of bonds to finance phase one of the reconstruction of Kings County Hospital (\$84 million project cost plus costs of issuance and capitalized interest) and the reconstruction of Queens Hospital (\$128 million project cost plus costs of issuance and capitalized interest).
- (6) The financing program includes DASNY financing of 100% of the City courts capital program. The amount reflected in fiscal years 1999 through 2003 includes an allocation for reserve funds and other costs of issuance of \$100 million.
- (7) Other Sources is comprised of changes in restricted cash balances, MAC program funding and Federal, State and private grants, and \$165 million of bond proceeds remaining as of the beginning of fiscal year 1999 from a prior DASNY courts financing.
- (8) City Capital Improvements includes capital cash expenditures for various City agencies, including the Department of Environmental Protection, the City's court program and a portion of HHC's hospital reconstruction program to be financed through DASNY.
- (9) Reserve Funds and Other comprises amounts necessary to fund certain reserves in connection with the issuance of Water Authority and DASNY revenue bonds, amounts to provide for certain costs of issuance of securities and allocations for original issue discounts and other uses in connection with the issuance of City and DASNY bonds.

A Federal law, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, generally requires that various facilities be made accessible to disabled persons. The City continues to analyze actions that are required to comply with the law. The City may incur substantial additional capital expenditures, as well as additional operating expenses to comply with the law. Compliance measures which require additional capital measures are expected to be achieved through the reallocation of existing funds within the City's capital program. In addition, the City could incur substantial additional capital expenditures for school construction if alternative proposals to relieve overcrowding in the public schools are not developed and implemented. The Financial Plan also assumes State approval of the repeal of the Wicks Law relating to contracting requirements for City construction projects. If such approval is not obtained, the City will incur additional expenditures for construction projects.



Currently, if all City capital projects were implemented, expenditures would exceed the City's financing projections in the current fiscal year and subsequent years. The City has therefore established capital budgeting priorities to maintain capital expenditures within the available long-term financing. Due to the size and complexity of the City's capital program, it is difficult to forecast precisely the timing of capital project activity so that actual capital expenditures may vary from the planned annual amounts.

The City's four-year financing program and capital program includes the issuance of revenue bonds by the Finance Authority and tobacco settlement bonds by a new entity to provide for capital financing needs of the City. The bonds issued by the Finance Authority are secured by the City's personal income tax revenue, and other revenues if personal income tax revenues do not satisfy specified debt service ratios, and are not subject to the constitutional debt limitation. Tobacco settlement bonds will be payable from funds derived from the settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies, and will not be subject to the constitutional debt limitation. See "SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—*Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness.*"

The City's current four-year financing program and capital program includes the issuance of water and sewer revenue bonds. The Water Authority is authorized to issue bonds to finance capital investment in the City's water and sewer system. Pursuant to State law, debt service on this indebtedness is secured by water and sewer fees paid by users of the water and sewer system. Such fees are revenues of the Water Board and the Water Board holds a lease interest in the City's water and sewer system. After providing for debt service on obligations of the Water Authority and certain incidental costs, the revenues of the Water Board are paid to the City to cover the City's costs of operating the water and sewer system and as rental for the system. The City's Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy covering fiscal years 2000 through 2009 projects City-funded water and sewer investment (which is expected to be financed with proceeds of Water Authority debt) at approximately \$9.1 billion of the \$46.0 billion City-funded portion of the plan.

The City is subject to statutory and regulatory standards relating to the quality of its drinking water. State and Federal regulations require the City water supply to meet certain standards to avoid filtration. The City's water supply now meets all technical standards and the City's current efforts are directed toward protection of the watershed area. The City has taken the position that increased regulatory, enforcement and other efforts to protect its water supply, relating to such matters as land use and sewage treatment, will preserve the high quality of water in the upstate water supply system and prevent the need for filtration. The City has estimated that if filtration of the upstate water supply system is ultimately required, the construction expenditures required could be between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. In accordance with the New York City Watershed Memorandum of Agreement which was signed on January 21, 1997, among the City, the State, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("USEPA"), the communities in the watershed area and several environmental groups, on May 6, 1997, USEPA granted the City a filtration avoidance waiver through April 15, 2002. The estimated incremental cost to the City of implementing this Watershed Memorandum of Agreement, beyond investments in the watershed which were planned independently, is approximately \$400 million. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection has estimated that the cost of the Watershed Memorandum of Agreement, including investments in the watershed which were previously included in the capital plan, is \$1.25 billion. The estimated cost does not include certain future administrative, construction, operating and maintenance costs which have not yet been determined.

Implementation of the capital plan is dependent upon the City's ability to market its securities successfully in the public credit markets. The terms and the success of projected public sales of City general obligation bonds, Water Authority, Finance Authority and HHC revenue bonds and tobacco settlement bonds will be subject to prevailing market conditions at the times of sale. No assurance can be given that the credit markets will absorb the projected amounts of public bond sales. As a significant portion of bond financing is used to reimburse the City's General Fund for capital expenditures already incurred, if the City is unable to sell such amounts of bonds it would have an adverse effect on the City's cash position. In addition, the need of the City to fund future debt service costs from current operations may also limit the City's capital program. The Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 totals \$48.1 billion, of which approximately 96% is to be financed with City funds. See "SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS—Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities—*Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness.*". Congressional developments affecting Federal taxation generally could reduce the market value of tax-favored investments and increase the City's debt-

service costs in carrying out the currently tax-exempt major portion of its capital plan. For information concerning litigation which, if determined against the City, could have an adverse impact on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding under the general debt limit (defined as 10% of the average full value of taxable real estate in the City for the most recent five years), see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes."

In October 1998, the City issued its annual assessment of the asset condition and a proposed maintenance schedule for its assets and asset systems which have a replacement cost of \$10 million or more and a useful life of at least ten years, as required by the City Charter (the "AIMS Report"). This report does not reflect any policy considerations which could affect the appropriate amount of investment, such as whether there is a continuing need for a particular facility or whether there have been changes in the use of a facility. The AIMS Report estimated that \$4.08 billion in capital investment was needed for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to bring the assets to a state of good repair. The report also estimated that \$123 million, \$82 million, \$104 million and \$103 million should be spent on maintenance in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, respectively.

The recommended capital investment for each inventoried asset is not readily comparable to the capital spending allocated by the City in the Four-Year Capital Plan and the Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy. Only a portion of the funding set forth in the Four-Year Capital Plan is allocated to specifically identified assets, and funding in the subsequent years of the Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy is even less identifiable with individual assets. Therefore, there is a substantial difference between the amount of investment recommended in the report for all inventoried City assets and amounts allocated to the specifically identified inventoried assets in the Four-Year Capital Plan. The City also issues an annual report (the "Reconciliation Report") that compares the recommended capital investment with the capital spending allocated by the City in the Four-Year Capital Plan to the specifically identified inventoried assets.

The most recent Reconciliation Report, in 1998, concluded that the capital investment in the Four-Year Capital Plan for the specifically identified inventoried assets funds 66% of the total investment recommended in the preceding AIMS Report issued in October 1997. Capital investment allocated in the Preliminary Ten-Year Capital Strategy published in January 1999 will fund an additional portion of the recommended investment. In the most recent Reconciliation Report, OMB estimated that 47% of the maintenance levels recommended by the October 1997 AIMS Report were included in the 1999-2002 financial plan, compared to 40% of the maintenance levels that OMB estimated were included in the previous year (fiscal 1998).

### **Seasonal Financing Requirements**

The City since 1981 has fully satisfied its seasonal financing needs in the public credit markets, repaying all short-term obligations within their fiscal year of issuance. The City has issued \$500 million of short-term obligations in the 1999 fiscal year to finance the City's projected cash flow needs for the 1999 fiscal year. The City issued \$1.075 billion of short-term obligations in fiscal year 1998 to finance the City's projected cash flow needs for the 1998 fiscal year. The City issued \$2.4 billion of short-term obligations in fiscal year 1997. Seasonal financing requirements for the 1996 fiscal year increased to \$2.4 billion from \$2.2 billion and \$1.75 billion in the 1995 and 1994 fiscal years, respectively. The delay in the adoption of the State's budget in certain past fiscal years has required the City to issue short-term notes in amounts exceeding those expected early in such fiscal years. See "—Assumptions."

## SECTION VIII: INDEBTEDNESS

### Indebtedness of the City and Certain Other Entities

#### *Outstanding City, MAC and PBC Indebtedness*

The following table sets forth outstanding indebtedness having an initial maturity greater than one year from the date of issuance of the City, MAC and the PBCs as of December 31, 1998.

(In Thousands)		
Gross City Long-Term Indebtedness(1) .....	\$26,477,994	
Less: Assets Held for Debt Service(1) .....	<u>142,270</u>	
Net City Long-Term Indebtedness .....		\$26,335,724
Gross MAC Long-Term Indebtedness(2) .....	3,894,970	
Less: Assets Held for Debt Service(2) .....	<u>719,964</u>	
Net MAC Long-Term Indebtedness .....		3,175,006
PBC Indebtedness(3)		
Bonds Payable .....	566,098	
Capital Lease Obligations .....	<u>789,458</u>	
Gross PBC Indebtedness .....	1,355,556	
Less: Assets Held for Debt Service .....	<u>212,898</u>	
Net PBC Indebtedness .....		<u>1,142,658</u>
Combined Net City, MAC and PBC Indebtedness .....		<u><u>\$30,653,388</u></u>

- (1) With respect to City long-term indebtedness, "Assets Held for Debt Service" consists of General Debt Service Fund assets, and \$138.7 million principal amount of City serial bonds held by MAC. Amounts do not include the indebtedness of the Finance Authority, which is \$3,050 million as of December 31, 1998. See "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes D, E and I."
- (2) With respect to MAC indebtedness, "Assets Held for Debt Service" consists of assets held in MAC's debt service funds less accrued liabilities for interest payable on MAC long-term indebtedness plus amounts held in reserve funds for payment of principal of and interest on MAC bonds. Other MAC funds, while not specifically pledged for the payment of principal of and interest on MAC bonds, are also available for these purposes. For further information regarding MAC indebtedness and assets held for debt service, see "Municipal Assistance Corporation Indebtedness" below and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes C and I."
- (3) "PBC Indebtedness" refers to City obligations to PBCs. For further information regarding the indebtedness of certain PBCs, see "Public Benefit Corporation Indebtedness" below and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes H and I." "PBC Indebtedness" does not include the indebtedness of individual PBCs which are Enterprise Funds. For further information regarding the indebtedness of Enterprise Funds PBCs, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes K, L, M, N and O."

*Trend in Outstanding Net City, MAC and PBC Indebtedness*

The following table shows the trend in the outstanding net long-term and net short-term debt of the City and MAC and in net PBC indebtedness as of June 30 of each of the fiscal years 1989 through 1998 and as of December 31, 1998, except for short-term debt information, which is as of March 1, 1999.

	City(1)		MAC(2)		Component Unit and City	Total
	Long-Term Net Debt(3)	Short-Term Debt	Long-Term Net Debt(4)	Short-Term Debt	Guaranteed Debt(3)	
	(In Millions)					
1989.....	\$ 9,332	\$ —	\$6,082	\$ —	\$ 780	\$16,194
1990.....	11,779	—	5,713	—	782	18,274
1991.....	15,293	—	5,265	—	803	21,361
1992.....	17,916	—	4,657	—	782	23,355
1993.....	19,624	—	4,470	—	768	24,862
1994.....	21,731	—	4,215	—	1,114	27,060
1995.....	23,258	—	4,033	—	1,098	28,389
1996.....	25,052	—	3,936	—	1,155	30,143
1997.....	26,180	—	3,717	—	1,182	31,079
1998.....	25,917	—	3,108	—	1,129	30,154
December 31, 1998.....	26,335	500	3,175	—	1,143	31,153

- (1) Amounts do not include debt of the City held by MAC. See "Outstanding City, MAC and PBC Indebtedness—note 2". Amounts do not include indebtedness of the Finance Authority, which is \$3,050 million as of December 31, 1998. See "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes D, E and I."
- (2) MAC reported outstanding long-term indebtedness without reduction for reserves, as follows: \$7,307 million, \$6,901 million, \$6,471 million, \$5,559 million, \$5,304 million, \$4,891 million, \$4,694 million, \$4,563 million, \$4,267 million and \$3,895 million as of June 30 of each of the years 1989 through 1998.
- (3) Net of reserves. See "Outstanding Indebtedness—note 2". Component Units are PBCs included in the City's financial statements other than PBCs which are Enterprise Funds. For more information concerning Component Unit PBCs, see "Public Benefit Corporation Indebtedness" below and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements Notes H and I". For more information concerning Enterprise Funds PBCs, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes K, L, M, N and O."
- (4) Calculations of net MAC indebtedness include the total bonds outstanding under MAC's 1991 General Bond Resolutions and accrued interest on those bonds less the amounts held by MAC in its debt service and reserve funds.

*Rapidity of Principal Retirement*

The following table details, as of December 31, 1998, the cumulative percentage of total City general obligation debt outstanding that is scheduled to be retired in accordance with its terms in each prospective five-year period.

Period	Cumulative Percentage of Debt Scheduled for Retirement
5 years	24.81%
10 years	49.55
15 years	69.89
20 years	85.38
25 years	92.13
30 years	99.85

*City, MAC and City-guaranteed PBC Debt Service Requirements*

The following table summarizes future debt service requirements, as of December 31, 1998, on City and MAC term and serial bonds outstanding and City-guaranteed debt of and capital lease obligations to certain PBCs.

<u>Fiscal Years</u>	<u>City Long-Term Debt</u>		<u>Component Unit and City Guaranteed Debt(2)</u>	<u>MAC Funding Requirements</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Principal of Bonds(1)</u>	<u>Interest(1)</u>			
			(In Thousands)		
1999 .....	\$ 269,421	\$ 700,276	\$ 63,371	\$ 547,222	\$ 1,861,699
2000 .....	1,185,124	1,423,482	138,062	542,974	3,289,642
2001 .....	1,312,346	1,361,845	138,041	543,340	3,355,572
2002 .....	1,365,712	1,297,090	136,322	543,718	3,342,842
2003 .....	1,336,880	1,217,273	136,873	543,874	3,234,900
2004 through 2147 .....	20,866,241	11,278,516	1,649,304	2,675,462(3)	36,469,523
Total .....	<u>\$26,335,724</u>	<u>\$17,278,482</u>	<u>\$2,261,973</u>	<u>\$5,396,590</u>	<u>\$51,554,178</u>

(1) Excludes debt service on \$138.7 million principal amount of serial bonds held by MAC. Excludes debt service on \$3,050 million principal amount of bonds issued by the Finance Authority. See "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes D, E and I."

(2) Component Units are PBCs included in the City's financial statements other than PBCs which are Enterprise Funds. For additional information concerning these PBCs, see "Public Benefit Corporation Indebtedness" below and "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes H and I." For more information concerning Enterprise Funds PBCs, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes K, L, M, N and O."

(3) Amount shown is for fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

*Certain Debt Ratios*

The following table sets forth information for each of the fiscal years 1989 through 1998, with respect to the approximate ratio of debt to certain economic factors. As used in this table, debt includes net City, MAC, Finance Authority and PBC debt.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Debt Per Capita</u>	<u>Debt as % of Total Taxable Real Property By</u>	
		<u>Assessed Valuation</u>	<u>Estimated Full Valuation(1)</u>
1989 .....	\$2,202	25.4%	4.6%
1990 .....	2,490	26.0	4.5
1991 .....	2,918	28.0	4.5
1992 .....	3,192	27.9	3.9
1993 .....	3,379	30.4	3.8
1994 .....	3,675	34.1	3.7
1995 .....	3,878	37.2	4.1
1996 .....	4,111	39.2	7.1
1997 .....	4,219	40.2	8.3
1998 .....	4,400	41.0	9.0

Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1998.

(1) Based on full valuations for each fiscal year derived from the application of the special equalization ratio reported by the State Board for such fiscal year.

*Ratio of Debt to Personal Income*

The following table sets forth, for each of fiscal years 1984 through 1996, debt per capita as a percentage of personal income per capita in current dollars. As used in this table, debt includes net City, MAC and PBC debt.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Debt per Capita</u>	<u>Personal Income per Capita (1)</u>	<u>Debt per Capita as % of Personal Income per Capita</u>
1984 .....	\$1,695	\$15,881	10.67%
1985 .....	1,723	16,919	10.18
1986 .....	1,833	18,318	10.01
1987 .....	1,893	19,488	9.71
1988 .....	2,041	21,322	9.57
1989 .....	2,202	22,858	9.63
1990 .....	2,490	24,589	10.13
1991 .....	2,917	25,271	11.54
1992 .....	3,188	27,807	11.46
1993 .....	3,379	27,710	12.19
1994 .....	3,687	28,390	12.99
1995 .....	3,897	30,298	12.86
1996 .....	4,137	31,928	12.96

Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1998.

(1) Personal income is measured before the deduction of personal income taxes and other personal taxes.

*Certain Provisions for the Payment of City Indebtedness*

The State Constitution requires the City to make an annual appropriation for: (i) payment of interest on all City indebtedness; (ii) redemption or amortization of bonds; (iii) redemption of other City indebtedness (except bond anticipation notes (“BANs”), tax anticipation notes (“TANs”), revenue anticipation notes (“RANs”), and urban renewal notes (“URNs”) contracted to be paid in that year out of the tax levy or other revenues); and (iv) redemption of short-term indebtedness issued in anticipation of the collection of taxes or other revenues, such as TANs, RANs and URNs, and renewals of such short-term indebtedness which are not retired within five years of the date of original issue. If this appropriation is not made, a sum sufficient for such purposes must be set apart from the first revenues thereafter received by the City and must be applied for these purposes.

The City’s debt service appropriation provides for the interest on, but not the principal of, short-term indebtedness, which has in recent years been issued as TANs and RANs. If such principal were not provided for from the anticipated sources, it would be, like debt service on the Bonds, a general obligation of the City.

Pursuant to the Act, the General Debt Service Fund has been established for the purpose of paying Monthly Debt Service, as defined in the Act. For information regarding the Fund, see “SECTION II: The Bonds—Payment Mechanism.” In addition, as required under the Act, a TAN Account has been established by the State Comptroller within the Fund to pay the principal of outstanding City TANs. After notification by the City of the date when principal due or to become due on an outstanding issue of TANs will equal 90% of the “available tax levy”, as defined in the Act, with respect to such issue, the State Comptroller must pay into the TAN Account from the collection of real estate tax payments (after paying amounts required to be deposited in the General Debt Service Fund for Monthly Debt Service) amounts sufficient to pay the principal of such TANs. Similarly, a RAN Account has been established by the State Comptroller within the Fund to pay the principal of outstanding City RANs. Revenues in anticipation of which RANs are issued must be deposited in the RAN Account. If revenue consists of State or other revenue to be paid to the City by the State Comptroller, the State Comptroller must deposit such revenue directly into the RAN Account on the date such revenue is payable to the City. Under the Act, after notification by the City of the date when principal due or to become due on an outstanding issue of RANs will equal 90% of the total amount of revenue against which such RANs were issued on or before the fifth day prior to the maturity date of the RANs, the State Comptroller must commence on such date to retain in the

RAN Account an amount sufficient to pay the principal of such RANs when due. Revenues required to be deposited in the RAN Account vest immediately in the State Comptroller in trust for the benefit of the holders of notes issued in anticipation of such revenues. No person other than a holder of such RANs has any right to or claim against revenues so held in trust. Whenever the amount contained in the RAN Account or the TAN Account exceeds the amount required to be retained in such Account, the excess, including earnings on investments, is to be withdrawn from such Account and paid into the General Fund of the City.

#### *Limitations on the City's Authority to Contract Indebtedness*

The Financial Emergency Act imposes various limitations on the issuance of City indebtedness. No TANs may be issued by the City which would cause the principal amount of such issue of TANs to exceed 90% of the "available tax levy", as defined in the Act, with respect to such issue; TANs and renewals thereof must mature not later than the last day of the fiscal year in which they were issued. No RANs may be issued by the City which would cause the principal amount of RANs outstanding to exceed 90% of the "available revenues", as defined in the Act, for that fiscal year; RANs must mature not later than the last day of the fiscal year in which they were issued; and in no event may renewals of RANs mature later than one year subsequent to the last day of the fiscal year in which such RANs were originally issued. No BANs may be issued by the City in any fiscal year which would cause the principal amount of BANs outstanding, together with interest due or to become due thereon, to exceed 50% of the principal amount of bonds issued by the City in the twelve months immediately preceding the month in which such BANs are to be issued; BANs must mature not later than six months after their date of issuance and may be renewed once for a period not to exceed six months. Budget Notes may be issued only to fund cost overruns in the expense budget; no Budget Notes, or renewals thereof, may mature later than sixty days prior to the last day of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year during which the Budget Notes were originally issued.

The MAC Act contains two limitations on the amount of short-term debt which the City may issue. As of February 4, 1999, the maximum amount of additional short-term debt which the City could issue was \$7.20 billion under the first limitation. The second limitation does not prohibit any issuance by the City of BANs or short-term debt issued and payable within the same fiscal year, such as TANs and RANs. However, subject to the other restrictions and requirements described above, as of February 4, 1999, the maximum amount of TANs, RANs, or Budget Notes issued in the current fiscal year and maturing next fiscal year, that the City could issue was approximately \$759.6 million under the second limitation. These limitations, and other restrictions on maturities of City notes and other requirements described above, could be amended by State legislative action.

The State Constitution provides that, with certain exceptions, the City may not contract indebtedness, including contracts for capital projects to be paid with the proceeds of City bonds ("contracts for capital projects"), in an amount greater than 10% of the average full value of taxable real estate in the City for the most recent five years (the "general debt limit"). See "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Real Estate Tax—Assessment". For information concerning litigation which, if determined against the City, could have an adverse impact on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding under the general debt limit, see "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation—Taxes". Certain indebtedness ("excluded debt") is excluded in ascertaining the City's authority to contract indebtedness within the constitutional limit. TANs, RANs, BANs, URNs and Budget Notes and long-term indebtedness issued for certain types of public improvements and capital projects are considered excluded debt. The City's statutory authority for variable rate debt is limited to 10% of the general debt limit. The State Constitution also provides that, subject to legislative implementation, the City may contract indebtedness for low-rent housing, nursing homes for persons of low income and urban renewal purposes in an amount not to exceed 2% of the average assessed valuation of the taxable real estate of the City for the most recent five years (the "2% debt limit"). Excluded from the 2% debt limit, after approval by the State Comptroller, is indebtedness for certain self-supporting programs aided by City guarantees or loans. Neither MAC indebtedness nor the City's commitments with other PBCs (other than certain guaranteed debt of the Housing Authority) are chargeable against the City's constitutional debt limits.

To provide for the City's capital program, State legislation was enacted which created the Finance Authority, the debt of which is not subject to the general debt limit of the City. Without the Finance Authority or other legislative relief, new contractual commitments for the City's general obligation financed capital program would have been virtually brought to a halt during the Financial Plan period beginning early in the 1998 fiscal year. The debt-incurring power of the Finance Authority has permitted the City to continue to enter into new contractual commitments.

The following table sets forth the calculation of the debt-incurring power of the City and of the Finance Authority as of March 31, 1999.

(In Thousands)		
Total City Debt-Incurring Power under General Debt Limit .....		\$28,949,708
Gross Debt—Funded .....	\$27,189,365	
Less: Excluded Debt.....	<u>892,755</u>	
	26,296,609	
Less: Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations for Principal of Debt .....	<u>57,792</u>	<u>26,238,817</u>
		2,710,890
Contracts and Other Liabilities, Net of Restricted Cash .....	4,745,877	
Less: Anticipated Finance Authority Financing of Liabilities Incurred Through Fiscal Year 1999 (1) .....	<u>3,896,023</u>	
Net Contracts and Other Liabilities Charged to General Debt Limit .....		<u>849,854</u>
Remaining City Debt-Incurring Power under General Debt Limit (1) .....		<u>\$ 1,861,036</u>
City and Finance Authority Debt-Incurring Power .....		<u>\$ 1,861,036</u>

Note: Numbers may not tally due to rounding.

(1) Without the creation of the Finance Authority, the debt-incurring power of the City under the general debt limit, as of March 31, 1999, would have been exceeded by \$5.639 billion.

Without additional borrowing capacity, under current projections the City would reach the limit of its capacity to enter into new contractual commitments in fiscal year 2000. In order to provide financing for the City's current capital plan during and after fiscal year 2000, the Finance Authority's debt-incurring capacity will need to be increased, some other financing mechanism will need to be established or the City's general obligation debt limit will need to be increased. An amendment to the State Constitution would be necessary to change the methodology used to calculate the debt limit to increase the City's general obligation debt limit. A proposed amendment to the State Constitution may be considered by the State Legislature and, if approved in two consecutive legislative sessions and by voter referendum, could have an effective date in the year 2002. Even if the Constitution were so amended, legislative action to increase the financing capacity of the Finance Authority or creation of some other financing mechanism would be necessary to permit the City to continue its capital program until the constitutional amendment took effect in 2002. Accordingly, the Financial Plan contemplates the issuance of debt by TSASC which would not be subject to the general debt limit in the amount of approximately \$2.5 billion of bonds, to be paid from revenues derived from the settlement of litigation with the four leading cigarette companies, which would provide financing for the City's capital program until the effective date of a constitutional amendment in 2002. Even with the ability to issue \$2.5 billion in bonds by TSASC, the City expects that it will be required to postpone a substantial part of its capital program from the latter part of fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2002. If TSASC is not able to issue \$2.5 billion of bonds, the City will need to find another source of financing or substantially curtail or halt its capital program. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—Revenue Assumptions—4. Miscellaneous Revenues" and "Certain Reports" for information concerning certain contingencies relating to the amount of tobacco settlement revenues to be paid. See "SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION—Litigation" for a description of litigation seeking to have the Finance Authority Act declared unconstitutional.



### *Federal Bankruptcy Code*

Under the Federal Bankruptcy Code, a petition may be filed in the Federal bankruptcy court by a municipality which is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature. The filing of such a petition would operate as a stay of any proceeding to enforce a claim against the City. The Code requires the municipality to file a plan for the adjustment of its debts, which may modify or alter the rights of creditors and may provide for the municipality to issue indebtedness, which could have priority over existing creditors and which could be secured. Any plan of adjustment confirmed by the court must be approved by the requisite majority of creditors. If confirmed by the bankruptcy court, the plan would be binding upon all creditors affected by it. Each of the City and the Control Board, acting on behalf of the City, has the legal capacity to file a petition under the Federal Bankruptcy Code.

### **Municipal Assistance Corporation Indebtedness**

MAC was organized in 1975 to provide financing assistance for the City and also to exercise certain review functions with respect to the City's finances. Since its creation, MAC has provided, among other things, financing assistance to the City by refunding maturing City short-term debt and transferring to the City funds received from sales of MAC bonds and notes. MAC is authorized to issue bonds and notes payable from certain stock transfer tax revenues and the City's portion of the State sales tax derived in the City and, subject to certain prior claims, State per capita aid otherwise payable by the State to the City. These revenues are paid, subject to appropriation, directly by the State to MAC to the extent they are needed for MAC debt service, MAC reserve fund requirements or MAC operating expenses; revenues which are not needed by MAC are paid by the State to the City, except for the stock transfer tax revenues, which are rebated to the payers of the tax. MAC bonds and notes constitute general obligations of MAC and do not constitute an enforceable obligation or debt of either the State or the City. Failure by the State to continue the imposition of such taxes, the reduction of the rate of such taxes to rates less than those in effect on July 2, 1975, failure by the State to pay such aid revenues and the reduction of such aid revenues below a specified level are included among the events of default in the resolutions authorizing MAC's long-term debt. The occurrence of an event of default may result in the acceleration of the maturity of all or a portion of MAC's debt.

As of December 31, 1998, MAC had outstanding an aggregate of approximately \$3.895 billion of its bonds. MAC is authorized to issue bonds and notes to refund its outstanding bonds and notes and to fund certain reserves. For additional information regarding MAC indebtedness, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes C and I."

### **Public Benefit Corporation Indebtedness**

#### *City Financial Commitments to PBCs*

PBCs are corporate governmental agencies created by State law to finance and operate projects of a governmental nature or to provide governmental services. Generally, PBCs issue bonds and notes to finance construction of housing, hospitals, dormitories and other facilities and receive revenues from the collection of fees, charges or rentals for the use of their facilities, including subsidies and other payments from the governmental entity whose residents have benefited from the services and facilities provided by the PBC. These bonds and notes do not constitute debt of the City unless expressly guaranteed or assumed by the City.

The City has undertaken various types of financial commitments with certain PBCs which, although they generally do not represent City indebtedness, have a similar budgetary effect. During a Control Period as defined by the Financial Emergency Act, neither the City nor any Covered Organization may enter into any arrangement whereby the revenues or credit of the City are directly or indirectly pledged, encumbered, committed or promised for the payment of obligations of a PBC unless approved by the Control Board. The principal forms of the City's financial commitments with respect to PBC debt obligations are as follows:

1. *Guarantees*—PBC indebtedness may be directly guaranteed by the City.
2. *Capital Lease Obligations*—These are leases of facilities by the City or a Covered Organization, entered into with PBCs, under which the City has no liability beyond monies legally available for lease payments. State law generally provides, however, that in the event the City fails to make any required lease payment, the amount of such payment will be deducted from State aid otherwise payable to the City and will be paid to the PBC.

3. *Executed Leases*—These are leases pursuant to which the City is legally obligated to make the required rental payments.

4. *Capital Reserve Fund Arrangements*—Under these arrangements, State law requires the PBC to maintain a capital reserve fund in a specified minimum amount to be used solely for the payment of the PBC's obligations. State law further provides that in the event the capital reserve fund is depleted, State aid otherwise payable to the City may be paid to the PBC to restore such fund.

The City's financial statements include MAC and certain PBCs, such as The New York City Educational Construction Fund ("ECF") and the CUCF. For further information regarding indebtedness of these PBCs, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes G and H." Certain other PBCs appear in the financial statements as Enterprise Funds. For information regarding Enterprise Funds PBCs, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Notes K, L, M, N and O."

#### *New York City Educational Construction Fund*

As of December 31, 1998, approximately \$154.4 million principal amount of ECF bonds to finance costs related to the school portions of combined occupancy structures was outstanding. Under ECF's leases with the City, debt service on the ECF bonds is payable by the City to the extent third party revenues are not sufficient to pay such debt service.

#### *New York City Housing Authority*

As of December 31, 1998, the City had guaranteed \$21.9 million principal amount of HA bonds. The Federal government has agreed to pay debt service on \$6.4 million principal amount of additional HA indebtedness guaranteed by the City. The City has also guaranteed the repayment of \$160.2 million principal amount of HA indebtedness to the State, of which the Federal government has agreed to pay debt service on \$67.6 million. The City also pays subsidies to the HA to cover operating expenses. Exclusive of the payment of certain labor costs, such subsidies amounted to \$38.3 million in the 1998 fiscal year and to \$37.7 million in the 1999 fiscal year.

#### *New York State Housing Finance Agency*

As of December 31, 1998, \$274.3 million principal amount of HFA refunding bonds relating to hospital and family care facilities leased to the City was outstanding. HFA does not receive third party revenues to offset the City's capital lease obligations with respect to these bonds. Lease payments, which are made by the City seven months in advance of payment dates of the bonds, are intended to cover development and construction costs, including debt service, of each facility plus a share of HFA's overhead and administrative expenses.

#### *Dormitory Authority of the State of New York*

As of December 31, 1998, \$417.2 million principal amount of DASNY bonds issued to finance the design, construction and renovation of court facilities in the City was outstanding. The court facilities are leased to the City by DASNY, with lease payments made by the City in amounts sufficient to pay debt service on DASNY bonds and certain fees and expenses of DASNY.

#### *City University Construction Fund*

As of December 31, 1998, approximately \$716.8 million principal amount of DASNY bonds, relating to Community College facilities, subject to capital lease arrangements was outstanding. The City and the State are each responsible for approximately one-half of the CUCF's annual rental payments to DASNY for Community College facilities which are applied to the payment of debt service on the DASNY's bonds issued to finance the leased projects plus related overhead and administrative expenses of DASNY.

#### *New York State Urban Development Corporation*

As of December 31, 1998, \$54.6 million principal amount of New York State Urban Development Corporation ("UDC") bonds subject to executed or proposed lease arrangements was outstanding. This amount differs from the amount calculated by UDC (\$66.4 million) because UDC has included certain interest costs relating to Public School 50 and Intermediate School 229 in Manhattan in its calculation. The City leases schools and certain other facilities from UDC.

## SECTION IX: OTHER INFORMATION

### Pension Systems

The City maintains a number of pension systems providing benefits for its employees and employees of various independent agencies (including certain Covered Organizations). The systems combine features of a defined benefit pension plan with those of a defined contribution pension plan. Membership in the City's five major actuarial systems on June 30, 1997 consisted of approximately 313,000 current employees, of whom approximately 75,000 were employees of certain independent agencies whose pension costs in some cases are provided by City appropriations. In addition, there are approximately 239,000 retirees and beneficiaries currently receiving benefits and other vested members terminated but not receiving benefits. The City also contributes to three other actuarial systems, maintains a non-actuarial retirement system for retired individuals not covered by the five major actuarial systems, provides other supplemental benefits to retirees and makes contributions to certain union annuity funds.

Each of the City's five major actuarial pension systems is managed by a board of trustees which includes representatives of the City and the employees covered by such system. The City Comptroller is the custodian of, and has been delegated investment responsibilities for, the major actuarial systems, subject to the policies established by the boards of trustees of the systems and State law.

The City's pension expenditures in fiscal year 1998 were \$1.47 billion. The City's pension expenditures for the 1999 fiscal year are expected to approximate \$1.4 billion. In each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, these expenditures are expected to approximate \$1.4 billion, \$1.2 billion, \$0.9 billion and \$0.8 billion, respectively. Certain of the systems provide pension benefits of 50% to 55% of "final pay" after 20 to 25 years of service with additional benefits for subsequent years of service. For the 1998 fiscal year, the City's total annual pension costs, including the City's pension costs not associated with the five major actuarial systems, plus Federal Social Security tax payments by the City for the year, were approximately 18.93% of total payroll costs. In addition, contributions are also made by certain component units of the City and other government units directly to the three cost sharing multiple employer actuarial systems. The State Constitution provides that pension rights of public employees are contractual and shall not be diminished or impaired.

The City expects that the results of a Charter-mandated study of the actuarial assumptions and methods used for the five New York City retirement systems will be released later in fiscal year 1999 or in fiscal year 2000. This study is expected to present a range of options that will be used by the City's Chief Actuary to make recommendations to the boards of the retirement systems concerning their actuarial assumptions and methods. The Chief Actuary will also make recommendations to the State Legislature and the Governor concerning the actuarial assumptions and methods over which they have authority. As a result of these recommendations and subsequent actions by the retirement system boards, the Legislature and the Governor, increased employer contribution requirements could result in additional costs to the City beyond the costs already assumed in the Financial Plan. At the request of the City, the Chief Actuary has prepared an outline of the major areas and issues that the Chief Actuary believes could result in changes to the actuarial assumptions and methods. In his outline the Chief Actuary identified potential changes in assumptions and methods that, if implemented, could increase the City's annual contribution starting in fiscal year 2001 by between \$600 million and \$1.6 billion annually. In disclosing these possible changes the Chief Actuary noted that they are preliminary and do not currently represent recommendations for change. The City has had its consulting actuary, William M. Mercer, Incorporated, review this preliminary information. As a result of that review the City has reflected in the Financial Plan increased pension contributions of \$154 million and expects to increase forecast pension contributions by an additional \$85 million, for a total of \$239 million annually, in the financial plan to be prepared in connection with the Executive Budget. One possible offset to these contributions would be a "market value restart," which, if appropriate and implemented, could reduce employer contributions in the short term.

The City makes pension contributions to the five major systems in amounts equivalent to the pension costs as determined in accordance with GAAP. Pension costs incurred with respect to the other actuarial systems to which the City contributes and the City's non-actuarial retirement systems and supplemental pension programs for participants in these non-actuarial systems are recorded and paid currently.

As of June 30, 1997, four of the five major actuarial systems were not fully funded. The excess of the present value of future pension benefits accrued over the value of the present assets of the pension systems for the five major

actuarial pension systems (including that which is attributable to independent agencies) as of June 30, 1992 through June 30, 1994, as calculated by the City's Chief Actuary on the basis of the actuarial assumptions then in effect, are set forth in the following table. In addition, such excess as of June 30, 1995 through June 30, 1997, for the major actuarial pension systems other than New York City Employees' Retirement System, whose actuarial value of assets exceeded its actuarial accrued liability as of such dates, is set forth in the following table.

<u>June 30</u>	<u>Amount(1)</u> <u>(In Billions)</u>
1992 .....	\$2.67
1993 .....	0.49
1994 .....	5.94(2)
1995 .....	4.03
1996 .....	4.29
1997 .....	4.28

(1) For purposes of making these calculations, accrued pension contributions receivable from the City were not treated as assets of the system.

(2) Prior to June 30, 1994, amounts are the unfunded pension benefit obligation calculated in accordance with GASB Statement No. 5, *Disclosure of Pension Information by Public Employee Retirement Systems and State and Local Government Employers*. For June 30, 1994, amounts are the unfunded actuarial accrued liability produced by the method used to fund the plans and reflect implementation of GASB Statement No. 27, *Accounting for Pensions by State and Local Governmental Employers*. Before adoption of this Statement, such amount was \$1.85 billion.

The five major actuarial systems are funded on a basis which is designed to reduce gradually the unfunded accrued liability of those systems. For further information regarding the City's pension systems see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note R."

### Litigation

The following paragraphs describe certain material legal proceedings and claims involving the City and Covered Organizations other than routine litigation incidental to the performance of their governmental and other functions and certain other litigation arising out of alleged constitutional violations, torts, breaches of contract and other violations of law and condemnation proceedings. While the ultimate outcome and fiscal impact, if any, on the City of the proceedings and claims described below are not currently predictable, adverse determinations in certain of them might have a material adverse effect upon the City's ability to carry out the 1999-2003 Financial Plan. The City has estimated that its potential future liability on account of outstanding claims against it as of June 30, 1998 amounted to approximately \$3.5 billion. See "SECTION VII: 1999-2003 FINANCIAL PLAN—Assumptions—*Expenditure Assumptions*—2. Other Than Personal Service Costs—*Judgments and Claims*."

### Taxes

1. Numerous real estate tax *certiorari* proceedings alleging overvaluation, inequality and illegality are pending against the City. Based on historical settlement activity, and including an estimated premium for inequality of assessment, the City estimates its potential future liability for outstanding *certiorari* proceedings to be \$406 million at June 30, 1998. For a discussion of the City's accounting treatment of its inequality and overvaluation exposure, see "APPENDIX B—FINANCIAL STATEMENTS—Notes to Financial Statements—Note I."

2. The City has brought proceedings challenging the final class ratios for class two and class four property certified by the State Board for the 1991 and 1992 assessment rolls. Class ratios are used in real property tax *certiorari* proceedings involving allegations of inequality of assessment and ratios that are too low can result in more successful claims for refunds for overpayments than appropriate. In a proceeding consolidating the City's challenges to the class ratios for the 1991 and 1992 assessment rolls, on December 15, 1994, the Supreme Court, New York County annulled the class two and class four ratios for those years and remanded the matter to the State Board for recalculation of the ratios consistent with the decision. Pursuant to a stipulation extending its time to appeal, the State Board has not yet appealed the judgment, but if the original class ratios were reinstated on appeal, it could lead to an increase in refunds, for overpayment of real property taxes paid in the 1992 and 1993 fiscal years. The State Board and the City have also agreed to toll the City's time to challenge final class ratios for classes two and four for the 1993 and 1994 assessment rolls, pending the outcome of efforts to resolve the matter without further litigation. For additional information, see "SECTION IV: SOURCES OF CITY REVENUES—Real Estate Tax—*Assessment*."

3. A group of real property taxpayers have brought a series of declaratory judgment actions charging that Tax Resolutions adopted by the City Council violate the State Constitution. Plaintiffs allege that the special equalization ratios calculated by the State Board resulted in the overstatement of the average full valuation of real property in the City with the result that the City's real estate tax levy is in excess of the State Constitution's real estate tax limit. Actions relating to the real estate tax levies for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996 have been commenced by groups of taxpayers and are pending in State Supreme Court, Albany County. The first such action was dismissed on standing grounds. Although plaintiffs do not specify the extent of the alleged real property overvaluation, an adverse determination significantly reducing such limit could subject the City to substantial liability for real property tax refunds and could have an adverse impact on the amount of debt the City can have outstanding under the general debt limit (defined as 10% of the average full value of taxable real estate in the City for the most recent five years).

#### *Miscellaneous*

1. Forty actions seeking in excess of \$364 million have been commenced in State Supreme Court, New York County, against the City seeking damages for personal injuries and property damage in connection with an explosion of a Con Edison steam pipe which occurred in Gramercy Park on August 19, 1989.

2. On April 3, 1990, the New York State Court of Appeals ruled, in a case brought by a group of New York City recipients of AFDC, that the New York Social Services Law requires that AFDC recipients receive for housing an adequate allowance that bears a reasonable relationship to the cost of housing and remanded the case to the trial court. On April 16, 1997, the trial court held that the current shelter allowance is not reasonably related to the cost of housing. The State received notice of entry of a settlement order relating to the allowance, which the State has appealed. The shelter allowance, while determined by the State Department of Social Services ("DSS"), is funded by contributions from the Federal, State and City governments. The City's contribution is 25% of the total allowance. If plaintiffs are ultimately successful in seeking substantial increases in the shelter allowance, it could result in substantial costs to the City.

3. Pursuant to regulations of the DSS, the New York City Human Resources Administration ("HRA") provides a limited number of medically disabled and/or physically handicapped persons with "sleep-in home attendants" who are assigned to live in the person's home on a 24-hour basis. On June 12, 1989, the Appellate Division, Second Department affirmed a determination by the New York State Industrial Board of Appeals (the "IBA") in a proceeding initiated by one union representing sleep-in home attendants that the attendants were covered by the Minimum Wage Law. In May 1984, the union commenced a separate but related action in the Supreme Court, New York County on behalf of a number of sleep-in home attendants claiming, *inter alia*, that since 1981 the attendants were entitled to compensation for a 24-hour day and at a rate in excess of the minimum wage. That action has been stayed pending the outcome of a proceeding on this issue before the IBA. On May 28, 1997, the IBA found in favor of HRA and the corporations it contracts with who provide the sleep-in home attendants. The IBA revoked the Notices of Labor Law violation, which had been issued by the State Department of Labor, which asserted that the sleep-in home attendants had been underpaid. The union's challenge to the IBA's determination in Supreme Court, New York County was dismissed by the court on May 26, 1998. The union's time to appeal has expired.

While the potential cost to the City of adverse determinations in the proceedings cannot be determined at this time, such findings could result in substantial costs to the City depending on the number of hours deemed worked by particular attendants, the extent of State and Federal reimbursements, the number of attendants actually covered by a final determination and the rate of pay to be applied.

4. In two pending actions plaintiffs seek broad injunctive relief directed toward the City's lead paint poisoning prevention activities. In the Federal action, a class has been certified consisting of children under the age of seven and pregnant women residing in housing owned by the City or where the City administers community development funds. In the State action, the Appellate Division, First Department, in June 1997, vacated certification of the plaintiff class consisting of children under the age of seven living in multiple dwellings in New York City where a complaint of lead paint has been made which the City allegedly has not timely and adequately inspected and abated. In December 1997, the court in the State action reversed its earlier order and certified the class. Plaintiffs are seeking further review of that order. A preliminary injunction was

issued in the State action which directed the City's Department of Housing Preservation and Development ("HPD") to issue regulations in conformance with the court's interpretation of local law governing the removal of lead paint in residential buildings. HPD issued regulations which the court found to be inadequate. As a result, the City and various officials have been held in civil contempt for failing to comply with the court order. In December, 1997 the Appellate Division, First Department, reversed a finding of criminal contempt. The later findings of civil contempt were affirmed by the Appellate Division, First Department, by order entered March 3, 1998. The City's motions for reargument or, alternatively, leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals have been denied. The City Council has considered several bills to amend the local law and discussions are ongoing.

The State action also challenges the City's activities relating to the screening of children for lead poisoning, the timeliness and adequacy of enforcement efforts, and inspection of day care facilities. The Federal action seeks warnings to tenants of lead paint hazards, abatement of lead paint hazards, and medical monitoring of class members. Adverse determinations on these issues could result in substantial additional costs to the City.

In addition, nearly 1,450 claims have been filed against the City on behalf of children exposed to lead in City apartments. The suits seek to hold the City liable for failing to fix lead paint hazards in City-owned buildings and for failing to enforce lead safety standards in privately owned buildings. Such claims could cost the City in excess of \$400 million in the future.

5. Numerous actions have been asserted against the City and the Covered Organizations alleging that the City and the Covered Organizations have failed to provide proper housing and services to homeless individuals and families in violation of the State Constitution, the State Social Services Law, the State Mental Hygiene Law, and various related regulations. In one such action brought by homeless mentally-ill patients released from City hospitals, the New York Court of Appeals has ruled that the City must, *inter alia*, assist in locating adequate and appropriate housing when such patients are discharged from in-patient care. The State Supreme Court on remand ordered Defendants to propose procedures for monitoring the post-discharge status of such patients. It is unclear at present what costs the City may incur as a result of these rulings. Adverse determinations in the other actions could also result in substantial costs to the City.

6. On January 26, 1994, the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association ("EPVA") commenced an action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that the City had failed to take steps prescribed by the Americans with Disabilities Act and regulations promulgated thereunder to make the streets and sidewalks of the City accessible to handicapped persons. The EPVA seeks to compel the City, among other things, to implement a plan to provide curb ramps or other sloped areas at all intersections in the City by a certain future date, to be determined in accordance with U.S. Department of Justice regulations. If the EPVA were to prevail in this action, performing such work in an expedited time frame would impose substantial costs on the City.

7. Six separate actions, commenced in 1994, are pending in the State Supreme Court in Putnam County seeking damages in the amount of approximately \$10.5 billion in the aggregate for alleged injury to property caused by regulations enacted for the protection of the water supply of the City. In April 1998, the City was sued by 67 additional landowners for the alleged impact of the regulations on their property values. The City has also received approximately 20 additional claims from property owners seeking similar relief. On May 22, 1998, the City was served with a class action on behalf of all property owners, lien holders, mortgagees and business owners relating to property throughout the watershed seeking \$1.5 billion in damages also for the alleged impact of the regulations on the values of watershed properties and businesses. In response to a motion to dismiss the six original actions brought by the City, on June 24, 1997, the Court ruled that plaintiffs could assert claims against the City for any diminution in the value of their property caused by a chilling effect on the real estate market from the City's watershed regulations. The Court further ruled that plaintiffs with development plans not approved by the City under the watershed regulations could assert claims for additional damages beyond any general effect of the City's watershed regulations on the real estate market. The City has appealed the Court's decision.

8. On April 15, 1996, Stanley Hill, Executive Director of District Council 37, representatives of certain other unions, certain Federal, City and State elected officials and other plaintiffs filed an action in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York, against the Mayor which asserted, among other things, that the City has violated the provisions of the Health and Hospitals Corporation Act by failing to subsidize HHC

at the minimum funding levels required for the 1994 through 1997 fiscal years, and failed to pay HHC for the value of services rendered to the City for indigent care and for prisoners, uniformed services and mortuary care to the extent that such services are not reimbursed. On July 15, 1997, the Court permitted the plaintiffs to amend the complaint and seek an order requiring the City to pay to HHC at least \$949 million, \$931 million and \$831 million for the 1994, 1995 and 1996 fiscal years, respectively, and an amount to be determined by the Court for the 1997 fiscal year. The Court denied plaintiff's motion to preliminarily enjoin the defendant from further reducing the City's subsidy to HHC for the 1996 and 1997 fiscal years from the amount originally budgeted for the 1996 fiscal year.

9. In June 1997, Robert L. Schulz, Gary T. Loughrey, et al. commenced an action in the State Supreme Court, Albany County against the State Legislature, Sheldon Silver, Speaker of the Assembly, Joseph Bruno, Senate Majority Leader, and the Governor. The action seeks a declaratory judgment declaring the New York City Transitional Finance Authority Act (the "Finance Authority Act") to be unconstitutional as allowing the City to issue debt in avoidance of the City's constitutional debt limit. At their request, the Finance Authority and the City were joined as defendants. On November 25, 1997, the Supreme Court found the Finance Authority Act to be constitutional and granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment. On July 30, 1998, the Appellate Division, Third Department, affirmed the Supreme Court decision. Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal with the New York Court of Appeals asserting an appeal as of right of the Appellate Division order. That appeal was dismissed on September 22, 1998. Plaintiffs subsequently filed a motion for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals, which motion was denied on December 22, 1998. In March 1999, plaintiffs filed a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

10. In May 1997, ten individuals commenced an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the City in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of themselves and persons similarly situated, alleging that City correctional officers since July 1996 had violated the constitutional rights of persons arrested for misdemeanors or non-criminal offenses by stripsearching such persons upon entry into pre-arraignment holding pens at the Manhattan and Queens criminal courthouses. In April 1998, the district court granted plaintiffs' motion for class certification. While the class action is in its preliminary stages and the potential cost to the City of adverse determinations of liability and damages in the action cannot be determined at this time, any such adverse determinations could result in substantial costs to the City.

### **Tax Exemption**

In the opinion of Brown & Wood LLP, New York, New York, as Bond Counsel, except as provided in the following sentence, interest on the Bonds will not be includable in the gross income of the owners of the Bonds for purposes of Federal income taxation under existing law. Interest on the Bonds will be includable in the gross income of the owners thereof retroactive to the date of issue of the Bonds in the event of a failure by the City to comply with applicable requirements of the Code, and covenants regarding use, expenditure and investment of bond proceeds and the timely payment of certain investment earnings to the United States Treasury; and no opinion is rendered by Brown & Wood LLP as to the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Bonds for Federal income tax purposes on or after the date on which any action is taken under the Bond proceedings upon the approval of counsel other than such firm.

Interest on the Bonds will be exempt from personal income taxes imposed by the State or any political subdivision thereof, including the City.

Interest on the Bonds will not be a specific preference item for purposes of the Federal individual or corporate alternative minimum tax. The Code contains other provisions that could result in tax consequences, upon which Brown & Wood LLP renders no opinion, as a result of ownership of such Bonds or the inclusion in certain computations (including, without limitation, those related to the corporate alternative minimum tax) of interest that is excluded from gross income. Interest on the Bonds owned by a corporation will be included in the calculation of the corporation's Federal alternative minimum tax liability.

Ownership of tax-exempt obligations may result in collateral tax consequences to certain taxpayers, including, without limitation, financial institutions, property and casualty insurance companies, certain foreign corporations doing business in the United States, certain S Corporations with excess passive income, individual

recipients of Social Security or railroad retirement benefits, taxpayers eligible for the earned income tax credit and taxpayers who may be deemed to have incurred or continued indebtedness to purchase or carry tax-exempt obligations. Prospective purchasers of the Bonds should consult their tax advisors as to applicability of any such collateral consequences.

The excess, if any, of the amount payable at maturity of any maturity of the Bonds over the initial public offering price to the public (excluding bond houses, brokers or similar persons acting in the capacity of underwriters or wholesalers) at which price a substantial amount of such maturity is sold constitutes original issue discount, which will be excludable from gross income to the same extent as interest on the Bonds for Federal, New York State and New York City income tax purposes. The Code provides that the amount of original issue discount accrues in accordance with a constant interest method based on the compounding of interest, and that a holder's adjusted basis for purposes of determining a holder's gain or loss on disposition of the Bonds with original issue discount (the "OID Bonds") will be increased by such amount. A portion of the original issue discount that accrues in each year to an owner of an OID Bond which is a corporation will be included in the calculation of the corporation's Federal alternative minimum tax liability. In addition, original issue discount that accrues in each year to an owner of an OID Bond is included in the calculation of the distribution requirements of certain regulated investment companies and may result in some of the collateral Federal income tax consequences discussed above. Consequently, owners of any OID Bond should be aware that the accrual of original issue discount in each year may result in an alternative minimum tax liability, additional distribution requirements or other collateral Federal income tax consequences although the owner of such OID Bond has not received cash attributable to such original issue discount in such year.

Owners of OID Bonds should consult their personal tax advisors with respect to the determination for Federal income tax purposes of the amount of original issue discount or interest properly accruable with respect to such OID Bonds, other tax consequences of owning OID Bonds and other state and local tax consequences of holding such OID Bonds.

The excess, if any, of the tax basis of the Bonds to a purchaser (other than a purchaser who holds such Bonds as inventory, stock in trade or for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business) over the amount payable at maturity is "bond premium". Bond premium is amortized over the term of such Bonds for Federal income tax purposes. Owners of such Bonds are required to decrease their adjusted basis in such Bonds by the amount of amortizable bond premium attributable to each taxable year such Bonds are held. The amortizable bond premium on such Bonds attributable to a taxable year is not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. Owners of such Bonds should consult their tax advisors with respect to the determination for Federal income tax purposes of the treatment of bond premiums upon sale or other disposition of such Bonds and with respect to the state and local tax consequences of owning and disposing of such Bonds.

Legislation affecting municipal securities is constantly being considered by the United States Congress. There can be no assurance that legislation enacted after the date of issuance of the Bonds will not have an adverse effect on the tax-exempt status of the Bonds. Legislative or regulatory actions and proposals may also affect the economic value of tax exemption or the market price of the Bonds.

## **Ratings**

Moody's has rated the Bonds A3. Standard & Poor's has rated the Bonds A-. Fitch has rated the Bonds A. These ratings do not reflect any bond insurance relating to any portion of the Bonds. The City expects that ratings on the MBIA Insured Bonds will be received prior to April 21, 1999. The ratings on the MBIA Insured Bonds will be based on the insurance policy to be issued by MBIA. Bonds insured to maturity by MBIA are rated "AAA" by Standard & Poor's, "Aaa" by Moody's and "AAA" by Fitch. Such ratings reflect only the views of Moody's, Standard & Poor's and Fitch from which an explanation of the significance of such ratings may be obtained. There is no assurance that such ratings will continue for any given period of time or that they will not be revised downward or withdrawn entirely. Any such downward revision or withdrawal could have an adverse effect on the market prices of the Bonds. On July 10, 1995, Standard & Poor's revised its rating of City bonds downward to BBB+. On July 16, 1998, Standard & Poor's revised its rating of City bonds upward to A-. Moody's rating of City bonds was revised in February 1998 to A3 from Baa1. On March 8, 1999, Fitch revised



its rating of City bonds upward to A. Moody's, Standard & Poor's and Fitch currently rate the City's outstanding general obligation bonds A3, A- and A, respectively.

### **Legal Opinions**

The legality of the authorization and issuance of the Bonds will be covered by the approving legal opinion of Brown & Wood LLP, New York, New York, Bond Counsel to the City. Reference should be made to the form of such opinion set forth in Appendix C hereto for the matters covered by such opinion and the scope of Bond Counsel's engagement in relation to the issuance of the Bonds. Such firm is also acting as counsel for and against the City in certain other unrelated matters.

Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the City by its Corporation Counsel.

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, New York, New York, Special Counsel to the City, will pass upon certain legal matters in connection with the preparation of this Official Statement. A description of those matters and the nature of the review conducted by that firm is set forth in its opinion and accompanying memorandum which are on file at the office of the Corporation Counsel. Such firm is also acting as counsel against the City in certain unrelated matters.

Certain legal matters will be passed upon by Rogers & Wells LLP, New York, New York, counsel for the Underwriters. Such firm is also acting as counsel for and against the City in certain other unrelated matters.

### **Reoffering by the Original Purchasers**

The Bonds are being purchased for reoffering by the original purchasers thereof at an aggregate discount, including net original issue discount, the cost of insurance paid for by the original purchasers and an underwriting discount of \$970,385.05.

### **Continuing Disclosure Undertaking**

As authorized by the Act, and to the extent that (i) Rule 15c2-12 (the "Rule") of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "1934 Act") requires the underwriters (as defined in the Rule) of securities offered hereby (under this caption, if subject to the Rule, the "securities") to determine, as a condition to purchasing the securities, that the City will covenant to the effect of the Undertaking, and (ii) the Rule as so applied is authorized by a Federal law that as so construed is within the powers of Congress, the City agrees with the record and beneficial owners from time to time of the outstanding securities (under this caption, if subject to the Rule, "Bondholders") to provide:

(a) within 185 days after the end of each fiscal year, to each nationally recognized municipal securities information repository and to any New York State information depository, core financial information and operating data for the prior fiscal year, including (i) the City's audited general purpose financial statements, prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles in effect from time to time, and (ii) material historical quantitative data on the City's revenues, expenditures, financial operations and indebtedness generally of the type found herein in Sections IV, V and VIII and under the captions "1994-1998 Summary of Operations" in Section VI and "Pension Systems" in Section IX; and

(b) in a timely manner, to each nationally recognized municipal securities information repository or to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and to any New York State information depository, notice of any of the following events with respect to the securities, if material:

- (1) principal and interest payment delinquencies;
- (2) non-payment related defaults;
- (3) unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;
- (4) unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;
- (5) substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform;
- (6) adverse tax opinions or events affecting the tax-exempt status of the security;

- (7) modifications to rights of security holders;
- (8) bond calls;
- (9) defeasances;
- (10) release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the securities;
- (11) rating changes; and
- (12) failure of the City to comply with clause (a) above.

Event (3) is included pursuant to a letter from the SEC staff to the National Association of Bond Lawyers dated September 19, 1995. However, event (3) may not be applicable, since the terms of the securities do not provide for "debt service reserves".

Events (4) and (5). The City does not undertake to provide any notice with respect to credit enhancement added after the primary offering of the securities, unless the City applies for or participates in obtaining the enhancement.

Event (6) is relevant only to the extent interest on the securities is tax-exempt.

Event (8). The City does not undertake to provide the above-described event notice of a mandatory scheduled redemption, not otherwise contingent upon the occurrence of an event, if (i) the terms, dates and amounts of redemption are set forth in detail in the final official statement (as defined in the Rule), (ii) the only open issue is which securities will be redeemed in the case of a partial redemption, (iii) notice of redemption is given to the Bondholders as required under the terms of the securities and (iv) public notice of the redemption is given pursuant to Exchange Act Release No. 23856 of the SEC, even if the originally scheduled amounts are reduced by prior optional redemptions or security purchases.

The City expects to provide the information described in clause (a) above by delivering its first bond official statement that includes its financial statements for the preceding fiscal year or, if no such official statement is issued by the 185-day deadline, by delivering the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller by such deadline.

At the date hereof, there is no New York State information depository and the nationally recognized municipal securities information repositories are: Bloomberg Municipal Repository, P.O. Box 840, Princeton, New Jersey 08542-0840; Kenny Information Systems, Inc., 65 Broadway—16th Floor, New York, New York 10006; Thomson NRMSIR, 395 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10004, Attn: Municipal Disclosure; and DPC Data Inc., One Executive Drive, Fort Lee, New Jersey 07024.

No Bondholder may institute any suit, action or proceeding at law or in equity ("Proceeding") for the enforcement of the Undertaking or for any remedy for breach thereof, unless such Bondholder shall have filed with the Corporation Counsel of the City evidence of ownership and a written notice of and request to cure such breach, and the City shall have refused to comply within a reasonable time. All Proceedings shall be instituted only as specified herein, in the Federal or State courts located in the Borough of Manhattan, State and City of New York, and for the equal benefit of all holders of the outstanding securities benefitted by the same or a substantially similar covenant, and no remedy shall be sought or granted other than specific performance of the covenant at issue.

Any amendment to the Undertaking may only take effect if:

(a) the amendment is made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, change in law, or change in the identity, nature, or status of the City, or type of business conducted; the Undertaking, as amended, would have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of award of the securities after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances; and the amendment does not materially impair the interests of Bondholders, as determined by parties unaffiliated with the City (such as, but without limitation, the City's financial advisor or bond counsel) and the annual financial information containing (if applicable) the amended operating data or financial information will explain, in narrative form, the reasons for the amendment and the "impact" (as that word is used in the letter from the staff of the SEC to the National Association of Bond Lawyers dated June 23, 1995) of the change in the type of operating data or financial information being provided; or

(b) all or any part of the Rule, as interpreted by the staff of the SEC at the date of the Undertaking, ceases to be in effect for any reason, and the City elects that the Undertaking shall be deemed terminated or amended (as the case may be) accordingly.

For purposes of the Undertaking, a beneficial owner of a security includes any person who, directly or indirectly, through any contract, arrangement, understanding, relationship, or otherwise has or shares investment power which includes the power to dispose, or to direct the disposition of, such security, subject to certain exceptions, as set forth in the Undertaking. An assertion of beneficial ownership must be filed, with full documentary support, as part of the written request to the Corporation Counsel described above.

### **Financial Advisor**

The City retains Public Resources Advisory Group (“PRAG”) to act as financial advisor with respect to the City’s financing program. PRAG is acting as financial advisor for the issuance of the Bonds.

### **Further Information**

The references herein to, and summaries of, Federal, State and local laws, including but not limited to the State Constitution, the Financial Emergency Act, the Moratorium Act, the MAC Act and the City Charter, and documents, agreements and court decisions, including but not limited to the Financial Plan, are summaries of certain provisions thereof. Such summaries do not purport to be complete and are qualified in their entirety by reference to such acts, laws, documents, agreements or decisions, copies of which are available for inspection during business hours at the office of the Corporation Counsel.

Copies of the most recent financial plan submitted to the Control Board are available upon written request to the Office of Management and Budget, General Counsel, 6th Floor, 75 Park Place, New York, NY 10007, and copies of the most recent published Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller are available upon written request to the Office of the Comptroller, Deputy Comptroller for Public Finance, Fifth Floor, Room 517, Municipal Building, One Centre Street, New York, NY 10007. Financial plans are prepared quarterly, and the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Comptroller is typically prepared at the end of October of each year.

Neither this Official Statement nor any statement which may have been made orally or in writing shall be construed as a contract or as a part of a contract with the original purchasers or any holders of the Bonds.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

[This page intentionally left blank]

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS

This section presents information regarding certain of the major economic and demographic factors in the City which may affect the City. All information is presented on a calendar year basis unless otherwise indicated. The data set forth are the latest available. Sources of information are indicated in the text or immediately following the tables. Although the City considers the sources to be reliable, the City has made no independent verification of the information presented herein and does not warrant its accuracy.

### New York City Economy

The City has a highly diversified economic base, with a substantial volume of business activity in the service, wholesale and retail trade and manufacturing industries and is the location of many securities, banking, law, accounting and advertising firms.

The City is a major seaport and focal point for international business. Many of the major corporations headquartered in the City are multinational in scope and have extensive foreign operations. Numerous foreign-owned companies in the United States are also headquartered in the City. These firms, which have increased in number substantially over the past decade, are found in all sectors of the City's economy, but are concentrated in trade, manufacturing sales offices, tourism and finance. The City is the location of the headquarters of the United Nations, and several affiliated organizations maintain their principal offices in the City. A large diplomatic community exists in the City to staff the 186 missions to the United Nations and the 96 foreign consulates.

Economic activity in the City has experienced periods of growth and recession and can be expected to experience periods of growth and recession in the future. Changes in the economic activity in the City, particularly employment, per capita personal income and retail sales, may have an impact on the City. From 1969 to 1977, the City experienced substantial declines in employment, but from 1978 to 1987 the City experienced strong growth in jobs, especially in the City's finance, insurance and real estate ("FIRE") sector due in large part to lower inflation, lower interest rates and a strong securities market. Beginning in 1988, employment growth in the City slowed, and in 1990 the City experienced job losses, although the U.S. economy expanded during that period. During 1991 and 1992, employment levels in the City continued to decline. In recent years, the City has experienced increases in employment. Real per capita personal income (i.e., per capita personal income adjusted for the effects of inflation and the differential in living costs) has generally experienced fewer fluctuations than employment in the City. Although the City periodically experienced declines in real per capita personal income between 1969 and 1981, real per capita personal income in the City has generally increased from the mid-1980s until the present. In nearly all of the years between 1969 and 1990 the City experienced strong increases in retail sales. However, from 1991 to 1993, the City experienced a weak period of retail sales. Since 1994, the City has returned to a period of growth in retail sales. Overall, the City's economic improvement accelerated significantly in 1997 and 1998. Much of the increase can be traced to the performance of the securities industry, but the City's economy also produced gains in the retail trade sector, the hotel and tourism industry, and business services, with private sector employment higher than previously forecasted. The City's current Financial Plan assumes that, after strong growth in 1998-1999, moderate economic growth will exist through calendar year 2003, with moderating job growth and wage increases. However, there can be no assurance that the economic projections assumed in the Financial Plan will occur or that the tax revenues projected in the Financial Plan to be received will be received in the amounts anticipated.

### Personal Income

Per capita personal income for City residents, unadjusted for the effects of inflation and the differential in living costs, has steadily increased from 1986 to 1996 (the most recent year for which City personal income data are available) and is higher than the average for the United States. From 1986 to 1996, per capita personal income in the City averaged 5.6% growth compared to 4.8% for the nation. The following table sets forth recent information regarding personal income in the City.

**PERSONAL INCOME IN NEW YORK CITY(1)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total NYC Personal Income (\$ billions)</u>	<u>Per Capita Personal Income NYC</u>	<u>Per Capita Personal Income U.S.</u>	<u>NYC as a Percent of U.S.</u>
1986 .....	\$133.7	\$18,265	\$15,185	120.3%
1987 .....	143.1	19,488	15,990	121.9
1988 .....	156.8	21,322	17,062	125.0
1989 .....	167.9	22,858	18,172	125.8
1990 .....	180.0	24,589	19,188	128.1
1991 .....	184.5	25,271	19,687	128.4
1992 .....	197.5	27,046	20,631	131.1
1993 .....	203.0	27,710	21,368	129.7
1994 .....	208.3	28,390	22,186	128.0
1995 .....	222.3	30,298	23,359	129.7
1996 .....	234.2	31,928	24,436	130.7

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Bureau of the Census.

(1) In current dollars. Personal Income is based on the place of residence and is measured from income which includes wages and salaries, other labor income, proprietors' income, personal dividend income, personal interest income, rental income of persons, and transfer payments.

**Sectoral Distribution of Employment and Income**

In 1998, the City's services employment sector hit an all-time peak, providing more than 1.3 million jobs and accounting for 37.6% of total employment. Figures on the sectoral distribution of employment in the City reflect a significant shift to non-manufacturing employment, particularly to the areas of services and FIRE, and a shrinking manufacturing base in the City relative to the nation.

The structural shift from manufacturing to the services and FIRE sectors affects the level of earnings per employee because employee compensation in finance and related business and professional services is considerably higher than in manufacturing. Moreover, per employee earnings in the FIRE sector are significantly higher in the City than in the nation. From 1977 to 1996, the employment share for FIRE increased from 13% to 14% in the City while the FIRE sector earnings share for the same period rose from 16% to 28.6% in the City. This shift in employment and earnings distribution toward the FIRE sector was more pronounced in the City than in the nation overall as indicated in the table below. Due to this shift in earnings distribution, sudden or large shocks in the financial markets have a disproportionately adverse effect on the City relative to the nation.

The City's and the nation's employment and earnings by industry are set forth in the following table.

**SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS(1)**

<u>Sector</u>	<u>Employment</u>				<u>Earnings(2)</u>			
	<u>1977</u>		<u>1996</u>		<u>1977</u>		<u>1996</u>	
	<u>NYC</u>	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
<b>Private Sector:</b>								
Non-Manufacturing:								
Services .....	24.6%	18.6%	36.6%	28.8%	24.9%	17.9%	33.6%	28.6%
Wholesale and Retail Trade .....	19.5	22.4	16.8	23.5	16.0	17.2	10.1	15.6
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate .....	13.0	5.4	14.0	5.8	16.0	5.8	28.6	8.4
Transportation and Public Utilities .....	8.1	5.7	6.1	5.2	10.9	7.7	6.2	6.9
Contract Construction .....	2.0	4.7	2.7	4.5	2.4	6.5	2.6	5.7
Mining .....	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.4	1.8	0.0	0.9
Total Non-Manufacturing .....	67.2	57.8	76.2	68.3	70.8	57.2	81.1	66.1
Manufacturing:								
Durable .....	5.1	14.0	2.0	9.0	4.3	16.4	1.6	11.2
Non-Durable .....	11.8	9.8	6.0	6.4	10.5	9.5	5.7	7.1
Total Manufacturing .....	16.9	23.9	7.9	15.4	14.8	25.9	7.3	18.3
<b>Total Private Sector</b> .....	<b>84.0</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>84.1</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>83.1</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>84.4</b>
<b>Government<sup>(3)</sup></b> .....	<b>15.9</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>15.6</b>

Note: Totals may not tally due to rounding.

Sources: The two primary sources of employment and earnings information are U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(1) The sectoral distributions are obtained by dividing each industry's employment or earnings by total non-agricultural employment or earnings.

(2) Includes the sum of wage and salary disbursements, other labor income, and proprietors' income. The latest information available for the City is 1996 data.

(3) Excludes military establishments.

**Employment Trends**

The City is a leading center for the banking and securities industry, life insurance, communications, publishing, fashion design and retail fields. From 1994 through 1998, the City has experienced significant private sector job growth with the addition of more than 264,000 (an average growth rate of 1.9%) new private sector jobs. This expansion over the last five years is the largest five year job growth rate that the City has experienced since the 1950s, and contrasts with the approximately 9% loss in the City's employment base during 1989-1992.

The table below shows the distribution of employment from 1989 to 1998.

**NEW YORK CITY EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION**

	Average Annual Employment (in thousands)									
	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
<b>Private Sector</b>										
Non-Manufacturing										
Services.....	1,147	1,149	1,097	1,093	1,116	1,148	1,184	1,227	1,275	1,326
Wholesale and Retail Trade.....	630	608	565	546	538	544	555	565	578	588
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	531	520	494	474	472	480	473	469	473	484
Transportation and Public Utilities	218	229	218	205	203	202	203	205	206	207
Construction.....	121	115	100	87	86	89	90	91	94	101
Total Non- Manufacturing...	2,647	2,621	2,474	2,404	2,415	2,463	2,506	2,557	2,625	2,706
Manufacturing:										
Durable .....	94	88	77	73	71	69	68	66	64	64
Non-Durable .....	265	250	231	220	218	211	206	201	201	198
Total Manufacturing...	359	338	308	293	289	281	274	266	265	262
<b>Total Private Sector ...</b>	<b>3,006</b>	<b>2,958</b>	<b>2,782</b>	<b>2,697</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>2,744</b>	<b>2,779</b>	<b>2,823</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>2,968</b>
<b>Government.....</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>556</b>
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>3,608</b>	<b>3,566</b>	<b>3,375</b>	<b>3,282</b>	<b>3,291</b>	<b>3,322</b>	<b>3,339</b>	<b>3,369</b>	<b>3,442</b>	<b>3,524</b>

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As of February, 1999, total employment in the City was approximately 3,538,000, compared to approximately 3,458,000 in February, 1998.

*Unemployment*

The unemployment rate of the City's resident labor force is shown in the following table.

**ANNUAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE(1)(2)**

	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
New York City .....	6.9%	6.9%	8.7%	11.0%	10.4%	8.7%	8.2%	8.8%	9.4%	8.0%
United States .....	5.3%	5.6%	6.9%	7.5%	6.9%	6.1%	5.6%	5.4%	5.0%	4.5%

Note: Monthly and semi-annual data are not seasonally adjusted. Because these estimates are based on a sample rather than a full count of population, these data are subject to sampling error. Accordingly, small differences in the estimates over time should be interpreted with caution. The Current Population Survey includes wage and salary workers, domestic and other household workers, self-employed persons and unpaid workers who work 15 hours or more during the survey week in family businesses.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, BLS.

- (1) Percentage of civilian labor force unemployed: excludes those persons unable to work and discouraged workers (i.e., persons not actively seeking work because they believe no suitable work is available).
- (2) Beginning in late 1992 the Current Population Survey (which provides household employment and unemployment statistics) methodology was revised for September 1992 and thereafter. As a result, the methodology used for such period differs from the methodology used for the period prior to September 1992 and, consequently, the pre-September 1992 data is inconsistent with the data for September 1992 and thereafter.

As of February, 1999, total unemployment in the City was 8.1% compared to 9.0% in February, 1998.



## Public Assistance

The following table sets forth the number of persons receiving public assistance in the City.

<b>PUBLIC ASSISTANCE(1)</b>									
(Annual Averages in Thousands)									
<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>
818.5	858.3	939.4	1,007.7	1,085.6	1,140.6	1,109.5	1,003.3	873.6	760.1

(1) Figures do not include aged, disabled or blind persons who were transferred from public assistance to the SSI program, which is primarily federally funded.

As of December 31, 1998, the number of persons receiving public assistance in the City was 715,733 compared to 817,407 in December 1997.

## Taxable Sales

The sales tax is levied on a variety of economic activities including retail sales, utility and communication sales, services and manufacturing. The total taxable sales volume has grown steadily over the past 13 years, except for the period from 1991-1992, with a growth rate averaging over 4%.

The City is a major retail trade market with the greatest volume of retail sales of any city in the nation. Retail sales account for almost 50% of the total taxable sales volume.

The following table illustrates the volume of sales and purchases subject to the sales tax over the past ten years.

### TAXABLE SALES AND PURCHASES SUBJECT TO SALES TAX (In Billions)

<u>Year(1)</u>	<u>Retail(2)</u>	<u>Utility &amp; Communication Sales(3)</u>	<u>Services(4)</u>	<u>Manufacturing</u>	<u>Other(5)</u>	<u>All Total</u>
1987 .....	\$22.6	\$7.1	\$ 7.7	\$3.9	\$6.7	\$48.0
1988 .....	23.8	7.3	8.5	3.9	7.3	50.8
1989 .....	24.5	7.6	9.0	3.8	7.8	52.8
1990 .....	25.4	8.1	9.2	3.7	7.9	54.4
1991 .....	24.0	8.5	9.1	3.3	7.8	52.6
1992 .....	23.8	7.3	9.0	3.2	7.9	51.1
1993 .....	24.1	9.4	9.1	3.2	8.6	54.5
1994 .....	26.2	9.3	10.3	3.3	8.1	57.2
1995 .....	27.6	9.0	10.7	3.3	8.9	59.4
1996 .....	29.1	9.7	11.4	3.6	9.4	63.1
1997 .....	30.3	9.8	12.8	3.8	10.7	67.4

Source: State Department of Taxation and Finance publication "Taxable Sales and Purchases, County and Industry Data."

(1) The yearly data is for the period from September 1 of the year prior to the listed year through August 31 of the listed year.

(2) Retail sales include building materials, general merchandise, food, auto dealers/gas stations, apparel, furniture, eating and drinking and miscellaneous retail.

(3) Utility and Communication sales include electric and gas and communication.

(4) Services include business services, hotels, personal services, auto repair and other services.

(5) All other sales include construction, wholesale trade and others.

## Population

The City has been the most populous city in the United States since 1810. The City's population is almost as large as the combined population of Los Angeles, Chicago and Houston, the three next most populous cities in the nation.

The City's population reached its peak of approximately 7.9 million in 1970 before declining by 10.4% between 1970 and 1980. From 1980 to 1990, the population of the City steadily increased before dropping slightly in 1991 and 1992. Since 1992, the City's population has increased slowly although the rate of growth has accelerated in recent years. From 1992 to 1998, the City's population has grown 1.6% from approximately 7.3 million to over 7.4 million. The following table provides information concerning the City's population.

#### POPULATION OF NEW YORK CITY

<u>Year(1)</u>	<u>Total Population</u>
1980 .....	7,071,639
1984 .....	7,198,277
1985 .....	7,232,780
1986 .....	7,276,928
1987 .....	7,292,432
1988 .....	7,283,880
1989 .....	7,313,757
1990 .....	7,321,713
1991 .....	7,303,372
1992 .....	7,303,017
1993 .....	7,327,437
1994 .....	7,347,275
1995 .....	7,361,221
1996 .....	7,385,494
1997 .....	7,420,166

Note: Figures do not include an undetermined number of undocumented aliens.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

(1) 1984-1989 and 1991-1997 figures are based on midyear population estimates of the U.S. Bureau of the Census as of March 1998.

The following table sets forth the distribution of the City's population by age between 1980 and 1990.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY AGE (In Thousands)

<u>Age</u>	<u>1980</u>		<u>1990</u>	
		<u>% of Total</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
Under 5 .....	471	6.7	510	7.0
5 to 17 .....	1,295	18.3	1,177	16.1
18 to 24 .....	826	11.7	778	10.6
25 to 34 .....	1,203	17.0	1,369	18.7
35 to 44 .....	834	11.8	1,117	15.2
45 to 64 .....	1,491	21.1	1,419	19.4
65 and Over .....	952	13.4	953	13.0

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

#### Housing

In 1996, the housing stock in the City consisted of approximately 2,995,000 housing units, excluding certain special types of units primarily in institutions such as hospitals and universities. The 1996 housing inventory represented an increase of approximately 18,000 units, or 0.6%, since 1993 and an increase of approximately 155,000 units, or 5.5% since 1987. The 1996 Housing and Vacancy Survey indicates that rental housing units predominate in the City. Of all occupied housing units in 1996, approximately 30% were conventional home-ownership units, cooperatives or condominiums and approximately 70% were rental units. The following table presents trends in the housing inventory in the City.

**HOUSING INVENTORY IN NEW YORK CITY**  
**(Housing Units in Thousands)**

<u>Ownership/Occupancy Status</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1996</u>
Total Housing Units .....	2,792	2,803	2,840	2,981	2,977	2,995
Owner Units .....	755	807	837	858	825	858
Owner-Occupied .....	746	795	817	829	805	834
Vacant for Sale .....	9	12	19	20	20	24
Rental Units .....	1,976	1,940	1,932	2,028	2,040	2,027
Renter-Occupied .....	1,934	1,901	1,884	1,952	1,970	1,946
Vacant for Rent .....	42	40	47	77	70	81
Vacant Not Available for Sale or Rent(1) .....	62	56	72	94	111	110

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1993 and 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

(1) Vacant units that are dilapidated, intended for seasonal use, held for occasional use, held for maintenance purposes or other reasons. Note: Details may not add up to totals due to rounding.

**LARGEST REAL ESTATE TAXPAYERS**

No single taxpayer accounts for 10% or more of the City's real property tax. For the 1999 fiscal year, the assessed valuation of real estate of utility corporations is \$6.5 billion. The following table presents the 38 non-utility properties having the greatest assessed valuation in the 1999 fiscal year as indicated in the tax rolls.

<u>Property</u>	<u>1999 Fiscal Year Assessed Valuation</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>1999 Fiscal Year Assessed Valuation</u>
Met Life Building .....	\$243,550,000	Paramount Plaza Building .....	\$111,600,000
General Motors Building .....	186,700,000	Celanese Building .....	111,060,000
Empire State Building .....	183,600,000	Merrill Lynch Building .....	109,016,000
Sperry Rand Building .....	175,500,000	595 Lexington Avenue .....	107,640,000
Stuyvesant Town .....	163,930,000	The Chase Manhattan Building ....	106,620,000
Bear Stearns Building .....	162,000,000	Chase World Headquarters .....	106,030,000
McGraw-Hill Building .....	158,050,000	Carpet Center Building .....	102,730,000
Bristol Myers Building .....	157,770,000	666 Fifth Avenue .....	102,660,000
Paine Webber Building .....	140,400,000	New York Hilton .....	100,640,000
Equitable Tower .....	140,000,000	Park Avenue Atrium .....	98,520,000
Credit Lyonnais .....	138,970,000	617 Lexington Avenue .....	92,610,000
Morgan Guaranty Building .....	134,210,000	Park Avenue Plaza .....	90,000,000
International Building .....	132,300,000	W.R. Grace Building .....	89,820,000
Alliance Capital Building .....	128,160,000	Smith Barney Building .....	89,690,000
One Liberty Plaza .....	124,920,000	Simon & Schuster Building .....	88,830,000
Worldwide Plaza .....	120,600,000	Continental Illinois Building .....	84,330,000
One Penn Plaza .....	118,950,000	North Shore Towers .....	82,592,000
Waldorf Astoria .....	117,050,000	Sony Building .....	81,850,000
Solow Building .....	116,100,000	Burroughs Building .....	80,820,000

Source: The City of New York, Department of Finance, Bureau of Real Property Assessment.

**GENERAL PURPOSE  
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
OF  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

**June 30, 1998 and 1997**

**INDEX**

	<u>Page</u>
Report of Independent Auditors .....	B-3
Combined Balance Sheet—All Fund Types, Account Groups and Discretely Presented Component Units—June 30, 1998 .....	B-4
Combined Balance Sheet—All Fund Types, Account Groups and Discretely Presented Component Units—June 30, 1997 .....	B-6
Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances—All Governmental Fund Types—for the Year Ended June 30, 1998 .....	B-8
Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances—All Governmental Fund Types—for the Year Ended June 30, 1997 .....	B-9
General Fund Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances—Budget and Actual—for the Years Ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 .....	B-10
Combined Statement of Changes in Pension and Similar Trust Funds Plan Net Assets—Pension and Similar Trust Funds for the Year Ended June 30, 1998 .....	B-11
Combined Statement of Changes in Pension and Similar Trust Funds Plan Net Assets—Pension and Similar Trust Funds for the Year Ended June 30, 1997 .....	B-12
Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Equity—Discretely Presented Component Units—for the Year Ended June 30, 1998 .....	B-13
Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Equity—Discretely Presented Component Units—for the Year Ended June 30, 1997 .....	B-14
Combined Statement of Cash Flows—Discretely Presented Component Units—for the Year Ended June 30, 1998 .....	B-15
Combined Statement of Cash Flows—Discretely Presented Component Units—for the Year Ended June 30, 1997 .....	B-16
Notes to Financial Statements—June 30, 1998 and 1997 .....	B-17

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

### Report of Independent Auditors

The People of The City of New York

We have audited the general purpose financial statements of The City of New York ("The City") as of and for the years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997, as listed in the index. These financial statements are the responsibility of The City's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We did not audit the financial statements of the entities disclosed in Note B. Those financial statements were audited by other auditors, whose reports have been furnished to us, and our opinion on the general purpose financial statements, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for such entities, is based solely on the reports of the other auditors.

We conducted our audits in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatements. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits and the reports of other auditors provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, based on our audits and the reports of the other auditors, the general purpose financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of The City at June 30, 1998 and 1997, and the results of its operations and cash flows of its discretely presented component units for the years then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

As described in Note A to the general purpose financial statements, in fiscal year 1997, The City adopted GASB Statement No. 31 *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and for External Investment Pools*. Also as described in Note A, The City's 1998 financial statements include the New York City Transitional Finance Authority, whose inception was October, 1997, as a component unit.

*KPMG Peat Marwick LLP*

*Watson Rice LLP*

October 26, 1998  
New York, New York

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED BALANCE SHEET—ALL FUND TYPES, ACCOUNT GROUPS AND DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**

JUNE 30, 1998  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types			Fiduciary Fund Type	Account Groups		Total (Memorandum Only) Primary Government	Discretely Presented Component Units	Total (Memorandum Only) Reporting Entity
	General	Capital Projects	Debt Service		General Fixed Assets	General Long-term Obligations			
<b>ASSETS:</b>									
Cash and cash equivalents .....	\$ 606,558	\$ 53,160	\$ 106,550	\$ 512,893	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 1,279,161	\$ 597,553	\$ 1,876,714
Investments, including accrued interest .....	2,306,196	—	2,658,740	102,019,131	—	—	106,984,067	1,594,435	108,578,502
Investments, collateral from securities lending transactions .....	—	—	—	10,652,217	—	—	10,652,217	—	10,652,217
Accounts receivable:									
Real estate taxes (less allowance for uncollectible amounts of \$309,669) .....	618,703	—	—	—	—	—	618,703	—	618,703
Federal, State and other aid .....	4,120,537	320,918	—	—	—	—	4,441,455	—	4,441,455
Patient service, net .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	776,649	776,649
Other, net .....	894,452	—	—	2,857,329	—	—	3,751,781	593,908	4,345,689
Mortgage loans and interest receivable, net .....	—	—	42,386	—	—	—	42,386	2,433,994	2,476,380
Due from other funds .....	1,846,893	1,190,769	—	—	—	—	3,037,662	—	3,037,662
Due from Primary Government .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	35,374	35,374
Due from Discretely Presented Component Units .....	194,815	198,847	10,682	—	—	—	404,344	—	404,344
Property, plant and equipment .....	—	—	—	—	21,594,879	—	21,594,879	25,953,228	47,548,107
Accumulated depreciation and amortization .....	—	—	—	—	(7,303,490)	—	(7,303,490)	(9,141,618)	(16,445,108)
Restricted cash and investments .....	—	397,846	—	—	—	—	397,846	1,752,449	2,150,295
Other assets .....	—	96,807	12,983	12,733	—	—	122,523	337,335	459,858
Amounts available in debt service funds .....	—	—	—	—	—	2,720,266	2,720,266	—	2,720,266
Amounts to be provided for general long-term obligations .....	—	—	—	—	—	41,212,687	41,212,687	—	41,212,687
<b>Total assets .....</b>	<b>\$10,588,154</b>	<b>\$2,258,347</b>	<b>\$2,831,341</b>	<b>\$116,054,303</b>	<b>\$14,291,389</b>	<b>\$43,932,953</b>	<b>\$189,956,487</b>	<b>\$24,933,307</b>	<b>\$214,889,794</b>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.



**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED BALANCE SHEET—ALL FUND TYPES, ACCOUNT GROUPS AND DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**

JUNE 30, 1998  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types		Fiduciary Fund Type	Account Groups		Total (Memorandum Only) Primary Government	Discretely Presented Component Units	Total (Memorandum Only) Reporting Entity
	General	Capital Projects		General Fixed Assets	General Long-term Obligations			
<b>LIABILITIES:</b>								
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	\$ 5,692,853	\$ 1,159,005	\$ 10,045,192	\$ —	\$ 16,939,152	\$ 18,281,414	\$ 1,342,262	\$ 18,281,414
Bonds and notes payable	—	—	—	33,517,904	33,517,904	46,795,648	13,277,744	46,795,648
Capital lease obligations	—	—	—	1,141,128	1,141,128	1,141,128	—	1,141,128
Accrued real estate tax refunds	47,753	—	—	405,688	453,441	453,441	—	453,441
Accrued tax refunds—other	74,513	—	—	—	74,513	74,513	—	74,513
Accrued judgments and claims	179,396	103,806	—	3,495,484	3,778,686	3,778,686	349,206	3,778,686
Accrued vacation and sick leave	—	—	—	2,031,970	2,031,970	2,381,176	103,089	2,381,176
Accrued pension liability	—	—	—	2,414,856	2,414,856	2,517,945	103,089	2,517,945
Landfill closure and postclosure care costs	—	—	—	925,923	925,923	925,923	—	925,923
Accrued interest payable	—	—	—	—	—	466,333	466,333	466,333
Deferred revenues	2,802,314	262,577	—	—	3,064,891	3,260,207	195,316	3,260,207
Due to other funds	1,190,769	1,818,020	28,873	—	3,037,662	3,037,662	—	3,037,662
Due to Primary Government	—	—	—	—	—	404,344	404,344	404,344
Due to Discretely Presented Component Units	35,374	—	—	—	35,374	35,374	—	35,374
Estimated disallowances of Federal, State and other aid	181,793	—	—	—	181,793	181,793	—	181,793
Securities lending transactions	—	—	10,652,217	—	10,652,217	10,652,217	—	10,652,217
Other	—	—	764,167	—	764,167	857,032	92,865	857,032
<b>Total liabilities</b>	<b>10,204,765</b>	<b>3,343,408</b>	<b>21,461,576</b>	<b>43,932,953</b>	<b>79,013,677</b>	<b>95,244,836</b>	<b>16,231,159</b>	<b>95,244,836</b>
<b>EQUITY AND OTHER CREDITS:</b>								
Investment in general fixed assets	—	—	—	—	14,291,389	14,291,389	—	14,291,389
Contributed capital	—	—	—	—	—	—	9,267,206	9,267,206
Retained earnings:								
Reserved for capital improvement	—	—	—	—	—	68,406	68,406	68,406
Reserved for loans and programs	—	—	—	—	—	95,107	95,107	95,107
Reserved for donor restrictions	—	—	—	—	—	11,497	11,497	11,497
Reserved for debt retirement	—	—	—	—	—	368,316	368,316	368,316
Unreserved deficit	—	—	—	—	—	(1,108,384)	(1,108,384)	(1,108,384)
Fund balance/plan net assets:								
Reserved for debt service	—	—	—	—	2,720,266	2,720,266	—	2,720,266
Reserved for noncurrent mortgage loans	—	—	—	40,100	40,100	40,100	—	40,100
Reserved for supplemental benefit payments	—	—	3,156,155	—	3,156,155	3,156,155	—	3,156,155
Reserved for pension benefits	—	—	91,436,572	—	91,436,572	91,436,572	—	91,436,572
Unreserved, (deficit)	383,389	(1,085,061)	—	—	(701,672)	(701,672)	—	(701,672)
<b>Total fund equity (deficit) and other credits</b>	<b>383,389</b>	<b>(1,085,061)</b>	<b>94,592,727</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>110,942,810</b>	<b>119,644,958</b>	<b>8,702,148</b>	<b>119,644,958</b>
Commitments and contingencies	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Total liabilities, fund equity and other credits</b>	<b>\$ 10,588,154</b>	<b>\$ 2,258,347</b>	<b>\$ 116,054,303</b>	<b>\$ 43,932,953</b>	<b>\$ 189,956,487</b>	<b>\$ 214,889,794</b>	<b>\$ 24,933,307</b>	<b>\$ 214,889,794</b>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED BALANCE SHEET—ALL FUND TYPES, ACCOUNT GROUPS AND DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**

JUNE 30, 1997  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types			Fiduciary Fund Type	Account Groups		Total (Memorandum Only) Primary Government	Discretely Presented Component Units	Total (Memorandum Only) Reporting Entity
	General	Capital Projects	Debt Service		Trust and Agency	General Fixed Assets			
<b>ASSETS:</b>									
Cash and cash equivalents .....	\$ 190,612	\$ 37,070	\$ 103,978	\$ 415,247	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 746,907	\$ 308,262	\$ 1,055,169
Investments, including accrued interest .....	2,527,567	—	2,289,797	87,537,044	—	—	92,354,408	1,101,593	93,456,001
Investments, collateral from securities lending transactions ..	—	—	—	9,552,293	—	—	9,552,293	—	9,552,293
Accounts receivable:									
Real estate taxes (less allowance for uncollectible amounts of \$336,808) .....	563,747	—	—	—	—	—	563,747	—	563,747
Federal, State and other aid .....	3,692,369	329,691	—	—	—	—	4,022,060	—	4,022,060
Patient service, net .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	784,201	784,201
Other, net .....	969,855	—	—	3,664,714	—	—	4,634,569	562,135	5,196,704
Mortgage loans and interest receivable, net .....	—	—	44,162	—	—	—	44,162	2,303,202	2,347,364
Due from other funds .....	1,690,799	941,202	75,000	—	—	—	2,707,001	—	2,707,001
Due from Primary Government .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,332	6,332
Due from Discretely Presented Component Units .....	158,100	277,488	3,074	—	—	—	438,662	—	438,662
Property, plant and equipment .....	—	—	—	—	19,856,267	—	19,856,267	24,818,928	44,675,195
Accumulated depreciation and amortization .....	—	—	—	—	(6,527,155)	—	(6,527,155)	(8,525,833)	(15,052,988)
Restricted cash and investments .....	—	542,843	—	—	—	—	542,843	1,845,169	2,388,012
Other assets .....	—	214,477	541	14,225	—	—	229,243	292,670	521,913
Amounts available in debt service funds .....	—	—	—	—	—	2,361,478	2,361,478	—	2,361,478
Amounts to be provided for general long-term obligations ..	—	—	—	—	—	39,662,165	39,662,165	—	39,662,165
Total assets .....	\$ 9,793,049	\$ 2,342,771	\$ 2,516,552	\$ 101,183,523	\$ 13,329,112	\$ 42,023,643	\$ 171,188,650	\$ 23,496,659	\$ 194,685,309

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

**COMBINED BALANCE SHEET—ALL FUND TYPES, ACCOUNT GROUPS AND DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**

JUNE 30, 1997  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types		Fiduciary Fund Type		Account Groups		Total (Memorandum Only) Primary Government	Discretely Presented Component Units	Total (Memorandum Only) Reporting Entity
			Trust and Agency						
	General	Capital Projects	Debt Service	General Fixed Assets	General Long-term Obligations				
<b>LIABILITIES:</b>									
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities . . . . .	\$5,044,088	\$1,133,818	\$ 82,789	\$ 9,922,284	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 16,182,979	\$ 1,428,702	\$ 17,611,681
Bonds and notes payable . . . . .	—	—	—	—	31,963,951	—	31,963,951	12,381,069	44,345,020
Capital lease obligations . . . . .	—	—	—	—	1,099,279	—	1,099,279	—	1,099,279
Accrued real estate tax refunds . . . . .	27,460	—	—	—	377,932	—	405,392	—	405,392
Accrued tax refunds—other . . . . .	40,217	—	—	—	—	—	40,217	—	40,217
Accrued judgments and claims . . . . .	120,572	104,818	—	—	3,490,851	—	3,716,241	—	3,716,241
Accrued vacation and sick leave . . . . .	—	—	—	—	1,734,830	—	1,734,830	328,833	2,063,663
Accrued pension liability . . . . .	—	—	—	—	2,479,390	—	2,479,390	105,866	2,585,256
Landfill closure and post-closure care costs . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	877,410	877,410	—	877,410
Accrued interest payable . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	440,319	440,319
Deferred revenues . . . . .	2,991,900	200,485	—	—	—	—	3,192,385	178,824	3,371,209
Due to other funds . . . . .	1,016,202	1,660,914	29,885	—	—	—	2,707,001	—	2,707,001
Due to Primary Government . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	438,662	438,662
Due to Discretely Presented Component Units . . . . .	6,332	—	—	—	—	—	6,332	—	6,332
Estimated disallowances of Federal, State and other aid . . . . .	168,306	—	—	—	—	—	168,306	—	168,306
Securities lending transactions . . . . .	—	—	—	9,552,293	—	—	9,552,293	—	9,552,293
Other . . . . .	—	—	—	675,656	—	—	675,656	100,373	776,029
Total liabilities . . . . .	9,415,077	3,100,035	112,674	20,150,233	42,023,643	—	74,801,662	15,402,648	90,204,310
<b>EQUITY AND OTHER CREDITS:</b>									
Investment in general fixed assets . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	13,329,112	13,329,112	—	13,329,112
Contributed capital . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8,941,553	8,941,553
Retained earnings:									
Reserved for capital improvement . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55,662	55,662
Reserved for loans and programs . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	89,687	89,687
Reserved for donor restrictions . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10,732	10,732
Reserved for debt retirement . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	330,355	330,355
Unreserved (deficit) . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(1,333,978)	(1,333,978)
Fund balance/Plan net assets:									
Reserved for debt service . . . . .	—	—	2,361,478	—	—	—	2,361,478	—	2,361,478
Reserved for noncurrent mortgage loans . . . . .	—	—	42,400	—	—	—	42,400	—	42,400
Reserved for supplemental benefit payments . . . . .	—	—	—	2,761,028	—	—	2,761,028	—	2,761,028
Reserved for pension benefits . . . . .	—	—	—	78,272,262	—	—	78,272,262	—	78,272,262
Unreserved (deficit) . . . . .	377,972	(757,264)	—	—	—	—	(379,292)	—	(379,292)
Total fund equity (deficit) and other credits . . . . .	377,972	(757,264)	2,403,878	81,033,290	—	13,329,112	96,386,988	8,094,011	104,480,999
Commitments and contingencies . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total liabilities, fund equity and other credits . . . . .	9,793,049	\$2,342,771	\$2,516,552	\$101,183,523	\$42,023,643	\$13,329,112	\$171,188,650	\$23,496,659	\$194,685,309

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

# THE CITY OF NEW YORK

## COMBINED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES ALL GOVERNMENTAL FUND TYPES

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1998  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types			Total (Memorandum Only)
	General	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Primary Government
REVENUES:				
Real estate taxes	\$ 7,239,193	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 7,239,193
Sales and use taxes	3,523,209	—	—	3,523,209
Personal income tax	5,136,827	—	16,109	5,152,936
Income taxes, other	3,393,756	—	—	3,393,756
Other taxes	1,085,536	—	—	1,085,536
Federal, State and other categorical aid	11,061,681	324,083	259,410	11,645,174
Unrestricted Federal and State aid	621,676	—	—	621,676
Charges for services	1,421,455	—	—	1,421,455
Other	1,414,167	754,906	113,114	2,282,187
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>34,897,500</b>	<b>1,078,989</b>	<b>388,633</b>	<b>36,365,122</b>
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:				
Transfer from Discretely Presented Component Units	31,167	—	—	31,167
Transfers from General Fund	—	—	3,682,892	3,682,892
Proceeds from sale of bonds	—	2,686,701	4,212	2,690,913
Capitalized leases	—	68,642	—	68,642
Refunding bond proceeds	—	—	5,507,269	5,507,269
<b>Total revenues and other financing sources</b>	<b>34,928,667</b>	<b>3,834,332</b>	<b>9,583,006</b>	<b>48,346,005</b>
EXPENDITURES:				
Current Operations:				
General government	884,801	—	—	884,801
Public safety and judicial	4,945,534	—	—	4,945,534
Education	8,812,494	—	—	8,812,494
City University	363,997	—	—	363,997
Social services	7,785,697	—	—	7,785,697
Environmental protection	1,266,500	—	—	1,266,500
Transportation services	758,849	—	—	758,849
Parks, recreation and cultural activities	259,588	—	—	259,588
Housing	443,553	—	—	443,553
Health (including payments to HHC)	1,552,726	—	—	1,552,726
Libraries	202,050	—	—	202,050
Pensions	1,408,604	—	—	1,408,604
Judgments and claims	386,127	—	—	386,127
Fringe benefit and other benefit payments	1,811,089	—	—	1,811,089
Other	365,195	—	35,008	400,203
Capital Projects	—	4,151,385	—	4,151,385
Debt Service:				
Interest	—	—	1,817,313	1,817,313
Redemptions	—	—	1,337,728	1,337,728
Lease payments	—	—	226,694	226,694
Refunding escrow	—	—	302,506	302,506
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>31,246,804</b>	<b>4,151,385</b>	<b>3,719,249</b>	<b>39,117,438</b>
OTHER FINANCING USES:				
Transfers to Debt Service Fund	3,672,148	10,744	—	3,682,892
Transfers to Discretely Presented Component Unit	4,298	—	—	4,298
Payment to refunded bond escrow holder	—	—	5,507,269	5,507,269
<b>Total expenditures and other financing uses</b>	<b>34,923,250</b>	<b>4,162,129</b>	<b>9,226,518</b>	<b>48,311,897</b>
EXCESS (DEFICIENCY) OF REVENUES AND OTHER FINANCING SOURCES OVER EXPENDITURES AND OTHER FINANCING USES				
	5,417	(327,797)	356,488	34,108
FUND BALANCES (DEFICIT) AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	377,972	(757,264)	2,403,878	2,024,586
FUND BALANCES (DEFICIT) AT END OF YEAR	<u>\$ 383,389</u>	<u>\$(1,085,061)</u>	<u>\$2,760,366</u>	<u>\$ 2,058,694</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

# THE CITY OF NEW YORK

## COMBINED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES ALL GOVERNMENTAL FUND TYPES

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1997  
(in thousands)

	Governmental Fund Types			Total
	General	Capital Projects	Debt Service	(Memorandum Only) Primary Government
REVENUES:				
Real estate taxes .....	\$ 7,290,685	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 7,290,685
Sales and use taxes .....	3,346,458	—	—	3,346,458
Personal income tax .....	4,377,184	—	—	4,377,184
Income taxes, other .....	3,190,040	—	—	3,190,040
Other taxes .....	1,063,261	—	—	1,063,261
Federal, State and other categorical aid .....	10,740,750	377,303	226,779	11,344,832
Unrestricted Federal and State aid .....	653,569	—	—	653,569
Charges for services .....	1,364,083	—	—	1,364,083
Other .....	1,684,450	959,876	156,733	2,801,059
Total revenues .....	33,710,480	1,337,179	383,512	35,431,171
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:				
Transfer from Discretely Presented Component Units .....	30,506	—	—	30,506
Transfers from General Fund .....	—	—	4,386,771	4,386,771
Proceeds from sale of bonds .....	—	2,519,180	13,608	2,532,788
Capitalized leases .....	—	40,778	—	40,778
Refunding bond proceeds .....	—	—	6,386,543	6,386,543
Total revenues and other financing sources .....	33,740,986	3,897,137	11,170,434	48,808,557
EXPENDITURES:				
Current Operations:				
General government .....	846,778	—	—	846,778
Public safety and judicial .....	4,727,205	—	—	4,727,205
Education .....	8,085,127	—	—	8,085,127
City University .....	354,056	—	—	354,056
Social services .....	7,748,606	—	—	7,748,606
Environmental protection .....	1,116,699	—	—	1,116,699
Transportation services .....	600,769	—	—	600,769
Parks, recreation and cultural activities .....	235,795	—	—	235,795
Housing .....	455,585	—	—	455,585
Health (including payments to HHC) .....	1,448,483	—	—	1,448,483
Libraries .....	107,577	—	—	107,577
Pensions .....	1,318,556	—	—	1,318,556
Judgments and claims .....	326,293	—	—	326,293
Fringe benefit and other benefit payments .....	1,732,249	—	—	1,732,249
Other .....	241,305	—	66,718	308,023
Capital Projects .....	—	3,858,578	—	3,858,578
Debt Service:				
Interest .....	—	—	1,868,269	1,868,269
Redemptions .....	—	—	1,358,219	1,358,219
Lease payments .....	—	—	205,696	205,696
Refunding escrow .....	—	—	166,030	166,030
Total expenditures .....	29,345,083	3,858,578	3,664,932	36,868,593
OTHER FINANCING USES:				
Transfers to Debt Service Fund .....	4,386,771	—	—	4,386,771
Transfers to Discretely Presented Component Unit .....	4,298	—	—	4,298
Payment to refunded bond escrow holder .....	—	—	6,386,543	6,386,543
Total expenditures and other financing uses .....	33,736,152	3,858,578	10,051,475	47,646,205
EXCESS OF REVENUES AND OTHER FINANCING SOURCES OVER EXPENDITURES AND OTHER FINANCING USES .....	4,834	38,559	1,118,959	1,162,352
FUND BALANCES (DEFICIT) AT BEGINNING OF YEAR .....	373,138	(795,823)	1,284,919	862,234
FUND BALANCES (DEFICIT) AT END OF YEAR .....	\$ 377,972	\$ (757,264)	\$2,403,878	\$ 2,024,586

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES**  
**AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES**  
**BUDGET AND ACTUAL**  
**GENERAL FUND**

FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1998 AND 1997

(in thousands)

	1998			1997		
	Budget		Actual	Budget		Actual
	Adopted	Modified		Adopted	Modified	
<b>REVENUES:</b>						
Real estate taxes	\$ 7,217,000	\$ 7,216,000	\$ 7,239,193	\$ 7,088,000	\$ 7,245,000	\$ 7,290,685
Sales and use taxes	3,285,000	3,491,500	3,523,209	3,211,300	3,310,300	3,346,458
Personal income tax	4,372,000	5,070,000	5,136,827	4,001,000	4,360,000	4,377,184
Income taxes other	3,050,435	3,539,435	3,393,756	2,917,555	3,370,020	3,190,040
Other taxes	946,900	1,029,500	1,085,536	906,718	975,800	1,063,261
Federal, State and other categorical aid	10,507,870	11,552,751	11,061,681	10,197,548	11,117,681	10,740,750
Unrestricted Federal and State aid	788,066	619,964	621,676	523,453	686,354	653,569
Charges for services	1,393,221	1,431,919	1,421,455	1,494,500	1,351,201	1,364,083
Other	1,514,770	1,616,794	1,414,167	2,350,955	1,860,336	1,684,450
Total revenues	33,075,262	35,567,863	34,897,500	32,691,029	34,276,692	33,710,480
<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:</b>						
Transfers from Discretely Presented Component Units	32,000	33,300	31,167	29,000	29,900	30,506
Total revenues and other financing sources	33,107,262	35,601,163	34,928,667	32,720,029	34,306,592	33,740,986
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>						
General government	929,241	952,585	884,801	821,614	880,787	846,778
Public safety and judicial	4,688,821	5,017,857	4,945,534	4,456,709	4,792,919	4,727,205
Board of Education	8,524,064	8,903,452	8,812,494	7,833,689	8,219,710	8,085,127
City University	389,449	400,752	363,997	389,092	391,169	354,056
Social services	7,839,822	8,074,789	7,785,697	7,799,586	7,943,635	7,748,606
Environmental protection	1,227,275	1,280,100	1,266,500	1,117,470	1,136,790	1,116,699
Transportation services	643,399	812,766	758,849	611,495	641,627	600,769
Parks, recreation and cultural activities	244,526	263,419	259,588	227,311	235,834	235,795
Housing	420,027	462,216	443,553	437,577	478,522	455,585
Health (including payments to HHC)	1,427,896	1,558,398	1,552,726	1,400,442	1,515,067	1,448,483
Libraries	200,776	203,396	202,050	105,996	107,661	107,577
Pensions	1,465,701	1,415,321	1,408,604	1,349,420	1,323,458	1,318,556
Judgments and claims	325,083	371,482	386,127	289,592	326,592	326,293
Fringe benefits and other benefit payments	1,845,579	1,816,872	1,811,089	1,752,304	1,741,398	1,732,249
Other	737,165	350,403	365,195	1,138,457	264,958	241,305
Total expenditures	30,908,824	31,883,808	31,246,804	29,730,754	30,000,127	29,345,083
<b>OTHER FINANCING USES:</b>						
Transfers to Debt Service Funds	2,194,140	3,713,057	3,672,148	2,984,977	4,302,167	4,386,771
Transfers to Discretely Presented Component Unit	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298
Total expenditures and other financing uses	33,107,262	35,601,163	34,923,250	32,720,029	34,306,592	33,736,152
<b>EXCESS OF REVENUES AND OTHER FINANCING SOURCES OVER EXPENDITURES AND OTHER FINANCING USES</b>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	5,417	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	4,834
FUND BALANCES AT BEGINNING OF YEAR			377,972			373,138
FUND BALANCES AT END OF YEAR			<u>\$ 383,389</u>			<u>\$ 377,972</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN PENSION**  
**AND SIMILAR TRUST FUNDS PLAN NET ASSETS**  
**PENSION AND SIMILAR TRUST FUNDS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1998**  
(in thousands)

	<b>Pension Trust Funds</b>	<b>Similar Trust Funds</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>ADDITIONS:</b>			
<b>Contributions:</b>			
Member contributions (net of loans to members) .....	\$ 419,563	\$ —	\$ 419,563
Employer contributions .....	1,531,227	—	1,531,227
Other employer contributions .....	20,211	—	20,211
<b>Total contributions</b> .....	<b>1,971,001</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1,971,001</b>
<b>Investment income:</b>			
Interest income .....	2,369,394	92,276	2,461,670
Dividend income .....	764,113	27,286	791,399
Net appreciation in fair value of investments .....	13,754,788	437,382	14,192,170
Less investment expenses .....	681,388	24,132	705,520
<b>Investment income, net</b> .....	<b>16,206,907</b>	<b>532,812</b>	<b>16,739,719</b>
Net payments from other funds .....	5,421	—	5,421
<b>Total additions</b> .....	<b>18,183,329</b>	<b>532,812</b>	<b>18,716,141</b>
<b>DEDUCTIONS:</b>			
Benefit payments and withdrawals .....	5,016,301	137,685	5,153,986
Net payments to other funds .....	2,718	—	2,718
<b>Total deductions</b> .....	<b>5,019,019</b>	<b>137,685</b>	<b>5,156,704</b>
Increase in plan net assets .....	13,164,310	395,127	13,559,437
<b>PLAN NET ASSETS HELD IN TRUST FOR PENSION AND SUPPLEMENTAL</b>			
<b>BENEFIT PAYMENTS:</b>			
BEGINNING OF YEAR .....	78,272,262	2,761,028	81,033,290
END OF YEAR .....	<b>\$91,436,572</b>	<b>\$3,156,155</b>	<b>\$94,592,727</b>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN PENSION**  
**AND SIMILAR TRUST FUNDS PLAN NET ASSETS**  
**PENSION AND SIMILAR TRUST FUNDS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1997**  
(in thousands)

	<u>Pension Trust Funds</u>	<u>Similar Trust Funds</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>ADDITIONS:</b>			
<b>Contributions:</b>			
Member contributions (net of loans to members) .....	\$ 381,241	\$ —	\$ 381,241
Employer contributions .....	1,428,280	—	1,428,280
Other employer contributions .....	19,793	—	19,793
<b>Total contributions</b> .....	<u>1,829,314</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1,829,314</u>
<b>Investment income:</b>			
Interest income .....	2,128,143	76,803	2,204,946
Dividend income .....	792,457	25,176	817,633
Net appreciation in fair value of investments .....	12,829,366	393,284	13,222,650
Less investment expenses .....	559,950	15,291	575,241
<b>Investment income, net</b> .....	<u>15,190,016</u>	<u>479,972</u>	<u>15,669,988</u>
Adjustment for transfer to similar trust funds .....	27,125	—	27,125
Net payments from other funds .....	6,238	—	6,238
<b>Total additions</b> .....	<u>17,052,693</u>	<u>479,972</u>	<u>17,532,665</u>
<b>DEDUCTIONS:</b>			
Benefit payments and withdrawals .....	4,840,690	149,879	4,990,569
Net payments to other funds .....	44,103	—	44,103
Reduction for transfer from pension trust fund .....	—	27,125	27,125
<b>Total deductions</b> .....	<u>4,884,793</u>	<u>177,004</u>	<u>5,061,797</u>
<b>Increase in plan net assets</b> .....	<u>12,167,900</u>	<u>302,968</u>	<u>12,470,868</u>
<b>PLAN NET ASSETS HELD IN TRUST FOR PENSION AND SUPPLEMENTAL</b>			
<b>BENEFIT PAYMENTS:</b>			
<b>BEGINNING OF YEAR</b> .....	66,104,362	2,458,060	68,562,422
<b>END OF YEAR</b> .....	<u>\$78,272,262</u>	<u>\$2,761,028</u>	<u>\$81,033,290</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.



**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENSES**  
**AND CHANGES IN FUND EQUITY**  
**DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1998**  
(in thousands)

	Health and Hospitals Corporation	Off-Track Betting Corporation	Housing and Economic Development Entities	Water and Sewer System	Total
<b>OPERATING REVENUES:</b>					
Patient service revenues, net .....	\$3,834,493	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$3,834,493
Charges for services .....	—	—	—	1,439,546	1,439,546
Federal, State and other aid .....	—	—	1,170,445	—	1,170,445
Rental income .....	—	—	559,379	—	559,379
Investment income .....	—	—	28,107	90,367	118,474
Other .....	280,454	226,350	546,836	43,612	1,097,252
<b>Total operating revenues .....</b>	<u>4,114,947</u>	<u>226,350</u>	<u>2,304,767</u>	<u>1,573,525</u>	<u>8,219,589</u>
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES:</b>					
Personal services .....	1,960,146	71,434	694,610	—	2,726,190
Affiliated institutions .....	433,585	—	—	—	433,585
Racing industry compensation .....	—	77,975	—	—	77,975
Operations and maintenance .....	882,410	—	—	822,791	1,705,201
Interest expense .....	—	—	175,645	457,768	633,413
Administrative and program .....	—	5,207	1,059,063	11,217	1,075,487
Depreciation and amortization .....	161,602	4,258	218,477	289,992	674,329
Provision for bad debts .....	582,763	—	—	149,748	732,511
Other operating .....	—	23,866	183,198	—	207,064
Distributions to the State and other local governments .....	—	14,998	—	—	14,998
<b>Total operating expenses .....</b>	<u>4,020,506</u>	<u>197,738</u>	<u>2,330,993</u>	<u>1,731,516</u>	<u>8,280,753</u>
<b>Operating income (loss) .....</b>	<u>94,441</u>	<u>28,612</u>	<u>(26,226)</u>	<u>(157,991)</u>	<u>(61,164)</u>
<b>NON-OPERATING REVENUES (EXPENSES):</b>					
Interest and dividend income .....	16,275	1,428	48,860	3,514	70,077
Interest expense .....	(89,840)	—	—	—	(89,840)
Amounts from other OTB communities .....	—	3,462	—	—	3,462
Other .....	—	—	(1,655)	—	(1,655)
<b>Total non-operating revenues (expenses) .....</b>	<u>(73,565)</u>	<u>4,890</u>	<u>47,205</u>	<u>3,514</u>	<u>(17,956)</u>
<b>Income (loss) before operating transfers .....</b>	<u>20,876</u>	<u>33,502</u>	<u>20,979</u>	<u>(154,477)</u>	<u>(79,120)</u>
<b>OPERATING TRANSFERS:</b>					
Transfer from Primary Government for debt service .....	—	—	4,298	—	4,298
Transfer to Primary Government .....	—	(31,167)	—	—	(31,167)
<b>Net income (loss) .....</b>	<u>20,876</u>	<u>2,335</u>	<u>25,277</u>	<u>(154,477)</u>	<u>(105,989)</u>
<b>FUND EQUITY AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</b>					
Contributed fixed assets and debt service .....	1,117,458	13,891	1,824,306	5,138,356	8,094,011
Net increase in donor restricted funds .....	24,044	—	669,162	20,155	713,361
<b>Net increase in donor restricted funds .....</b>	<u>765</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>765</u>
<b>FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR</b> .....	<u>\$1,163,143</u>	<u>\$ 16,226</u>	<u>\$2,518,745</u>	<u>\$5,004,034</u>	<u>\$8,702,148</u>
<b>COMPONENTS OF FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR:</b>					
Reserved .....	\$ 425,487	\$ 19,764	\$4,547,613	\$4,817,668	\$9,810,532
Unreserved (deficit) .....	737,656	(3,538)	(2,028,868)	186,366	(1,108,384)
<b>FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR</b> .....	<u>\$1,163,143</u>	<u>\$ 16,226</u>	<u>\$2,518,745</u>	<u>\$5,004,034</u>	<u>\$8,702,148</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENSES**  
**AND CHANGES IN FUND EQUITY**  
**DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1997**  
(in thousands)

	<u>Health and Hospitals Corporation</u>	<u>Off-Track Betting Corporation</u>	<u>Housing and Economic Development Entities</u>	<u>Water and Sewer System</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>OPERATING REVENUES:</b>					
Patient service revenues, net .....	\$3,775,931	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$3,775,931
Charges for services .....	—	—	—	1,387,679	1,387,679
Federal, State and other aid .....	—	—	1,039,136	—	1,039,136
Rental income .....	—	—	545,269	—	545,269
Investment income .....	—	—	28,963	64,676	93,639
Other .....	293,510	220,469	723,465	39,011	1,276,455
<b>Total operating revenues</b> .....	<u>4,069,441</u>	<u>220,469</u>	<u>2,336,833</u>	<u>1,491,366</u>	<u>8,118,109</u>
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES:</b>					
Personal services .....	1,948,917	70,842	702,076	—	2,721,835
Affiliated institutions .....	470,765	—	—	—	470,765
Racing industry compensation .....	—	72,034	—	—	72,034
Operations and maintenance .....	846,210	—	—	775,318	1,621,528
Interest expense .....	—	—	177,835	407,997	585,832
Administrative and program .....	—	6,190	1,218,601	13,375	1,238,166
Depreciation and amortization .....	145,654	3,353	192,209	287,546	628,762
Provision for bad debts .....	542,390	—	—	189,775	732,165
Other .....	—	22,893	302,785	—	325,678
Distributions to the State and other local governments .....	—	16,541	—	—	16,541
<b>Total operating expenses</b> .....	<u>3,953,936</u>	<u>191,853</u>	<u>2,593,506</u>	<u>1,674,011</u>	<u>8,413,306</u>
<b>Operating income (loss)</b> .....	<u>115,505</u>	<u>28,616</u>	<u>(256,673)</u>	<u>(182,645)</u>	<u>(295,197)</u>
<b>NON OPERATING REVENUES (EXPENSES):</b>					
Interest and dividend income .....	2,521	1,201	32,319	3,516	39,557
Interest expense .....	(89,193)	—	—	—	(89,193)
Amounts from other OTB communities .....	—	3,664	—	—	3,664
Other .....	—	—	(2,855)	—	(2,855)
<b>Total non operating revenues (expenses)</b> .....	<u>(86,672)</u>	<u>4,865</u>	<u>29,464</u>	<u>3,516</u>	<u>(48,827)</u>
<b>Income (loss) before operating transfers</b> .....	<u>28,833</u>	<u>33,481</u>	<u>(227,209)</u>	<u>(179,129)</u>	<u>(344,024)</u>
<b>OPERATING TRANSFERS:</b>					
Transfer from Primary Government for debt service .....	—	—	4,298	—	4,298
Transfer to Primary Government .....	—	(30,506)	—	—	(30,506)
<b>Net income (loss)</b> .....	<u>28,833</u>	<u>2,975</u>	<u>(222,911)</u>	<u>(179,129)</u>	<u>(370,232)</u>
<b>FUND EQUITY AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</b> .....					
Contributed fixed assets and debt service .....	1,013,731	10,916	1,094,123	5,266,870	7,385,640
Net decrease in donor restricted funds .....	74,976	—	953,094	50,615	1,078,685
	(82)	—	—	—	(82)
<b>FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR</b> .....	<u>\$1,117,458</u>	<u>\$ 13,891</u>	<u>\$1,824,306</u>	<u>\$5,138,356</u>	<u>\$8,094,011</u>
<b>COMPONENTS OF FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR:</b>					
Reserved .....	\$ 461,690	\$ 19,289	\$4,039,359	\$4,907,651	\$9,427,989
Unreserved (deficit) .....	655,768	(5,398)	(2,215,053)	230,705	(1,333,978)
<b>FUND EQUITY AT END OF YEAR</b> .....	<u>\$1,117,458</u>	<u>\$ 13,891</u>	<u>\$1,824,306</u>	<u>\$5,138,356</u>	<u>\$8,094,011</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS**  
**DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1998**  
(in thousands)

	Health and Hospitals Corporation	Off-Track Betting Corporation	Housing and Economic Development Entities	Water and Sewer System	Total
<b>OPERATING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Operating income (loss) .....	\$ 94,441	\$ 28,612	\$ (26,226)	\$ (157,991)	\$ (61,164)
Adjustments to reconcile operating income (loss) to net cash provided by (used in) operating activities:					
Depreciation and amortization .....	161,602	4,258	218,477	289,992	674,329
Provision for bad debts .....	582,763	—	—	149,748	732,511
Increase in patient service receivables .....	(595,941)	—	—	—	(595,941)
Decrease (increase) in accounts and other receivables .....	(35,525)	500	(4,769)	(143,966)	(183,760)
Decrease in accounts payable and accrued liabilities .....	(4,557)	(924)	(30,615)	(9,556)	(45,652)
Increase in accrued vacation and sick leave .....	3,674	—	16,629	—	20,303
Decrease in accrued pension liability .....	(2,578)	(199)	—	—	(2,777)
Increase (decrease) in deferred revenues .....	—	—	(2,835)	18,931	16,096
Distribution to Primary Government .....	—	(31,542)	—	—	(31,542)
Increase in program loans issued .....	—	—	(162,845)	—	(162,845)
Receipt from collections of program loans .....	—	—	40,228	—	40,228
Increase in distribution to State and local governments .....	—	(150)	—	—	(150)
Decrease in payable to Primary Government .....	—	—	—	(107,683)	(107,683)
Other .....	35,045	(38)	7,460	(23,883)	18,584
Total adjustments .....	<u>144,483</u>	<u>(28,095)</u>	<u>81,730</u>	<u>173,583</u>	<u>371,701</u>
Net cash provided by operating activities .....	<u>238,924</u>	<u>517</u>	<u>55,504</u>	<u>15,592</u>	<u>310,537</u>
<b>NONCAPITAL FINANCING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Proceeds from issuing bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	—	—	433,460	—	433,460
Repayments of bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	—	—	(56,628)	—	(56,628)
Transfer from Primary Government for debt service .....	—	—	4,298	—	4,298
Amounts from other OTB communities .....	—	3,462	—	—	3,462
Net cash provided by noncapital financing activities .....	<u>—</u>	<u>3,462</u>	<u>381,130</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>384,592</u>
<b>CAPITAL AND RELATED FINANCING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Additions to fixed assets .....	(119,959)	(5,104)	(348,307)	(665,527)	(1,138,897)
Proceeds from issuing bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	11,561	—	7,264	2,521,837	2,540,662
Repayments of bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	(15,936)	—	(70,811)	(1,961,328)	(2,048,075)
Contributed capital other than for operations .....	23,744	—	666,185	—	689,929
Interest paid on bonds, notes and other borrowings .....	(89,840)	—	—	—	(89,840)
Net cash provided by (used in) capital and related financing activities .....	<u>(190,430)</u>	<u>(5,104)</u>	<u>254,331</u>	<u>(105,018)</u>	<u>(46,221)</u>
<b>INVESTING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Proceeds from sales and maturities of investments .....	—	—	11,541,687	6,105,671	17,647,358
Purchase of investments .....	—	—	(12,033,409)	(5,929,286)	(17,962,695)
Interest on investments .....	16,275	1,428	42,784	5,173	65,660
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities .....	<u>16,275</u>	<u>1,428</u>	<u>(448,938)</u>	<u>181,558</u>	<u>(249,677)</u>
<b>INCREASE IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS</b> .....	<b>64,769</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>242,027</b>	<b>92,132</b>	<b>399,231</b>
<b>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS BEGINNING OF YEAR</b> .....	<b>199,967</b>	<b>21,888</b>	<b>224,166</b>	<b>685,111</b>	<b>1,131,132</b>
<b>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS END OF YEAR</b> .....	<b><u>\$ 264,736</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 22,191</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 466,193</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 777,243</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 1,530,363</u></b>
Cash and cash equivalents .....	\$ 249,643	\$ 21,091	\$ 320,247	\$ 6,572	\$ 597,553
Restricted cash and investments .....	383,890	1,100	189,693	1,177,766	1,752,449
Less restricted investments .....	368,797	—	43,747	407,095	819,639
Cash and cash equivalents end of year .....	<u>\$ 264,736</u>	<u>\$ 22,191</u>	<u>\$ 466,193</u>	<u>\$ 777,243</u>	<u>\$ 1,530,363</u>

The above is a reconciliation of cash and cash equivalents per the statement of cash flows to the balance sheet.

The following are the noncash investing, capital, and financing activities:

HHC received capital assets of \$23.7 million for fiscal year 1998 which represent contributed capital from Primary Government.

The Water Board received capital assets of \$20.2 million for fiscal year 1998 which represent contributed capital from Primary Government.

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**COMBINED STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS**  
**DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1997**  
(in thousands)

	<b>Health and Hospitals Corporation</b>	<b>Off-Track Betting Corporation</b>	<b>Housing and Economic Development Entities</b>	<b>Water and Sewer System</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>OPERATING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Operating income (loss) .....	\$ 115,505	\$ 28,616	\$ (256,673)	\$ (182,645)	\$ (295,197)
Adjustments to reconcile operating income (loss) to net cash provided by (used in) operating activities:					
Depreciation and amortization .....	145,654	3,353	192,209	287,546	628,762
Provision for bad debts .....	542,390	—	—	189,775	732,165
Increase in patient service receivables .....	(649,594)	—	—	—	(649,594)
Decrease (increase) in accounts and other receivables .....	8,335	860	21,216	(270,399)	(239,988)
Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and accrued liabilities .....	(123,037)	893	107,084	(6,757)	(21,817)
Increase (decrease) in accrued vacation and sick leave .....	16,060	(81)	442	—	16,421
Decrease in accrued pension liability .....	(2,156)	(174)	—	—	(2,330)
Increase in deferred revenues .....	—	—	10,152	10,294	20,446
Distribution to Primary Government .....	—	(30,090)	—	—	(30,090)
Increase in program loans issued .....	—	—	(125,830)	—	(125,830)
Receipt from collections of program loans .....	—	—	38,725	—	38,725
Increase in distribution to State and local governments .....	—	(191)	—	—	(191)
Increase in payable to Primary Government .....	—	—	—	71,226	71,226
Other .....	(248,041)	(49)	(34,918)	275	(282,733)
Total adjustments .....	(310,389)	(25,479)	209,080	281,960	155,172
Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities .....	(194,884)	3,137	(47,593)	99,315	(140,025)
<b>NONCAPITAL FINANCING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Proceeds from issuing bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	—	—	371,465	—	371,465
Repayments of bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	—	—	(256,681)	—	(256,681)
Transfer from Primary Government for debt service .....	—	—	4,298	—	4,298
Amounts from other OTB communities .....	—	3,664	—	—	3,664
Net cash provided by noncapital financing activities .....	—	3,664	119,082	—	122,746
<b>CAPITAL AND RELATED FINANCING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Additions to fixed assets .....	(133,491)	(4,142)	(392,113)	(820,898)	(1,350,644)
Proceeds from issuing bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	320,000	—	17,029	1,854,390	2,191,419
Repayments of bonds, notes, and other borrowings .....	(11,570)	—	(70,837)	(831,146)	(913,553)
Contributed capital other than for operations .....	73,847	—	514,438	—	588,285
Interest paid on bonds, notes and other borrowings .....	(89,193)	—	—	—	(89,193)
Net cash provided by (used in) capital and related financing activities .....	159,593	(4,142)	68,517	202,346	426,314
<b>INVESTING ACTIVITIES:</b>					
Proceeds from sales and maturities of investments .....	—	—	13,881,919	27,521,461	41,403,380
Purchase of investments .....	—	—	(14,074,969)	(27,624,046)	(41,699,015)
Interest on investments .....	2,521	1,201	30,755	4,626	39,103
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities .....	2,521	1,201	(162,295)	(97,959)	(256,532)
<b>INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS .....</b>	<b>(32,770)</b>	<b>3,860</b>	<b>(22,289)</b>	<b>203,702</b>	<b>152,503</b>
<b>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS BEGINNING OF YEAR .....</b>	<b>232,737</b>	<b>18,028</b>	<b>246,455</b>	<b>481,409</b>	<b>978,629</b>
<b>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS END OF YEAR .....</b>	<b>\$ 199,967</b>	<b>\$ 21,888</b>	<b>\$ 224,166</b>	<b>\$ 685,111</b>	<b>\$ 1,131,132</b>
Cash and cash equivalents .....	\$ 189,163	\$ 19,107	\$ 95,266	\$ 4,726	\$ 308,262
Restricted cash and investments .....	410,925	2,781	168,086	1,263,377	1,845,169
Less restricted investments .....	400,121	—	39,186	582,992	1,022,299
Cash and cash equivalents end of year .....	<u>\$ 199,967</u>	<u>\$ 21,888</u>	<u>\$ 224,166</u>	<u>\$ 685,111</u>	<u>\$ 1,131,132</u>

The above is a reconciliation of cash and cash equivalents per the statement of cash flows to the balance sheet.

The following are the noncash investing, capital, and financing activities:

HHC received capital assets of \$73.8 million for fiscal year 1997 which represent contributed capital from Primary Government.

The Water Board received capital assets of \$50.6 million for fiscal year 1997 which represent contributed capital from Primary Government.

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

---

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**  
**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**  
**JUNE 30, 1998 AND JUNE 30, 1997**

---

**A. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

The accompanying general purpose financial statements of The City of New York (City or primary government) are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) for governments as prescribed by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB). The amounts shown in the "Totals —(Memorandum Only) Primary Government" and "Totals—(Memorandum Only) Reporting Entity" columns of the accompanying combined financial statements are only presented to facilitate financial analysis and are not the equivalent of consolidated financial statements.

The following is a summary of the significant accounting policies and reporting practices of the City:

*Reporting Entity*

The City of New York is a municipal corporation governed by the Mayor and the City Council.

The financial reporting entity consists of the primary government including the Board of Education and the community colleges of the City University of New York, organizations for which the primary government is financially accountable, and other organizations for which the nature and significance of their relationship with the primary government are such that exclusion would cause the reporting entity's financial statements to be misleading or incomplete.

The definition of the reporting entity is based primarily on the notion of financial accountability. A primary government is financially accountable for the organizations that make up its legal entity. It is also financially accountable for legally separate organizations if its officials appoint a voting majority of an organization's governing body and either it is able to impose its will on that organization or there is a potential for the organization to provide specific financial benefits to, or to impose specific financial burdens on, the primary government. A primary government may also be financially accountable for governmental organizations that are fiscally dependent on it.

Most component units are included in the financial reporting entity by discrete presentation. Some component units, despite being legally separate from the primary government, are so integrated with the primary government, that they are in substance part of the primary government. These component units are blended with the primary government.

The New York City Transitional Finance Authority, which commenced operations in October, 1997 concurrent with its first debt offering, is included in the reporting entity for fiscal year 1998.

*Blended Component Units*

These component units, although legally separate, all provide services exclusively to the City and thus are reported as if they were part of the primary government. They include the following:

- Municipal Assistance Corporation For The City of New York (MAC)
- New York City Transitional Finance Authority (TFA)
- New York City Samurai Funding Corporation (SFC)
- New York City Educational Construction Fund (ECF)
- City University Construction Fund (CUCF)
- New York City School Construction Authority (SCA)

*Discretely Presented Component Units*

All discretely presented component units are legally separate from the primary government. These entities are reported as discretely presented component units because the City appoints a majority of these organizations' boards, is able to impose its will on them, or a financial benefit/burden situation exists.

The discretely presented component unit column in the combined financial statements includes the financial data of these entities, which are reported in a separate column to emphasize that they are legally separate from the City. They include the following:

- New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)
- New York City Off-Track Betting Corporation (OTB)
- Housing and Economic Development Entities:
  - New York City Housing Development Corporation (HDC)
  - New York City Housing Authority (HA)

- New York City Industrial Development Agency (IDA)
- New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC)
- Business Relocation Assistance Corporation (BRAC)
- Brooklyn Navy Yard Development Corporation (BNYDC)

**Water And Sewer System:**

- New York City Water Board (Water Board)
- New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority (Water Authority)

Note: These organizations publish separate annual financial statements which are available at: Office of the Comptroller, Bureau of Accountancy—Room 800, 1 Centre Street, New York, New York 10007.

*Fiduciary Funds*

These funds are used to account for assets when a governmental unit is functioning either as a trustee or an agent for another party. They include the following:

**Pension and Similar Trust Funds:**

- New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS)
- New York City Teachers' Retirement System—Qualified Pension Plan (TRS)
- New York City Board of Education Retirement System—Qualified Pension Plan (BERS)
- New York Police Department Pension Fund—Subchapter 2 (POLICE)
- New York Fire Department Pension Fund—Subchapter 2 (FIRE)
- New York Police Department Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (POVSF)
- New York Police Department Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (PSOVSF)
- New York Fire Department Firefighters' Variable Supplements Fund (FFVSF)
- New York Fire Department Fire Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (FOVSF)
- Transit Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (TPOVSF)
- Transit Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (TPSOVSF)
- Housing Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (HPOVSF)
- Housing Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (HPSOVSF)

Note: These organizations publish separate annual financial statements which are available at: Office of the Comptroller, Bureau of Accountancy—Room 800, 1 Centre Street, New York, New York 10007.

**Agency Funds:**

- Deferred Compensation Plan for Employees of The City of New York and Related Agencies and Instrumentalities (DCP)
- Other Agency Funds

Significant accounting policies and other matters concerning the financial information of these organizations are described elsewhere in the Notes to Financial Statements.

The City's operations also include those normally performed at the county level and, accordingly, transactions applicable to the operations of the five counties which comprise the City are included in these financial statements.

The New York City Transit Authority is an affiliated agency of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority of the State of New York which is a component unit of New York State and is excluded from the City's financial reporting entity.

*Fund Accounting*

The City uses funds and account groups to report on its financial position and the results of its operations. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain government functions or activities.

A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. An account group is a financial reporting device designed to provide accountability for certain assets and liabilities that are not recorded in the funds because they do not directly affect net expendable available financial resources.

Funds are classified into three categories: governmental, fiduciary, and proprietary. Except for proprietary (the only organizations that would be categorized as proprietary funds are reported as discretely presented component units), each category, in turn, is divided into separate "fund types."

### *Governmental*

#### *General Fund*

The General Fund is the general operating fund of the City. Substantially all tax revenues, Federal and State aid (except aid for capital projects), and other operating revenues are accounted for in the General Fund. This fund also accounts for expenditures and transfers as appropriated in the Expense Budget, which provides for the City's day-to-day operations, including transfers to Debt Service Funds for payment of long-term obligations.

#### *Capital Projects Funds*

The Capital Projects Funds account for resources used to construct or acquire fixed assets and make capital improvements. Such assets and improvements include substantially all land, buildings, equipment, water distribution and sewage collection system, and other elements of the City's infrastructure having a minimum useful life of five years, having a cost of more than \$15,000, and having been appropriated in the Capital Budget (see Budgets). The Capital Projects Funds include the activities of the New York City Capital Projects Fund, SCA, and TFA. Resources of the Capital Projects Funds are derived principally from proceeds of City and TFA bond issues, payments from the Water Authority, and from Federal, State, and other aid. The cumulative deficits of \$1,085 million and \$757 million at June 30, 1998 and 1997, respectively, represent the amounts expected to be financed from future bond issues or intergovernmental reimbursements. To the extent the deficits will not be financed or reimbursed, a transfer from the General Fund will be required.

#### *Debt Service Funds*

The Debt Service Funds account for the accumulation of resources for payment of principal and interest on long-term obligations. Separate funds are maintained to account for transactions relating to: (i) the City's Debt Service Funds and the General Debt Service Fund required by State legislation; (ii) certain other public benefit corporations whose indebtedness has been guaranteed by the City, or with whom the City has entered into lease purchase and similar agreements; (iii) MAC, TFA, and SFC; and (iv) ECF and CUCF as component units of the City.

ECF and CUCF are to account for governmental financial resources to pay for long-term debt consistent with the activity of the Debt Service Funds, and not for the construction of major capital projects.

### *Fiduciary*

#### *Trust and Agency Funds*

The Trust and Agency Funds account for the assets and activities of the Pension and Similar Trust Funds and Agency Funds.

The Pension and Similar Trust Funds account for the operations of NYCERS, TRS, BERS, POLICE, and FIRE employee retirement systems, and POVSF, PSOVSF, FFVSF, FOVSF, TPOVSF, TPOVSF, HPOVSF, and HPSOVSF. These funds use the accrual basis of accounting and a measurement focus on the periodic determination of additions, deductions, and net assets held in trust for pension benefits and supplemental benefits payments.

The Agency Funds account for the operations of DCP, which was created in accordance with Internal Revenue Code Section 457 and Other Agency Funds which account for miscellaneous assets held by the City for other funds, governmental units, and individuals. The Agency Funds are custodial in nature and do not involve measurement of results of operations.

### *Account Groups*

#### *General Fixed Assets Account Group*

The General Fixed Assets Account Group accounts for those fixed assets which are used for general governmental purposes and are not available for expenditure. Such assets include all capital assets, except for the City's infrastructure elements that are not required to be capitalized under GAAP. Infrastructure elements include the roads, bridges, curbs and gutters, streets and sidewalks, park land and improvements, and subway tracks and tunnels. The fixed assets of SCA are included in the City's General Fixed Assets Account Group. The fixed assets of the water distribution and sewage collection system are recorded in the Water and Sewer System component unit financial statements under a lease agreement between the City and the Water Board.

### *General Long-term Obligations Account Group*

The General Long-term Obligations Account Group accounts for unmatured long-term bonds payable which at maturity will be paid through the Debt Service Funds. In addition, the General Long-term Obligations Account Group includes other long-term obligations for: (i) capital leases; (ii) real estate tax refunds; (iii) judgments and claims; (iv); unpaid vacation and sick leave; (v) certain unfunded pension liabilities; and (vi) landfill closure and postclosure care costs.

### *Discretely Presented Component Units*

The discretely presented component units consist of HHC, OTB, HDC, HA and other component units comprising the Housing and Economic Development Entities, and the Water and Sewer System. These activities are accounted for in a manner similar to private business enterprises, in which the focus is on the periodic determination of revenues, expenses, and net income.

### *Basis of Accounting*

The accounting and financial reporting applied to a fund is determined by its measurement focus. Governmental fund types use the flow of current financial resources measurement focus. This focus is on the determination of, and changes in financial position, and generally only current assets and current liabilities are included on the balance sheet. These funds use the modified accrual basis of accounting, whereby revenues are recognized in the accounting period in which they become both measurable and available to finance expenditures of the fiscal period. Expenditures are recorded when the related liability is incurred, except for interest on long-term obligations and certain estimated liabilities recorded in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

The measurement focus of the Pension and Similar Trust Funds and the discretely presented component units is on the flow of economic resources. This focus emphasizes the determination of net income, changes in net assets, and financial position. With this measurement focus, all assets and liabilities associated with the operation of these funds and discretely presented component units are included on the balance sheet. These funds and discretely presented component units use the accrual basis of accounting whereby revenues are recognized in the accounting period in which they are earned, and expenses are recognized in the period incurred. In accordance with GASB Statement No. 20, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Proprietary Funds and Other Governmental Activities That Use Proprietary Fund Accounting*, the discretely presented component units have elected not to apply Financial Accounting Standards Board statements and interpretations issued after November 30, 1989. The Pension Trust Funds' contributions from members are recorded when the employer makes payroll deductions from Plan members. Employer contributions are recognized when due. Benefits and refunds are recognized when due and payable in accordance with the terms of the Plans.

The Agency Funds use the modified accrual basis of accounting and do not measure the results of operations.

### *Budgets and Financial Plans*

#### *Budgets*

Annual Expense Budget appropriations, which are prepared on the modified accrual basis, are adopted for the General Fund, and unused appropriations lapse at fiscal year-end. The City uses appropriations in the Capital Budget to authorize the expenditure of funds for various capital projects. Capital appropriations, unless modified or rescinded, remain in effect until the completion of each project.

The City is required by State Law to adopt and adhere to a budget, on a basis consistent with GAAP, that would not have General Fund expenditures in excess of revenues.

Expenditures made against the Expense Budget are controlled through the use of quarterly spending allotments and units of appropriation. A unit of appropriation represents a subdivision of an agency's budget and is the level of control at which expenditures may not legally exceed the appropriation. The number of units of appropriation and the span of operating responsibility which each unit represents, differs from agency to agency depending on the size of the agency and the level of control required. Transfers between units of appropriation and supplementary appropriations may be made by the Mayor subject to the approval provisions set forth in the City Charter. Supplementary appropriations increased the Expense Budget by \$2,494 million and \$1,587 million subsequent to its original adoption in fiscal years 1998 and 1997, respectively.

#### *Financial Plans*

The New York State Financial Emergency Act for The City of New York, as amended in 1978, requires the City to operate under a "rolling" Four-Year Financial Plan (Plan). Revenues and expenditures, including operating transfers, of each year of the Plan are required to be balanced on a basis consistent with GAAP. The Plan is broader in scope than the Expense Budget; it



comprehends General Fund revenues and expenditures, Capital Projects Fund revenues and expenditures, and all short and long-term financing.

The Expense Budget is generally consistent with the first year of the Plan and operations under the Expense Budget must reflect the aggregate limitations contained in the approved Plan. The City reviews its Plan periodically during the year and, if necessary, makes modifications to incorporate actual results and revisions to assumptions.

#### *Encumbrances*

Encumbrance accounting, under which purchase orders, contracts, and other commitments for expenditures are recorded to reflect the use of the applicable spending appropriations, is used by the General Fund during the fiscal year to control expenditures. The cost of those goods received and services rendered on or before June 30 are recognized as expenditures. Encumbrances not resulting in expenditures by year-end lapse.

#### *Cash and Investments*

The City considers all highly liquid investments (including restricted assets) with a maturity of three months or less when purchased, to be cash equivalents.

Cash and cash equivalents include compensating balances maintained with certain banks in lieu of payments for services rendered. The average compensating balances maintained during fiscal years 1998 and 1997 were approximately \$205 million and \$264 million, respectively.

Investments in fixed income securities are recorded at fair value. Securities purchased pursuant to agreements to resell are carried at the contract price, exclusive of interest, at which the securities will be resold.

Investments of the Pension and Similar Trust Funds and DCP are reported at fair value. Investments are stated at the last reported sales price on a national securities exchange on the last business day of the fiscal year.

A description of the City's securities lending activities for the Pension and Similar Trust Funds in fiscal years 1998 and 1997 is provided in Deposits and Investments (see Note F).

Most investments are reported in the balance sheet at fair value. Investment income, including changes in the fair value of investments, is reported in operations.

In March, 1997, GASB issued Statement No. 31, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and for External Investment Pools*. The Statement requires that most investments be reported in the balance sheet at fair value, and that all investment income, including changes in the fair value of investments, be reported in the statement of operations. The City implemented Statement No. 31 in fiscal year 1997. The adoption of the Statement did not have a material impact on the City's financial statements.

#### *Inventories*

Materials and supplies are recorded as expenditures in governmental funds at the time of purchase. Accordingly, inventories on hand at June 30, 1998 and 1997 (estimated at \$201 million and \$214 million, respectively, based on average cost) have not been reported on the governmental funds balance sheets.

#### *Restricted Cash and Investments*

Certain proceeds of component unit bonds, as well as certain resources set aside for bond repayment, are classified as restricted cash and investments on the balance sheet because their use is limited by applicable bond covenants.

#### *Fixed Assets*

Fixed assets are generally stated at historical cost, or at estimated historical cost based on appraisals or on other acceptable methods when historical cost is not available. Donated fixed assets are stated at their fair market value as of the date of the donation. Capital leases are classified as fixed assets in amounts equal to the lesser of the fair market value or the present value of net minimum lease payments at the inception of the lease (see Note H).

Accumulated depreciation and amortization are reported as reductions of fixed assets. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method based upon estimated useful lives of 40 to 50 years for buildings and 5 to 35 years for equipment. Capital lease assets and leasehold improvements are amortized over the term of the lease or the life of the asset, whichever is less.

See Notes L, M, N and O for fixed asset accounting policies used by HHC, OTB, HA, and the Water and Sewer System, respectively.

*Allowance for Uncollectible Mortgage Loans*

Mortgage loans and interest receivable in the Debt Service Funds are net of an allowance for uncollectible amounts of \$722.9 million and \$709.6 million for fiscal years 1998 and 1997, respectively. The allowance is composed of the balance of first mortgages one or more years in arrears and the balance of refinanced mortgages where payments to the City are not expected to be completed for approximately 25 to 30 years.

*Vacation and Sick Leave*

Earned vacation and sick leave is recorded as an expenditure in the period when it is payable from current financial resources. The estimated value of vacation leave earned by employees which may be used in subsequent years or earned vacation and sick leave paid upon termination or retirement, and therefore payable from future resources, is recorded in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group, except for leave of the employees of the discretely presented component units which is accounted for in those component unit financial statements.

*Treasury Obligations*

Bonds payable included in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group and investments in the Debt Service Funds are reported net of "treasury obligations." Treasury obligations represent City bonds held as investments of the Debt Service Funds which are offset and reported as if these bonds had been redeemed.

*Judgments and Claims*

The City is uninsured with respect to risks including, but not limited to, property damage, personal injury, and workers' compensation. Expenditures for judgments and claims (other than workers' compensation and condemnation proceedings) are recorded on the basis of settlements reached or judgments entered within the current fiscal year. Expenditures for workers' compensation are recorded when paid. Settlements relating to condemnation proceedings are reported in the Capital Projects Fund when the liability is estimable. The estimated liability for judgments and claims which have not been adjudicated, settled, or reported at the end of a fiscal year is recorded in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group. The current liability for settlements reached or judgments entered but not yet paid is recorded in the General Fund.

*General Long-term Obligations*

For general long-term obligations, only that portion expected to be financed from expendable available financial resources is reported as a fund liability of a governmental fund. The remaining portion of such obligations is reported in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group. Long-term liabilities expected to be financed from discretely presented component unit operations are accounted for in those component unit financial statements.

*Real Estate Tax*

Real estate tax payments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998 were due July 1, 1997 and January 1, 1998 except that payments by owners of real property assessed at \$40,000 or less and cooperatives whose individual units on average are valued at \$40,000 or less were due in quarterly installments on the first day of each quarter beginning on July 1.

The levy date for fiscal year 1998 taxes was June 6, 1997. The lien date is the date taxes are due.

Real estate tax revenue represents payments received during the year and payments received (against the current fiscal year and prior years' levies) within the first two months of the following fiscal year reduced by tax refunds.

The City offered the usual discount of 2% for the prepayment of real estate taxes for fiscal year 1998, but discontinued the special 5% discount that was offered in fiscal year 1997. Collections of these real estate taxes received on or before June 30, 1998 and 1997 were \$1.222 billion and \$1.878 billion, respectively. These amounts were recorded as deferred revenue.

On June 18, 1997, the City sold approximately \$100 million of real property tax liens in a two phase sale. Phase I proceeds of \$61.7 million, fully attributable to fiscal year 1997, were received at the time of the sale. Pursuant to the sale agreement, the City refunded the value of liens later determined to be defective, plus interest and a five percent surcharge. It was estimated that \$9.5 million worth of liens sold in Phase I would require replacement. The estimated refund accrual of \$10 million, including the surcharge, and the actual 1997 refund of \$200 thousand, brought the fiscal year 1997 sale proceeds to \$51.5 million. Phase II proceeds of \$27.5 million, received August 7, 1997, are from sales of liens on fiscal year 1998 taxes, and therefore represent fiscal year 1998 revenue.

It has been estimated that \$4.75 million worth of liens sold in Phase II will require replacement. The estimated refund accrual amount of \$5 million, including the surcharge, results in fiscal year 1998 sale proceeds of \$22.5 million.

In fiscal year 1998, \$13.3 million, including the surcharge and interest, was refunded for defective liens from prior years sales. This resulted in charges to fiscal year 1998 revenue of \$500 thousand for principal refunded in excess of the fiscal year 1997 accrual of \$10 million, as well as charges to fiscal year 1998 interest expense of \$2.8 million.

In fiscal years 1998 and 1997, \$310 million and \$337 million, respectively, were provided as allowances for uncollectible real estate taxes against the balance of the receivable. Delinquent real estate taxes receivable that are estimated to be collectible but which are not collected in the first two months of the next fiscal year are recorded as deferred revenues.

The City is permitted to levy real estate taxes for general operating purposes in an amount up to 2.5% of the average full value of taxable real estate in the City for the last five years and in unlimited amounts for the payment of principal and interest on long-term City debt. Amounts collected for payment of principal and interest on long-term debt in excess of that required for that purpose in the year of the levy must be applied towards future years' debt service. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998, an excess amount of \$348 million was transferred to the Debt Service Funds. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1997, no such excess amount was available to be transferred to the Debt Service Funds.

*Other Taxes and Other Revenues*

Taxpayer-assessed taxes, such as sales and income taxes, net of estimated refunds, are recognized in the accounting period in which they become susceptible to accrual.

Licenses, permits, privileges and franchises, fines, forfeitures, and other revenues are recorded when received in cash. The City receives revenue from the Water Board for operating and maintenance costs and rental payments for use of the Water and Sewer System. These revenues are recognized when the services are provided by the City for the Water Board.

*Federal, State, and Other Aid*

Categorical aid, net of a provision for estimated disallowances, is reported as revenue when the related reimbursable expenditures are incurred. Unrestricted aid is reported as revenue in the fiscal year of entitlement. The City has not recognized \$408 million of prior year Board of Education claims for reimbursement from the New York State Education Department. While these revenues are measurable, they are not considered available to fund current operations based on the history of the State's appropriation practice over the last several years.

*Bond Discounts/Issuance Costs*

In governmental fund types, bond discounts and issuance costs are recognized as expenditures in the period incurred. Bond discounts and issuance costs in the discretely presented component units are deferred and amortized over the term of the bonds using the bonds-outstanding method, which approximates the effective interest method. Bond discounts are presented as a reduction of the face amount of bonds payable, whereas issuance costs are recorded as deferred charges.

*Transfers*

Payments from a fund or discretely presented component unit receiving revenue to a fund or discretely presented component unit through which the revenue is to be expended are reported as operating transfers. Such payments include transfers for debt service and OTB net revenues.

*Subsidies*

The City makes various payments to subsidize a number of organizations which provide services to City residents. These payments are recorded as expenditures in the year paid.

*Pensions*

Pension cost is required to be measured and disclosed using the accrual basis of accounting (see Note R), regardless of the amount recognized as pension expense on the modified accrual basis of accounting. Annual pension cost should be equal to the annual required contributions to the pension plan, calculated in accordance with certain parameters.

*Comparative Data*

Comparative total data for the prior year have been presented, where appropriate, in order to provide an understanding of changes in the City's operations. Reclassifications and adjustments of certain prior year amounts have been made to conform with the current year presentation and separately issued financial statements of reported entities.

*Estimates and Assumptions*

A number of estimates and assumptions relating to the reporting of revenues, expenditures, assets and liabilities, and the disclosure of contingent liabilities were used to prepare these financial statements in conformity with GAAP. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

*Pronouncements Issued But Not Yet Effective or Implemented*

In May, 1990, GASB issued Statement No. 11, *Measurement Focus and Basis of Accounting—Governmental Fund Operating Statements*. The Statement establishes an accrual basis of accounting with a financial resources measurement focus for governmental funds. The operating results expressed using the financial resources measurement focus show the extent to which financial resources obtained during a period are sufficient to cover claims against financial resources incurred during that period. The City currently follows the modified accrual basis. Using the modified accrual basis, revenues are recognized in the accounting period in which they become measurable and available and expenditures are recognized when the fund liability is incurred, if measurable, except for unmatured interest on general long-term debt, which is recognized when due. The effective date of the Statement has been deferred by GASB Statement No. 17, *Measurement Focus and Basis of Accounting—Governmental Fund Operating Statements: Amendment of the Effective Dates of GASB Statement No. 11 and Related Statements*, to periods beginning approximately two years after an implementation standard is issued. Early implementation of Statement No. 11 is not permitted. The City has not yet completed the complex analysis required to estimate the financial statement impact of Statement No. 11.

In October, 1997, GASB issued Statement No. 32, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Internal Revenue Code Section 457 Deferred Compensation Plans*. The Statement addresses the accounting implications of changes to Internal Revenue Code Section 457 which require that the assets of eligible deferred compensation plans be held in trust for the exclusive use of plan participants and their beneficiaries. The effect of the implementation of the Statement will be that the Deferred Compensation Plan for Employees of The City of New York and Related Agencies and Instrumentalities will be reported as an Expendable Trust Fund instead of an Agency Fund. The Statement will be implemented when the changes to the plan are made to conform to the new requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, which is expected to be as of January 1, 1999.

**B. AUDIT RESPONSIBILITY**

In fiscal years 1998 and 1997, respectively, the separately administered organizations included in the financial statements of the City audited by auditors other than KPMG Peat Marwick LLP, are the Municipal Assistance Corporation For The City of New York, New York City Housing Authority, New York City Economic Development Corporation, New York City Educational Construction Fund, New York City Industrial Development Agency, New York City Off-Track Betting Corporation, New York City School Construction Authority, Brooklyn Navy Yard Development Corporation, Business Relocation Assistance Corporation, City University Construction Fund, and the Deferred Compensation Plan. Fiscal year 1998 also includes the New York City Transitional Finance Authority.

The following describes the proportion of certain key financial information that is audited by other auditors in fiscal years 1998 and 1997:

	Fund Types								Account Groups				Discretely Presented Component Units	
	General		Capital Projects		Debt Service		Trust and Agency		General Fixed Assets		General Long-term Obligations			
	1998	1997	1998	1997	1998	1997	1998	1997	1998	1997	1998	1997	1998	1997
Total assets/liabilities	0	0	16	8	41	38	2	2	28	28	15	13	20	20
Operating revenues and other financing sources	0	0	46	15	20	26	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	29	29

NA: Not Applicable

**C. MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK (MAC)**

MAC is a corporate governmental agency and instrumentality of the State constituting a public benefit corporation. MAC was created in June, 1975 by the Municipal Assistance Corporation For The City of New York Act (Act) to assist the City in providing essential services to its inhabitants without interruption and in reestablishing investor confidence in the soundness of City obligations. Pursuant to the Act, MAC is empowered to issue and sell bonds and notes, pay or loan to the City funds received from such sales, and exchange its obligations for those of the City. Also pursuant to the Act, MAC provides certain oversight of the City's financial activities.

MAC has no taxing power. All outstanding bonds issued by MAC are general obligations of MAC and do not constitute an enforceable obligation or a debt of either the City or the State and neither the City nor the State is liable thereon. Neither the City nor a creditor of the City has any claim to MAC's revenues and assets. Debt service requirements and operating expenses are funded by allocations from the State's collection of certain sales and compensating use taxes (imposed by the State within the City at rates formerly imposed by the City), the stock transfer tax, and certain per capita aid subject in each case to appropriation by the State Legislature. Net collections of taxes and per capita aid are returned to the City by the State after MAC debt service

requirements are met. The MAC bond resolutions provide for liens by bondholders on certain monies received by MAC from the State.

MAC was authorized by the Act to issue, until January 1, 1985, obligations in an aggregate principal amount of \$10 billion, of which MAC issued approximately \$9.445 billion, exclusive of obligations issued to refund outstanding obligations of MAC and of notes issued to enable the City to fulfill its seasonal borrowing requirements. In July, 1990, State legislation was enacted which, among other things, authorized MAC to issue up to an additional \$1.5 billion of bonds and notes to fund a portion of the capital programs of the New York City Transit Authority and SCA. This legislation also provides for a reduction in the July, 1990 issuance authority to the extent that the transit and schools capital programs are funded by the City. As of June 30, 1997, the City had completed funding of these programs, and MAC's additional \$1.5 billion in borrowing authority lapsed without any of it being used.

MAC continues to be authorized to issue obligations to renew or refund outstanding obligations, without limitation as to amount. No obligations of MAC may mature later than July 1, 2008. MAC may issue new obligations provided their issuance would not cause certain debt service limitations and debt service coverage ratios to be exceeded.

As indicated in Note A, MAC transactions and account balances are included in the accompanying financial statements because MAC's financing activities are considered an essential part of the City's financing activities. In order to include the financial statements of MAC with those of the City, the following eliminations were made: (i) July 1st bond redemptions and interest on bonds payable which are reflected on MAC's statements at June 30; and (ii) certain City obligations purchased by MAC (see Note I). MAC account balances and transactions are shown in the Debt Service Funds and General Long-term Obligations Account Group; revenues appropriated and paid by the State of New York to MAC are first included in General Fund revenues and then transferred to the Debt Service Funds in the fiscal year of such payments.

During fiscal year 1998, MAC issued \$653.8 million aggregate principal amount of bonds under its 1991 General Bond Resolution in combined advance and current refundings of various bonds issued under its Second General Bond Resolution. The net proceeds of the refunding issues, together with other available funds, were placed in trust to pay the principal and redemption price and interest on the refunded bonds. The refunded bonds are considered to be defeased and the liability for these bonds has been removed from the general long-term debt account group. The refunding will result in savings of \$190.8 million. Present value savings amount to \$82.5 million. Similarly, in fiscal year 1997 MAC issued \$2,068.7 million aggregate principal amount of bonds under its 1991 General Bond Resolution to refund various bonds issued under its Second General Bond Resolution. These refunding transactions generated present value savings of \$164.4 million. As of June 30, 1998, defeased bonds of \$772.8 million remained outstanding, of which \$288.6 million were retired on July 1, 1998.

#### **D. NEW YORK CITY TRANSITIONAL FINANCE AUTHORITY (TFA)**

TFA is a corporate governmental agency constituting a public benefit corporation and instrumentality of the State. TFA was created in March, 1997 by the New York City Financial Authority Act (Act) to assist the City in funding its capital program, the purpose of which is to maintain, rebuild and expand the infrastructure of the City. TFA became operational in October, 1997 concurrent with its first debt offering.

TFA has no taxing power. All outstanding bonds issued by TFA are general obligations of TFA and do not constitute an enforceable obligation or a debt of either the City or the State and neither the City nor the State is liable thereon. Neither the City nor a creditor of the City has any claim to TFA's revenues and assets. Debt service requirements and operating expenses are funded by allocations from the State's collection of personal income taxes (imposed by the City and collected by the State) and, under certain circumstances, sales taxes. Sales taxes are only available to TFA after such amounts required by MAC are deducted and if the amounts of personal income tax revenues fall below statutorily specified coverage levels. Net collections of taxes not required by TFA are paid to the City by TFA. No sales tax revenues were received by TFA during fiscal year 1998.

TFA was authorized by the Act to issue obligations in an aggregate principal amount of \$7.5 billion in debt for City purposes, providing an alternative to the issuance of General Obligation Debt subject to the constitutional limitation, of which TFA issued \$2.150 billion for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998.

TFA account balances and transactions are shown in the Capital Projects Funds, Debt Service Funds and General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

#### **E. NEW YORK CITY SAMURAI FUNDING CORPORATION (SFC)**

The City created SFC on August 25, 1992. This is a special-purpose governmental not-for-profit entity, created to issue Yen-denominated bonds. The members, directors, and officers of SFC are all elected officials or employees of the City.

SFC issued Yen-denominated bonds to investors on May 27, 1993 and simultaneously bought general obligation bonds from the City. Such bonds require the City to make floating rate interest and principal payments in U.S. dollars to SFC. SFC entered into

currency and interest rate exchange agreements to swap the City's payments into fixed rate Yen which are used to pay SFC's bondholders. These agreements limit the City's currency and exchange rate change exposure. SFC's bonds are included in the City's General Long-term Obligations Account Group. The proceeds from the City's bonds sold to SFC were used for housing and economic development projects.

## F. DEPOSITS AND INVESTMENTS

### *Deposits*

The City's bank depositories are designated by the Banking Commission, which consists of the Comptroller, the Mayor, and the Finance Commissioner. Independent bank rating agencies are used to determine the financial soundness of each bank, and the City's banking relationships are under periodic operational and credit reviews.

The City Charter limits the amount of deposits at any time in any one bank or trust company to a maximum of one-half of the amount of the capital and net surplus of such bank or trust company. The discretely presented component units included in the City's reporting entity maintain their own banking relationships which generally conform with the City's. Bank balances are currently insured up to \$100,000 in the aggregate by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) for each bank for all funds other than monies of the retirement systems, which are held by well-capitalized banks and are insured by the FDIC up to \$100,000 per retirement system member. At June 30, 1998 and 1997, the carrying amount of the City's cash and cash equivalents was \$1,279 million and \$747 million, respectively, and the bank balances were \$1,218 million and \$704 million, respectively. Of the bank balances, \$615 million and \$424 million, respectively, were covered by Federal depository insurance or collateralized with securities held by the City's agent in the City's name, and \$603 million and \$280 million, respectively, were uninsured and collateralized with securities held by the City's agent in the City's name. At June 30, 1998 and 1997, the carrying amount of the discretely presented component units' cash and cash equivalents was \$598 million and \$308 million, respectively, and the bank balances were \$67 million and \$40 million, respectively. Of the bank balances, \$7 million and \$8 million, respectively, were covered by Federal depository insurance or collateralized with securities held by the City's agent in the City's name, and \$60 million and \$32 million, respectively, were uninsured and collateralized with securities held by the City's agent in the City's name.

The uninsured, collateralized cash balances carried during the year represent primarily the compensating balances to be maintained at banks for services provided. It is the policy of the City to invest all funds in excess of compensating balance requirements.

### *Investments*

The City's investment of cash in its governmental fund types is currently limited to U.S. Government guaranteed securities purchased directly and through repurchase agreements from primary dealers as well as commercial paper rated A1 or P1 by Standard & Poor's Corporation or Moody's Investors Service, Inc., respectively. The repurchase agreements must be collateralized by U.S. Government guaranteed securities or eligible commercial paper in a range of 100% to 103% of the matured value of the repurchase agreements.

The investment policies of the discretely presented component units included in the City's reporting entity generally conform to those of the City's. The criteria for the Pension and Similar Trust Funds' investments are as follows:

1. Fixed income investments may be made in U.S. Government securities or securities of U.S. Government agencies, securities of companies rated BBB or better by both Standard & Poor's Corporation and Moody's Investors Service, Inc., and any bond that meets the qualifications of the New York State Retirement and Social Security Law, the New York State Banking Law, and the New York City Administrative Code.
2. Equity investments may be made only in those stocks that meet the qualifications of the New York State Retirement and Social Security Law, the New York State Banking Law, and the New York City Administrative Code.
3. Short-term investments may be made in the following:
  - a. U.S. Government securities or U.S. Government agency securities.
  - b. Commercial paper rated A1 or P1 by Standard & Poor's Corporation or Moody's Investors Service, Inc., respectively.
  - c. Repurchase agreements collateralized in a range of 100% to 103% of matured value, purchased from primary dealers of U.S. Government securities.
  - d. Investments in bankers' acceptances and certificates of deposit—time deposits are limited to banks with world-wide assets in excess of \$50 billion that are rated within the highest categories of the leading bank rating services and selected regional banks also rated within the highest categories.

4. Investments up to 15% of total pension fund assets in instruments not specifically covered by the New York State Retirement and Social Security Law.
5. No investment in any one corporation can be: (i) more than 2% of the pension plan net assets; or (ii) more than 5% of the total outstanding issues of the corporation.

All investments are held by the City's custodial banks (in bearer or book-entry form) solely as agent of the Comptroller of The City of New York on behalf of the various account owners. Payments for purchases are not released until evidence of ownership of the underlying investments are received by the City's custodial bank.

Investments of the City and its discretely presented component units are categorized by level of credit risk (the risk that a counterparty to an investment transaction will not fulfill its obligations). Category 1, the lowest risk, includes investments that are insured or registered or for which securities are held by the entity or its agent in the entity's name. Category 2, includes investments that are uninsured and unregistered with securities held by the counterparty's trust department or agent in the entity's name. Category 3, the highest risk, includes investments that are uninsured and unregistered with securities held by the counterparty, or by its trust department or agent but not in the entity's name.

The City's investments, including those of the discretely presented component units (DPCU), as of June 30, 1998 and 1997 are classified as follows:

	1998									
	Category						Total Carrying Amount		Fair Value	
	1		2		3		City	DPCU	City	DPCU
	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU
	(in millions)									
Repurchase agreements	\$ 1,707	\$ 235	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 1,707	\$ 235	\$ 1,708	\$ 235
U.S. Government securities	16,062	1,003	—	—	—	—	16,062	1,003	16,062	1,023
Commercial paper	4,695	—	—	—	—	—	4,695	—	4,695	—
Corporate bonds	10,390	—	—	—	—	—	10,390	—	10,390	—
Corporate stocks	59,049	—	—	—	—	—	59,049	—	59,049	—
Short-term investment fund	2,347	—	—	—	—	—	2,347	—	2,347	—
Agency discount notes	—	217	—	—	—	—	—	217	—	219
Time deposits	—	117	—	—	—	—	—	117	—	117
Other	—	18	—	4	—	—	—	22	—	22
Securities lending investment collateral (categorized):										
Repurchase agreements	884	—	—	—	—	—	884	—	884	—
U.S. Government securities	76	—	—	—	—	—	76	—	76	—
Commercial paper	2,592	—	—	—	—	—	2,592	—	2,592	—
Short-term investment fund	3,524	—	—	—	—	—	3,524	—	3,524	—
Corporate bonds	2,971	—	—	—	—	—	2,971	—	2,971	—
Corporate stocks	78	—	—	—	—	—	78	—	78	—
Other	453	—	—	—	—	—	453	—	453	—
	<u>\$104,828</u>	<u>\$1,590</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 4</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>104,828</u>	<u>1,594</u>	<u>104,829</u>	<u>1,616</u>
Mutual funds (1)							1,757	—	1,757	—
International investment fund—fixed income (1)							—	—	—	—
International investment fund—equity (1)							9,781	—	9,781	—
Guaranteed investment contracts (1)							966	—	966	—
Management investment contracts (1)							202	—	202	—
Securities lending investment collateral (uncategorized):										
Guaranteed investment contracts							65	—	65	—
Mutual funds							11	—	11	—
Small mortgages (1)							18	—	18	—
Other (2)							8	—	8	—
Total investments							<u>\$117,636</u>	<u>\$1,594</u>	<u>\$117,637</u>	<u>\$1,616</u>

- (1) These investments are not categorized because they are not evidenced by securities that exist in physical or book entry form.
- (2) These investments are Tier 4 pension loans that cannot be categorized by type of securities.

In fiscal year 1998, the restricted cash, cash equivalents, and investments applicable to the Capital Projects Funds include \$306.2 million of cash and cash equivalents, of which the repayment of \$306.2 million was insured or collateralized and none was uninsured and uncollateralized. Restricted investments, principally in U.S. Government securities with a cost and approximate fair value of \$91.7 million are fully registered with securities held by the City's agent in the entity's name of which none have maturities of three months or less.

In fiscal year 1998, the restricted cash, cash equivalents, and investments applicable to discretely presented component units include \$932.8 million of cash and cash equivalents, of which the repayment of \$929.2 million was insured or collateralized and \$3.6 million was uninsured and uncollateralized. Restricted investments, principally in U.S. Government securities with a cost and approximate fair value of \$819.6 million are fully registered with securities held by the City's agent in the entity's name of which \$24.8 million have maturities of three months or less.

	1997											
	1		Category 2				3		Total Carrying Amount		Fair Value	
	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU	City	DPCU		
	(in millions)											
Repurchase agreements	\$ 3,323	\$ 374	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 3,323	\$ 374	\$ 3,350	\$ 384		
U.S. Government securities	14,244	642	—	5	—	—	14,244	647	14,248	645		
Commercial paper	3,030	—	—	—	—	—	3,030	—	3,032	—		
Corporate bonds	8,801	—	—	—	—	—	8,801	—	8,801	—		
Corporate stocks	48,927	—	—	—	—	—	48,927	—	48,927	—		
Short-term investment fund	2,707	—	—	—	—	—	2,707	—	2,707	—		
Agency discount notes	—	44	—	—	—	—	—	44	—	46		
Time deposits	—	37	—	—	—	—	—	37	—	37		
Securities lending investment collateral (categorized):												
Repurchase agreements	635	—	—	—	—	—	635	—	635	—		
U.S. Government securities	130	—	—	—	—	—	130	—	130	—		
Commercial paper	2,930	—	—	—	—	—	2,930	—	2,930	—		
Asset-backed securities	693	—	—	—	—	—	693	—	693	—		
Corporate notes	1,772	—	—	—	—	—	1,772	—	1,772	—		
Certificates of deposits	814	—	—	—	—	—	814	—	814	—		
Loan participation	397	—	—	—	—	—	397	—	397	—		
Time deposits	895	—	—	—	—	—	895	—	895	—		
Other (2)	58	—	—	—	—	—	58	—	58	—		
	<u>\$89,356</u>	<u>\$1,097</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 5</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>89,356</u>	<u>1,102</u>	<u>89,389</u>	<u>1,112</u>		
Mutual funds (1)							1,150	—	1,150	—		
International investment fund—fixed income (1)							710	—	710	—		
International investment fund—equity (1)							8,704	—	8,704	—		
Guaranteed investment contracts (1)							906	—	906	—		
Management investment contracts (1)							232	—	232	—		
Securities lending investment collateral (uncategorized):												
International							1,228	—	1,228	—		
Small mortgages (1)							20	—	20	—		
Total investments							<u>\$102,306</u>	<u>\$1,102</u>	<u>\$102,339</u>	<u>\$1,112</u>		

(1) These investments are not categorized because they are not evidenced by securities that exist in physical or book entry form.  
 (2) These investments are securities lending domestic funds that cannot be categorized by type of security.



In fiscal year 1997, the restricted cash, cash equivalents, and investments applicable to the Capital Projects Funds include \$447.8 million of cash and cash equivalents, of which the repayment of \$447.8 million was insured or collateralized and none was uninsured and uncollateralized. Restricted investments, principally in U.S. Government securities with a cost and approximate fair value of \$95.1 million are fully registered with securities held by the City's agent in the entity's name of which none have maturities of three months or less.

In fiscal year 1997, the restricted cash, cash equivalents, and investments applicable to discretely presented component units include \$822.7 million of cash and cash equivalents, of which the repayment of \$822.7 million was insured or collateralized and none was uninsured and uncollateralized. Restricted investments, principally in U.S. Government securities with a cost and approximate fair value of \$1,022.3 million are fully registered with securities held by the City's agent in the entity's name of which \$31.4 million have maturities of three months or less.

*Securities Lending*

State statutes and boards of trustees policies permit the Pension and Retirement Systems & certain Variable Supplements Funds (Systems & Funds) to lend their securities (the underlying securities) to brokers-dealers and other entities with a simultaneous agreement to return the collateral for the same securities in the future. The Systems' & Funds' custodians lend the following types of securities: short-term securities, common stock, long-term corporate bonds, U.S. Government and U.S. Government agencies' bonds, asset-backed securities, and international equities and bonds held in collective investment funds. Securities on loan at year-end are classified as a Category 1 risk in the preceding schedule of custodial credit risk. International securities are uncategorized. In return, they receive collateral in the form of cash at 100%—105% of the principal plus accrued interest for reinvestment. At year-end, the Systems & Funds had no credit risk exposure to borrowers because the amounts the Systems & Funds owe the borrowers exceed the amounts the borrowers owe the Systems & Funds. The contracts with the Systems' & Funds' custodian requires borrowers to indemnify the Systems & Funds if the borrowers fail to return the securities, if the collateral is inadequate, and if the borrowers fail to pay the Systems & Funds for income distributions by the securities' issuers while the securities are on loan.

All securities loans can be terminated on demand within a period specified in each agreement by either the Systems & Funds or the borrowers. Cash collateral is invested in the lending agents' short-term investment pools, which have a weighted-average maturity of 90 days. The underlying securities (fixed income) have an average maturity of 10 years except for the TRS securities lending program discussed below which has an average maturity of 5 years.

In addition, TRS administers a securities lending program for TRS and BERS Variable A investment program which is comparable to the securities lending program discussed above.

The City reports securities loaned as assets on the balance sheet. Cash received as collateral on securities lending transactions and investments made with that cash are also recorded as assets. Liabilities resulting from these transactions are reported on the balance sheet. Accordingly, the City records the investments purchased with the cash collateral as Collateral From Securities Lending Transactions with a corresponding liability as Securities Lending Transactions.

**G. GENERAL FIXED ASSETS ACCOUNT GROUP**

The following is a summary of changes in general fixed assets for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1997 and 1998:

	Balance June 30, 1996	Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 1997	Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 1998
	(in thousands)						
Land .....	\$ 624,646	\$ 10,495	\$ —	\$ 635,141	\$ 306	\$ —	\$ 635,447
Buildings .....	9,454,694	1,055,144	8,370	10,501,468	804,784	2,845	11,303,407
Equipment .....	2,919,778	259,074	44,264	3,134,588	204,746	81,608	3,257,726
Construction work-in-progress .....	5,420,627	1,219,587	1,055,144	5,585,070	1,618,013	804,784	6,398,299
	18,419,745	2,544,300	1,107,778	19,856,267	2,627,849	889,237	21,594,879
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization .....	5,895,541	669,802	38,188	6,527,155	838,154	61,819	7,303,490
Total changes in net fixed assets .....	<u>\$12,524,204</u>	<u>\$1,874,498</u>	<u>\$1,069,590</u>	<u>\$13,329,112</u>	<u>\$1,789,695</u>	<u>\$ 827,418</u>	<u>\$14,291,389</u>

The following are the sources of funding for the general fixed assets for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997. Sources of funding for fixed assets are not available prior to fiscal year 1987.

	1998	1997
	(in thousands)	
Capital Projects Funds:		
Prior to fiscal year 1987 .....	\$ 6,716,365	\$ 6,718,326
City bonds .....	13,159,930	11,503,732
Federal grants .....	310,333	296,262
State grants .....	118,989	117,777
Private grants .....	48,308	47,857
Capitalized leases .....	1,240,954	1,172,313
Total funding sources .....	<u>\$21,594,879</u>	<u>\$19,856,267</u>

At June 30, 1998 and 1997, the General Fixed Assets Account Group includes approximately \$1.3 billion of City-owned assets leased for \$1 per year to the New York City Transit Authority which operates and maintains the assets. In addition, assets leased to HHC and to the Water and Sewer System are excluded from the General Fixed Assets Account Group and are recorded in the respective component unit financial statements.

Included in land and buildings at June 30, 1998 and 1997 are leased properties capitalized at \$1,241 million and \$1,172 million, respectively, with related accumulated amortization of \$108 million and \$73 million, respectively.

The City's infrastructure is not required to be capitalized in the General Fixed Assets Account Group under GAAP although the acquisition and construction of such items are expenditures of the Capital Projects Funds (see Note A). For this reason, expenditures of the Capital Projects Funds for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 exceed the \$2.628 billion and \$2.544 billion increases recorded as general fixed assets by \$1.523 billion and \$1.315 billion, respectively.

#### H. LEASES

The City leases a significant amount of property and equipment from others. Leased property having elements of ownership are recorded as capital leases in the General Fixed Assets Account Group. The related obligations, in amounts equal to the present value of minimum lease payments payable during the remaining term of the leases, are recorded in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group. Other leased property not having elements of ownership are classified as operating leases. Both capital and operating lease payments are recorded as expenditures when payable. Total expenditures on such leases for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 were approximately \$360 million and \$352 million, respectively.

As of June 30, 1998, the City (excluding discretely presented component units) had future minimum payments under capital and operating leases with a remaining term in excess of one year as follows:

	Capital Leases	Operating Leases	Total
	(in thousands)		
Fiscal year ending June 30:			
1999 .....	\$ 118,207	\$ 171,993	\$ 290,200
2000 .....	117,987	166,461	284,448
2001 .....	118,404	158,336	276,740
2002 .....	119,050	151,364	270,414
2003 .....	119,078	141,966	261,044
Thereafter until 2025 .....	<u>1,302,507</u>	<u>851,877</u>	<u>2,154,384</u>
Future minimum payments .....	1,895,233	<u>\$1,641,997</u>	<u>\$3,537,230</u>
Less interest .....	754,105		
Present value of future minimum payments .....	<u>\$1,141,128</u>		

The present value of future minimum lease payments includes approximately \$800 million for leases with Public Benefit Corporations (PBC) where State law generally provides that in the event the City fails to make any required lease payment, the amount of such payment will be deducted from State aid otherwise payable to the City and paid to PBC.

The City also leases City-owned property to others, primarily for markets, ports, and terminals. Total rental revenue on these operating leases for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 was approximately \$151 million and \$143 million, respectively. As of June 30, 1998, the following future minimum rentals are provided for by the leases:

	<u>Amount</u> (in thousands)
Fiscal year ending June 30:	
1999 .....	\$ 50,694
2000 .....	49,836
2001 .....	47,947
2002 .....	43,446
2003 .....	40,755
Thereafter until 2086 .....	866,302
Future minimum rentals .....	<u>\$1,098,980</u>

**I. LONG-TERM OBLIGATIONS**

*Long-term Debt*

Following is a summary of the bond transactions of the City, MAC, TFA, SFC, and certain public benefit corporations that are component units of the City and/or whose debt is guaranteed by the City. For information on notes and bonds payable of the discretely presented component units, see Notes L, M, N and O.

	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1996</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Repaid or</u> <u>Defeased</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1997</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Repaid or</u> <u>Defeased</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1998</u>
	(in thousands)						
City debt:							
General obligation bonds	\$26,179,215	\$6,830,595	\$5,861,631	\$27,148,179	\$5,509,025	\$5,778,170	\$26,879,034
MAC debt:(4)							
Second general resolution							
bonds .....	3,281,855	—	2,356,485	925,370	—	925,370	—
1991 general resolution							
bonds .....	1,442,315	2,068,695	12,805	3,498,205	657,760	89,450	4,066,515
	<u>4,724,170</u>	<u>2,068,695</u>	<u>2,369,290</u>	<u>4,423,575</u>	<u>657,760</u>	<u>1,014,820</u>	<u>4,066,515</u>
TFA debt:							
Future tax secured							
bonds .....	—	—	—	—	2,150,000	—	2,150,000
SFC debt:							
Japanese Yen bonds . . . .	200,000	—	—	200,000	—	—	200,000
Component unit debt: (1)							
City University							
Construction Fund(2) .	403,795	14,702(3)	—	418,497	11,272(3)	—	429,769
New York City Educational							
Construction Fund . . .	126,180	44,880	6,350	164,710	—	6,630	158,080
	<u>529,975</u>	<u>59,582</u>	<u>6,350</u>	<u>583,207</u>	<u>11,272</u>	<u>6,630</u>	<u>587,849</u>
Total before treasury							
obligations .....	31,633,360	8,958,872	8,237,271	32,354,961	8,328,057	6,799,620	33,883,398
Less treasury obligations . .	1,121,675	—	730,665	391,010	—	25,516	365,494
Total summary of							
bond transactions . .	<u>\$30,511,685</u>	<u>\$8,958,872</u>	<u>\$7,506,606</u>	<u>\$31,963,951</u>	<u>\$8,328,057</u>	<u>\$6,774,104</u>	<u>\$33,517,904</u>

- (1) The debt of CUCF and ECF are reported as bonds outstanding pursuant to their treatment as component units (see Note A).
- (2) Excludes \$285,992 in 1997 and \$287,517 in 1998 to be provided by the State.
- (3) Net adjustment based on allocation of debt between New York State and New York City.
- (4) Includes \$171,545 of principal debt due July 1, 1998 which MAC reports as redeemed as of June 30, 1998.

The bonds payable, net of treasury obligations, at June 30, 1998 and 1997 summarized by type of issue are as follows:

	1998			1997		
	General Obligations	Revenue	Total	General Obligations	Revenue	Total
	(in thousands)					
Bonds payable:						
City debt .....	\$26,513,540	\$ —	\$26,513,540	\$26,757,169	\$ —	\$26,757,169
MAC debt .....	4,066,515	—	4,066,515	4,423,575	—	4,423,575
TFA debt .....	2,150,000	—	2,150,000	—	—	—
SFC debt .....	200,000	—	200,000	200,000	—	200,000
Component unit debt .....	—	587,849	587,849	—	583,207	583,207
Total bonds payable .....	<u>\$32,930,055</u>	<u>\$587,849</u>	<u>\$33,517,904</u>	<u>\$31,380,744</u>	<u>\$583,207</u>	<u>\$31,963,951</u>

The following table summarizes future debt service requirements as of June 30, 1998:

	City Debt					Other Blended Component Unit Debt	Total
	General Obligation Bonds	Interest on Bonds (1)	MAC	TFA	SFC (2)		
	(in thousands)						
Fiscal year ending June 30:							
1999 .....	\$ 1,054,913	\$ 1,449,058	\$ 387,187	\$ 106,275	\$ 54,000	\$ 61,749	\$ 3,113,182
2000 .....	1,167,673	1,402,057	543,573	148,060	51,200	60,967	3,373,530
2001 .....	1,257,961	1,341,611	538,818	147,958	48,400	61,030	3,395,778
2002 .....	1,310,196	1,279,592	539,001	147,889	45,600	59,215	3,381,493
2003 .....	1,282,386	1,202,553	539,269	178,080	42,800	59,790	3,304,878
Thereafter until 2147 .....	20,440,411	11,071,182	3,175,322	3,304,395	—	678,665	38,669,975
	<u>26,513,540</u>	<u>17,746,053</u>	<u>5,723,170</u>	<u>4,032,657</u>	<u>242,000</u>	<u>981,416</u>	<u>55,238,836</u>
Less interest component .....	—	<u>17,746,053</u>	<u>1,656,655</u>	<u>1,882,657</u>	<u>42,000</u>	<u>393,567</u>	<u>21,720,932</u>
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$26,513,540</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$4,066,515</u>	<u>\$2,150,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$587,849</u>	<u>\$33,517,904</u>

(1) Includes interest estimated at 4% rate on tax-exempt adjustable rate bonds and at 6% rate on taxable adjustable rate bonds.

(2) Interest estimated at 7% rate.

The average (weighted) interest rates for outstanding City general obligation bonds as of June 30, 1998 and 1997 were 5.8% (range 3.0% to 13.55%) and 6.1% (range 3.0% to 13.6%), respectively, and the interest rates on outstanding MAC fixed rate bonds as of June 30, 1998 and 1997 ranged from 4.1% to 6.625% and 3.9% to 7.75%, respectively. The last maturity of the outstanding City debt is in the year 2147.

In fiscal year 1998, the City issued \$4.878 billion of general obligation bonds to advance refund general obligation bonds of \$4.590 billion aggregate principal amount. The net proceeds from the sales of the refunding bonds, together with other funds of \$86.2 million, were irrevocably placed in escrow accounts and invested in United States Government securities. As a result of providing for the payment of the principal and interest to maturity, and any redemption premium, the advance refunded bonds are considered to be defeased and, accordingly, the liability is not reported in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group. The refunding transactions will decrease the City's aggregate debt service payments by \$336 million and provide an economic gain of \$277 million. At June 30, 1998, \$10.263 billion of the City's outstanding general obligation bonds were considered defeased.

The City utilizes derivative financial instruments in connection with certain bond issues in order to reduce debt service costs. The City minimizes the interest rate risk of these instruments through hedging transactions and minimizes counterparty credit risk by dealing with high-quality counterparties.

The City has entered into a number of interest rate swap agreements to facilitate the issuance and sale of certain variable rate bonds by providing protection to the City against variable rate risk. The agreements effectively change the City's interest rate exposure on its obligation to pay fluctuating amounts of interest on floating rate debt instruments to fixed rate interest payments.

Debt instruments subject to interest rate swap agreements were: \$22.5 million Short RITES bonds, \$43.8 million indexed inverse floaters, and \$14.6 million inverse floating rate notes.

The State Constitution requires the City to pledge its full faith and credit for the payment of the principal and interest on City term and serial bonds and guaranteed debt. The general debt-incurring power of the City is limited by the Constitution to 10% of the average of five years' full valuations of taxable real estate. Excluded from this debt limitation is certain indebtedness incurred for water supply, certain obligations for transit, sewage, and other specific obligations which exclusions are based on a relationship of debt service to net revenue.

As of July 1, 1998, the 10% general limitation was approximately \$28.950 billion (compared with \$30.948 billion as of July 1, 1997). The New York State Legislature, recognizing that the City was approaching its constitutional debt limit thereby placing in jeopardy the availability of adequate funding for its capital programs, enacted legislation creating TFA. As of July 1, 1998, the combined City and TFA remaining debt incurring power totaled \$3.901 billion.

Pursuant to State legislation on January 1, 1979, the City established a General Debt Service Fund administered and maintained by the State Comptroller into which payments of real estate taxes and other revenues are deposited in advance of debt service payment dates. Debt service on all City notes and bonds is paid from this Fund. In fiscal year 1998, a discretionary transfer of \$1.357 billion was made from the General Fund to the General Debt Service Fund for fiscal year 1999 debt service. In addition, discretionary transfers totaling \$537 million were made to certain component units of the Debt Service Funds.

Subsequent to June 30, 1998, the City completed the following long-term financing:

*City Debt:* On July 10, 1998, the City sold in the public credit market for refunding purposes \$463.7 million tax-exempt general obligation bonds, \$137.3 million taxable general obligation bonds, and \$11.4 million tax-exempt capital appreciation bonds. On August 13, 1998, the City sold in the public credit market its Series C tax-exempt general obligation bonds of \$400 million for various municipal capital purposes, and its Series D tax-exempt bonds of \$131.4 million and taxable bonds of \$10.1 million for refunding purposes. On October 21, 1998, the City offered for sale in the public credit market its Fiscal 1999 Series A general obligation revenue anticipation notes of \$500 million.

*Dormitory Authority Debt:* On July 29, 1998, the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York issued its Municipal Health Facilities Improvement Program lease revenue bonds (The City of New York Issue), Series 1998 A for \$14.7 million.

#### *Judgments and Claims*

The City is a defendant in lawsuits pertaining to material matters, including claims asserted which are incidental to performing routine governmental and other functions. This litigation includes but is not limited to: actions commenced and claims asserted against the City arising out of alleged torts; alleged breaches of contracts; alleged violations of law; and condemnation proceedings. As of June 30, 1998 and 1997, claims in excess of \$472 billion and \$530 billion, respectively, were outstanding against the City for which the City estimates its potential future liability to be \$3.5 billion for both fiscal years 1998 and 1997.

As explained in Note A, the estimate of the liability for unsettled claims has been reported in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group. The liability was estimated by categorizing the various claims and applying a historical average percentage, based primarily on actual settlements by type of claim during the preceding ten fiscal years, and supplemented by information provided by the New York City Law Department with respect to certain large individual claims and proceedings. The recorded liability is the City's best estimate based on available information and application of the foregoing procedures.

The City is a party to a proceeding initiated by a union representing sleep-in home attendants asserting that its attendants were covered by minimum wage law. Hearings based on the number of hours actually worked by its attendants during the first several months of 1981 were completed in September, 1991 and post-hearing briefs were filed in February, 1992. In May, 1984, the union commenced a separate but related action in the Supreme Court, New York County on behalf of a number of sleep-in attendants claiming, *inter alia*, that since 1981, the attendants were entitled to compensation for a 24-hour day at a rate in excess of the minimum wage. That action has been stayed pending a proceeding before the New York State Industrial Board of Appeals (IBA). In May, 1998, IBA found in favor of the City. IBA revoked the Notices of Labor Law Violation, which had been issued by the State Department of Labor, which asserted that sleep-in home attendants had been underpaid. The union's challenge to the IBA determination was dismissed by the Supreme Court, New York County in May, 1998. The union's time to appeal has expired. While the potential cost to the City of an adverse determination in the remaining proceeding cannot be determined at this time, such finding could result in substantial costs to the City depending on the number of hours deemed worked by particular attendants, the extent of State and Federal reimbursements, the number of attendants actually covered by a final determination, and the rate of pay to be applied.

In May, 1997, an action was commenced against the City in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York by ten individuals on behalf of themselves and persons similarly situated, alleging that City correctional officers since July, 1996 had violated the constitutional rights of persons arrested for misdemeanors or non-criminal offenses by stripsearching

such persons upon entry into prearraignment holding pens at the Manhattan and Queens criminal courthouses. In April, 1998, the district court granted plaintiffs' motion for class certification. The number of potential classmembers who will respond to class notice (which has not been issued by the court) cannot be determined at this time nor can the City yet know the extent of damages, if any, sustained by such persons. While the class action is in its preliminary stages and the potential cost to the City of adverse determinations of liability and damages in the action cannot be determined at this time, any such adverse determinations could result in substantial costs to the City.

In addition to the above claims and proceedings, numerous real estate tax certiorari proceedings are presently pending against the City on grounds of alleged overvaluation, inequality, and illegality of assessment. In response to these actions, in December, 1981, State legislation was enacted which, among other things, authorizes the City to assess real property according to four classes and makes certain evidentiary changes in real estate tax certiorari proceedings. Based on historical settlement activity, the City estimates its potential liability for outstanding certiorari proceedings to be \$406 million as reported in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

*Pension Liability*

The City's pension liability resulted from a statutory change in the timing of the City's contribution to its pension plans. Prior to fiscal year 1981, the City's pension contribution reflected pension costs incurred two years earlier and a phase-in of certain actuarial assumptions. The City's liability was originally amortized over 40 years. Later legislation reduced the amortization period to 20 years. As of June 30, 1998, the remaining amortization period is 12 years.

*Landfill Closure and Postclosure Care Costs*

The City's only active landfill available for waste disposal is the Fresh Kills landfill. A portion of the total estimated current cost of the closure and postclosure care is to be recognized as an expense and as a liability in each period the landfill accepts solid waste. For governmental funds, the measurement and recognition of the accrued liability for closure and postclosure care is based on total estimated current cost and landfill usage to date. Expenditures and fund liabilities are recognized using the modified accrual basis of accounting. The remainder of the liability is reported in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

Upon the landfill becoming inactive, the City is required by Federal and State law to close the landfill, including final cover, stormwater management, landfill gas control, and to provide postclosure care for a period of 30 years following closure. The City is also required under Consent Order with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to conduct certain corrective measures associated with the landfill. The corrective measures include construction and operation of a leachate mitigation system for the active portions of the landfill as well as closure, postclosure, and groundwater monitoring activities for the sections no longer accepting solid waste.

The liability for these activities as of June 30, 1998 is \$721.7 million based on the cumulative landfill capacity used to date. The total estimated current cost is \$762.2 million; therefore, the costs remaining to be recognized are \$40.5 million. During fiscal year 1996, New York State legislation was enacted which states that no waste will be accepted at the Fresh Kills landfill on or after January 1, 2002. Accordingly, the liability for closure and postclosure care costs is based upon an effective cumulative landfill capacity used to date of approximately 94%. Cost estimates are based on current data including contracts awarded by the City, contract bids, and engineering studies. These estimates are subject to adjustment for inflation and to account for any changes in landfill conditions, regulatory requirements, technologies, or cost estimates.

During fiscal year 1998, expenditures for landfill closing costs totaling \$85.9 million were recorded in the General Fund.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Subtitle D Part 258, which became effective April, 1997, requires financial assurance regarding closure and postclosure care. This assurance was provided, on April 8, 1998, by the City's Chief Financial Officer placing in the Fresh Kills Landfill operating record representation in satisfaction of the Local Government Financial Test.

The City has five inactive hazardous waste sites not covered by the EPA rule. The City has included the long-term portion of these postclosure care costs in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

The following represents the City's total landfill and hazardous waste sites liability which is recorded in the General Long-term Obligations Account Group:

	Amount (in thousands)
Landfill .....	\$721,656
Hazardous waste sites .....	204,267
Total landfill and hazardous waste sites liability .....	<u>\$925,923</u>

*Changes In Certain Long-term Obligations*

In fiscal years 1997 and 1998, the changes in long-term obligations other than for bonds were as follows:

	Balance June 30, 1996	Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 1997 <small>(in thousands)</small>	Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 1998
Capital lease obligations . . .	\$1,067,729	\$ 40,778	\$ 9,228	\$ 1,099,279	\$ 77,246	\$ 35,397	\$ 1,141,128
Real estate tax refunds . . . .	336,498	90,846	49,412	377,932	93,484	65,728	405,688
Judgments and claims . . . .	2,841,839	975,305	326,293	3,490,851	390,760	386,127	3,495,484
Deferred wages . . . . .	24,884	—	24,884	—	—	—	—
Vacation and sick leave (1)	1,674,888	59,942	—	1,734,830	297,140	—	2,031,970
Pension liability . . . . .	2,531,193	—	51,803	2,479,390	—	64,534	2,414,856
Landfill closure and post- closure care costs . . . . .	753,836	123,574	—	877,410	48,513	—	925,923
Total changes in certain long-term obligations . . . . .	<u>\$9,230,867</u>	<u>\$1,290,445</u>	<u>\$461,620</u>	<u>\$10,059,692</u>	<u>\$907,143</u>	<u>\$551,786</u>	<u>\$10,415,049</u>

(1) The amount of additions and deletions is not available, thus the net amounts are presented.

**J. PRIMARY GOVERNMENT/DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNIT RECEIVABLE AND PAYABLE BALANCES**

At June 30, 1998 and 1997, primary government and discretely presented component unit receivable and payable balances were as follows:

	1998		1997	
	Receivable	Payable	Receivable	Payable
	<small>(in thousands)</small>			
<b>PRIMARY GOVERNMENT:</b>				
General Fund:				
Capital Projects Funds . . . . .	\$1,818,020	\$1,190,769	\$1,660,914	\$ 941,202
HDC . . . . .	194,615	—	157,525	—
Debt Service Funds . . . . .	28,873	—	29,885	75,000
OTB . . . . .	200	—	575	—
Water Board . . . . .	—	35,374	—	6,332
Total General Fund . . . . .	<u>2,041,708</u>	<u>1,226,143</u>	<u>1,848,899</u>	<u>1,022,534</u>
Capital Projects Funds:				
Water Authority . . . . .	198,847	—	277,488	—
General Fund . . . . .	1,190,769	1,818,020	941,202	1,660,914
Total Capital Projects Funds . . . . .	<u>1,389,616</u>	<u>1,818,020</u>	<u>1,218,690</u>	<u>1,660,914</u>
Debt Service Funds:				
General Fund . . . . .	—	28,873	75,000	29,885
HDC . . . . .	10,682	—	3,074	—
Total Debt Service Funds . . . . .	<u>10,682</u>	<u>28,873</u>	<u>78,074</u>	<u>29,885</u>
<b>DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS:</b>				
Primary Government:				
OTB . . . . .	—	200	—	575
Water Board . . . . .	35,374	—	6,332	—
Water Authority . . . . .	—	198,847	—	277,488
HDC . . . . .	—	205,297	—	160,599
Total Discretely Presented Component Units . . . . .	<u>35,374</u>	<u>404,344</u>	<u>6,332</u>	<u>438,662</u>
Total primary government/discretely presented component unit receivable and payable balances . . . . .	<u>\$3,477,380</u>	<u>\$3,477,380</u>	<u>\$3,151,995</u>	<u>\$3,151,995</u>

**K. SEGMENT INFORMATION FOR DISCRETELY PRESENTED COMPONENT UNITS**

Selected segment information for HHC, OTB, HDC, HA, the Economic Development Entities, and the Water and Sewer System as of and for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 is as follows:

	1998						Total
	Health and Hospitals Corporation	Off-Track Betting Corporation	Housing Development Corporation	Housing Authority	Economic Development Entities	Water and Sewer System	
	(in millions)						
Operating revenues	\$4,115	\$226	\$ 180	\$1,788	\$337	\$1,574	\$ 8,220
Operating expenses (excluding depreciation and amortization expense)	3,859	194	135	1,663	314	1,442	7,607
Depreciation and amortization expense	162	4	—	217	1	290	674
Operating income (loss)	94	28	45	(92)	22	(158)	(61)
Nonoperating revenues (expenses)	(73)	5	(2)	43	5	4	(18)
Net income (loss) before operating transfers	21	33	43	(49)	27	(154)	(79)
Transfers (to) from primary government	—	(31)	—	4	—	—	(27)
Net income (loss)	21	2	43	(45)	27	(154)	(106)
Contributed capital	24	—	—	669	—	20	713
Current assets	1,123	21	995	953	84	387	3,563
Property, plant and equipment, net	1,264	22	—	3,609	20	11,896	16,811
Other assets	432	2	2,401	171	200	1,353	4,559
Current liabilities	733	23	427	1,214	66	236	2,699
Long-term liabilities	923	6	2,497	1,647	63	8,396	13,532
Total equity	1,163	16	472	1,872	175	5,004	8,702

  

	1997						Total
	Health and Hospitals Corporation	Off-Track Betting Corporation	Housing Development Corporation	Housing Authority	Economic Development Entities	Water and Sewer System	
	(in millions)						
Operating revenues	\$4,069	\$220	\$ 177	\$1,646	\$515	\$1,491	\$ 8,118
Operating expenses (excluding depreciation and amortization expense)	3,808	188	135	1,761	506	1,386	7,784
Depreciation and amortization expense	146	3	—	191	1	288	629
Operating income (loss)	115	29	42	(307)	9	(183)	(295)
Nonoperating revenues (expenses)	(87)	5	(3)	28	4	4	(49)
Net income (loss) before operating transfers	29	33	39	(279)	13	(179)	(344)
Transfers (to) from primary government	—	(30)	—	4	—	—	(26)
Net income (loss)	29	3	39	(275)	13	(179)	(370)
Contributed capital	75	—	—	953	—	51	1,079
Current assets	1,035	19	628	571	107	402	2,762
Property, plant and equipment, net	1,305	21	—	3,486	14	11,467	16,293
Other assets	462	5	2,265	163	178	1,369	4,442
Current liabilities	747	24	392	1,209	146	1,102	3,620
Long-term liabilities	938	7	2,073	1,763	4	6,998	11,783
Total equity	1,117	14	428	1,248	149	5,138	8,094



**L. NEW YORK CITY HEALTH AND HOSPITALS CORPORATION (HHC)***General*

HHC, a public benefit corporation, assumed responsibility for the operation of the City's municipal hospital system in 1970. HHC's financial statements include the accounts of HHC and its wholly-owned subsidiary, HHC Capital Corporation. All significant intercompany accounts and transactions have been eliminated.

The City provides funds to HHC for care given to uninsured indigent patients, members of the uniformed services and prisoners, and for other costs not covered by other payors. The City's Annual Expense Budget determines the support to HHC on a cash-flow basis. In addition, the City has paid HHC's costs for settlements of claims for medical malpractice, negligence, and other miscellaneous torts and contracts, as well as other HHC costs including utilities expense, City debt which funded HHC capital acquisitions, and New York State Housing Finance Agency (HFA) debt on HHC assets acquired through lease purchase agreements. HHC reimburses the City for these debt payments. HHC records both a revenue and an expense in an amount equal to expenditures made on its behalf by the City.

*Revenues*

Patient service accounts receivable and revenues are reported at estimated collectible amounts. Substantially all direct patient service revenue is derived from third-party payors. Generally, revenues from these sources are based upon cost reimbursement principles and are subject to routine audit by applicable payors. HHC records adjustments resulting from audits and from appeals when the amount is reasonably determinable.

*Fund Accounting*

HHC maintains separate accounts in its financial records to assure compliance with specific restrictions imposed by the City and other grantors or contributors.

*Plant and Equipment*

All facilities and equipment are leased from the City at \$1 per year. In addition, HHC operates certain facilities which are financed by HFA and leased to the City on behalf of HHC. HHC records as revenue and as expense the interest portion of such lease purchase obligations paid by the City. Because HHC is responsible for the control and maintenance of all plant and equipment, and because depreciation is a significant cost of operations, HHC capitalizes plant and equipment at cost or estimated cost based on appraisals. Depreciation is computed for financial statement purposes on a straight-line basis using estimated useful lives based on American Hospital Association guidelines. As a result of modernizing programs and changes in service requirements, HHC has closed certain facilities and portions of facilities during the past several years. It is the policy of HHC to reflect the financial effect of the closing of facilities or portions thereof in the financial statements when a decision has been made as to the disposition of such assets. HHC records the cost of construction that it controls as costs are incurred. Costs associated with facilities constructed by HFA are recorded when the facilities are placed in service.

*Donor Restricted Assets*

Contributions which are restricted as to use are recorded as donor restricted funds.

*Pensions*

Substantially all HHC employees are eligible to participate in NYCERS (see Note R). The provisions for pension costs were actuarially determined and amounted to \$15 million and \$17 million for fiscal years 1998 and 1997, respectively. These amounts were fully funded.

*Affiliated Institution Expenses*

Affiliated institution expenses represent contractual expenses incurred by affiliated institutions and charged to HHC for participation in patient service programs at HHC's facilities.

*Debt Service*

In fiscal year 1997, HHC issued Series A, B, C, and D Health Systems bonds in the amount of \$320 million for the purpose of funding a portion of its ongoing capital programs.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, Continued

The following table summarizes future debt service requirements as of June 30, 1998:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal year ending June 30:			
1999 .....	\$ 15,860	\$ 44,075	\$ 59,935
2000 .....	16,620	43,350	59,970
2001 .....	17,330	42,563	59,893
2002 .....	18,075	41,727	59,802
2003 .....	18,960	40,846	59,806
Thereafter until 2026 .....	<u>740,765</u>	<u>515,755</u>	<u>1,256,520</u>
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$827,610</u>	<u>\$728,316</u>	<u>\$1,555,926</u>

The interest rates on the bonds as of June 30, 1998 range from 4.50% to 6.30%.

The following is a summary of revenue bond transactions for HHC for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1997 and 1998:

	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1996</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1997</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>June 30,</u> <u>1998</u>
	(in thousands)						
Revenue bonds .....	\$531,885	\$320,000	\$9,145	\$842,740	\$ —	\$15,130	\$827,610

*Installment Note Payable*

HHC issued a secured 8-year installment note payable with an 8% rate of interest. The following table summarizes future debt service requirements as of June 30, 1998:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal year ending June 30:			
1999 .....	\$ —	\$117	\$ 117
2000 .....	389	87	476
2001 .....	420	56	476
2002 .....	456	20	476
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$1,265</u>	<u>\$280</u>	<u>\$1,545</u>

*Capital Lease Obligations*

HHC entered into a long-term agreement which involves the construction of a parking garage at Elmhurst Hospital Center. As of June 30, 1998, the future minimum lease payments under the capitalized lease are as follows:

	<u>Amount</u> (in thousands)
Fiscal year ending June 30:	
1999 .....	\$ 982
2000 .....	980
2001 .....	981
2002 .....	978
2003 .....	1,003
Thereafter until 2013 .....	<u>11,422</u>
Future minimum lease payments .....	16,346
Less interest .....	<u>4,196</u>
Present value of future minimum lease payments .....	<u>\$12,150</u>

*Equipment Financing Agreement*

HHC entered into an equipment financing agreement that allows HHC to borrow up to \$50 million to primarily fund the purchase of patient information systems. In fiscal year 1998, HHC drew down \$11.6 million with a 5.19% rate of interest.

The following table summarizes future debt service requirements as of June 30, 1998:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal year ending June 30:			
1999 .....	\$ 2,107	\$ 533	\$ 2,640
2000 .....	2,218	422	2,640
2001 .....	2,336	304	2,640
2002 .....	2,460	180	2,640
2003 .....	1,930	50	1,980
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$11,051</u>	<u>\$1,489</u>	<u>\$12,540</u>

*Changes in Fund Equity*

Presented below are the changes in fund equity for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1997 and 1998:

	<u>Unreserved Retained Earnings</u>	<u>Contributed Capital Plant and Equipment</u>	<u>Reserve for Donor Restrictions</u>	<u>Total Fund Equity</u>
	(in thousands)			
Balance, June 30, 1996 .....	\$ 230,794	\$ 772,123	\$ 10,814	\$1,013,731
Excess of revenues over expenses .....	28,833	—	—	28,833
Increase in bonds payable .....	311,036	(311,036)	—	—
Decrease in other debt, net .....	(905)	905	—	—
Additions to plant and equipment funded by:				
Donations .....	—	1,129	—	1,129
The City of New York .....	—	73,847	—	73,847
HHC .....	(59,644)	59,644	—	—
Donor restricted fund activity:				
Interest earned and contributions .....	—	—	514	514
Net assets released from restrictions .....	—	—	(596)	(596)
Depreciation charged to plant and equipment leased .....	145,654	(145,654)	—	—
Balance, June 30, 1997 .....	<u>655,768</u>	<u>450,958</u>	<u>10,732</u>	<u>1,117,458</u>
Excess of revenues over expenses .....	20,876	—	—	20,876
Decrease in bonds payable .....	(14,956)	14,956	—	—
Increase in other debt, net .....	10,581	(10,581)	—	—
Additions to plant and equipment funded by:				
Donations .....	—	300	—	300
The City of New York .....	—	23,744	—	23,744
HHC .....	(96,215)	96,215	—	—
Donor restricted fund activity:				
Interest earned and contributions .....	—	—	922	922
Net assets released from restrictions .....	—	—	(157)	(157)
Depreciation charged to plant and equipment leased .....	161,602	(161,602)	—	—
Balance, June 30, 1998 .....	<u>\$ 737,656</u>	<u>\$ 413,990</u>	<u>\$ 11,497</u>	<u>\$1,163,143</u>

**M. NEW YORK CITY OFF-TRACK BETTING CORPORATION (OTB)**

*General*

OTB was established in 1970 as a public benefit corporation to operate a system of off-track betting in the City. OTB earns: (i) revenues on its betting operations ranging between 15% and 31% of wagers handled, depending on the type of wager; (ii) a 5% surcharge and surcharge breakage on pari-mutuel winnings; (iii) a 1% surcharge on multiple, exotic, and super exotic wagering pools; and (iv) breakage, the revenue resulting from the rounding down of winning payoffs. Pursuant to State law, OTB: (i) distributes various portions of the surcharge and surcharge breakage to other localities in the State; (ii) allocates various percentages of wagers handled to the racing industry; (iii) allocates various percentages of wagers handled and breakage together with all uncashed pari-mutuel tickets to the State; and (iv) allocates the 1% surcharge on exotic wagering pools for the financing of capital acquisitions. All remaining net revenue is distributable to the City. In addition, OTB acts as a collection agent for the City with respect to surcharge and surcharge breakage due from other community off-track betting corporations.

OTB has cumulative deficits of \$3.5 million and \$5.4 million after providing for mandatory transfers in fiscal years 1998 and 1997, respectively.

*Net Revenue Retained for Capital Acquisitions*

For the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997, the changes in net revenue retained for capital acquisition were as follows:

	<u>1998</u>	<u>1997</u>
	(in thousands)	
Balance, June 30 .....	\$19,289	\$18,136
Capital acquisition surcharge .....	3,594	3,578
Depreciation of assets purchased with funds restricted for capital acquisition .....	<u>(3,119)</u>	<u>(2,425)</u>
Balance, June 30 .....	<u>\$19,764</u>	<u>\$19,289</u>

Since inception of the capital acquisition surcharge at July 21, 1990, surcharges of approximately \$31.9 million have been collected and approximately \$30.8 million has been used to finance leasehold improvements and the acquisition of property and equipment through June 30, 1998.

*Property and Equipment*

Property and equipment are recorded at cost. Depreciation and amortization are computed using the straight-line method based upon estimated useful lives ranging from 3 to 15 years. Leasehold improvements are amortized principally over the term of the lease.

Rental expense, including escalation charges for leased property was approximately \$14 million for both fiscal years 1998 and 1997. As of June 30, 1998, OTB had future minimum rental obligations on noncancelable operating leases as follows:

	<u>Amount</u>
	(in thousands)
Fiscal year ending June 30:	
1999 .....	\$10,169
2000 .....	7,411
2001 .....	6,278
2002 .....	5,116
2003 .....	4,262
Thereafter until 2009 .....	<u>12,477</u>
Total future minimum rental obligations .....	<u>\$45,713</u>

*Pensions*

Substantially all full-time employees of OTB are members of NYCERS (see Note R). The provisions for pension costs were actuarially determined and amounted to approximately \$1 million for both fiscal years 1998 and 1997. These amounts were fully funded.

**N. HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES**

*General*

The Housing and Economic Development Entities are comprised of the New York City Housing Development Corporation (HDC), the New York City Housing Authority (HA), the New York City Industrial Development Agency (IDA), the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC), the Business Relocation Assistance Corporation (BRAC), and the Brooklyn Navy Yard Development Corporation (BNYDC), the largest of which are HDC and HA.

*HDC*

HDC was established in 1971 to encourage private housing development by providing low interest mortgage loans. The combined financial statements include the accounts of HDC and its wholly-owned subsidiaries, Housing Assistance Corporation, Housing New York Corporation, and the New York City Residential Mortgage Insurance Corporation. HDC finances multiple dwelling mortgages substantially through issuance of HDC bonds and notes, and also acts as an intermediary for the sale and refinancing of certain City multiple dwelling mortgages. HDC has a fiscal year ending October 31.

HDC is authorized to issue bonds and notes for any corporate purpose in a principal amount outstanding, exclusive of refunding bonds and notes, not to exceed \$2.8 billion and certain other limitations.

HDC is supported by service fees, investment income, and interest charged to mortgagors and has been self-sustaining. Mortgage loans are carried at cost. Mortgage loan interest income, fees, charges, and interest expense are recognized on the accrual basis. HDC maintains separate funds in its financial records to assure compliance with specific restrictions of its various bond and note resolutions.

Substantially all HDC employees are eligible to participate in NYCERS (see Note R). The provisions for pension costs were actuarially computed, determined, and funded by HDC.

The future debt service requirements on HDC bonds and notes payable at October 31, 1997 were as follows:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal year ending October 31:			
1998 .....	\$ 275,570	\$ 120,619	\$ 396,189
1999 .....	33,855	121,017	154,872
2000 .....	36,108	119,562	155,670
2001 .....	38,536	117,846	156,382
2002 .....	40,600	115,998	156,598
Thereafter until 2036 .....	<u>2,122,543</u>	<u>1,570,766</u>	<u>3,693,309</u>
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$2,547,212</u>	<u>\$2,165,808</u>	<u>\$4,713,020</u>

The bonds and notes will be repaid from assets and future earnings of the assets. The interest rates on the bonds and notes as of October 31, 1997 range from 2.0% to 8.95%.

HDC had no general obligation bonds and notes outstanding at October 31, 1997.

The following is a summary of bond transactions of HDC for the fiscal years ended October 31, 1996 and 1997:

	<u>Balance</u> <u>October 31,</u> <u>1995</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>October 31,</u> <u>1996</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Balance</u> <u>October 31,</u> <u>1997</u>
	(in thousands)						
General obligation .....	\$ 228,620	\$ —	\$228,620	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —
Revenue .....	<u>1,821,114</u>	<u>372,930</u>	<u>25,200</u>	<u>2,168,844</u>	<u>433,460</u>	<u>55,092</u>	<u>2,547,212</u>
Total summary of bond transactions .....	<u>\$2,049,734</u>	<u>\$372,930</u>	<u>\$253,820</u>	<u>\$2,168,844</u>	<u>\$433,460</u>	<u>\$ 55,092</u>	<u>\$2,547,212</u>

*HA*

HA is a public benefit corporation chartered under the New York State Public Housing Law. HA develops, constructs, manages, and maintains low cost housing for eligible low income families in The City of New York. At December 31, 1997, HA maintained 346 developments encompassing approximately 182,000 units. HA also maintains a leased housing program which provides housing assistance payments to approximately 72,000 families.

Substantial operating losses (the difference between operating revenues and expenses) result from the essential services that HA provides, and such operating losses will continue in the foreseeable future. To meet the funding requirements of these operating losses, HA receives subsidies from: (a) the Federal government primarily the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in the form of annual grants for operating assistance, debt service payments, contributions for capital and reimbursement of expenditures incurred for certain Federal housing programs; (b) New York State in the form of operating assistance, reimbursement of certain expenses, and debt service payments; and (c) New York City in the form of operating assistance and debt service payments. Subsidies are established through budgetary procedures which establish amounts to be funded by the grantor agencies. Projected operating income or loss amounts are budgeted on an annual basis and approved by the grantor agency. Expected variances from budgeted amounts are communicated to the agency during periodic budget revisions, as any revisions to previously approved budgets must be agreed to by the grantor. HA has a calendar year-end.

*Revenue*

Rents are received from tenants on the first day of each month. As a result, receivable balances primarily consist of rents past due and vacated tenants. An allowance for doubtful accounts is established to provide for all accounts which may not be collected in the future for any reason. At December 31, 1997 and 1996, tenant accounts receivable approximated \$32.5 million and \$24.2 million, respectively, with related allowances of \$28.7 million and \$21.0 million, respectively.

HA receives Federal financial assistance from HUD in the form of annual contributions for debt service and operating subsidies for public housing projects, as well as rent subsidies for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program (HAP). In addition, assistance is also received under HUD's Public Housing Development Programs, Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program, and other programs.

HA also receives Federal assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for child care feeding and summer food service programs and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for special programs for the aging.

HA receives financial assistance from the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), a City of New York agency. HPD receives these funds from HUD based on certain criteria (e.g., population, poverty, and extent of overcrowded housing in the area applying for funds).

HA also receives assistance from New York State and The City of New York in the form of operating subsidies for public housing projects and annual contributions for debt service and capital.

*Land, Structures, and Equipment*

Land, structures, and equipment are recorded at cost which is comprised of initial project development costs, property betterments and additions, and modernization program costs. HA depreciates these assets over their estimated useful lives (buildings—40 years, capital improvements—10 to 30 years, and equipment—5 to 15 years) using the straight-line method of depreciation. Land, structures, and equipment, including modernization costs, are generally funded through grant awards (for Federal, State, and City programs). A summary of costs at December 31, 1997 and 1996 is as follows:

	<u>1997</u>	<u>1996</u>
	(in thousands)	
Land .....	\$ 695,558	\$ 695,490
Buildings .....	3,189,910	3,204,965
Capital improvements .....	2,518,713	2,176,998
Equipment .....	350,555	337,117
	<u>6,754,736</u>	<u>6,414,570</u>
Accumulated depreciation .....	(3,145,756)	(2,929,198)
Land, structures, and equipment—net .....	<u>\$ 3,608,980</u>	<u>\$ 3,485,372</u>

Interest costs related to debt reflected on the books of HA of \$459 thousand and \$268 thousand were capitalized as part of development costs in calendar years 1997 and 1996, respectively.

*Debt Service*

The future debt service requirements on HA bonds and notes at December 31, 1997 were as follows:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Calendar year ending December 31:			
1998 .....	\$ 58,517	\$ 25,901	\$ 84,418
1999 .....	55,827	23,621	79,448
2000 .....	52,923	21,539	74,462
2001 .....	48,459	19,562	68,021
2002 .....	46,843	17,668	64,511
Thereafter until 2028 .....	<u>372,372</u>	<u>90,948</u>	<u>463,320</u>
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$634,941</u>	<u>\$199,239</u>	<u>\$834,180</u>

Interest rates on outstanding bonds and notes as of December 31, 1997 and 1996 range from 1% to 7.0%. During calendar years 1997 and 1996, principal repayments totaled \$59.9 million and \$60.8 million, respectively.

*Advance Notes—HUD*

Advance Notes—HUD at December 31, 1997 and 1996 consist of the following:

	<u>1997</u>	<u>1996</u>
	(in thousands)	
Unsubsidized improvement notes .....	\$ 22,619	\$ 32,299
Modernization and development notes .....	989,597	982,333
Total advance notes—HUD .....	<u>\$1,012,216</u>	<u>\$1,014,632</u>

Through 1985, HA funded development projects by issuing Advance Notes which generally matured in less than one year and were refinanced at market rates upon maturity. Principal and interest payments were financed by funds provided by HUD through accruing annual contributions.

In 1985, the U.S. Treasury purchased all then-outstanding Advance Notes. Subsequently, additional Advance Notes were issued by HUD to fund development and modernization projects.

In April, 1986, HUD ceased funding the debt service on all Advance Notes, therefore, principal and interest have not been paid since that date. Subsequently, HUD issued notice PIH 87-12 which covered the forgiveness of Advance Notes held by the Treasury. Three months after issuance of PIH 87-12, HUD temporarily suspended this notice. HA did not file the appropriate paperwork before the suspension of the notice. This notice, if complied with by HA before suspension of the notice, would have allowed HA to remove this debt and accrued interest payable from its balance sheet and reflect these amounts as contributed equity.

HA has continued to accrue interest for a portion of the Advance Notes at the contractual rates in accordance with HUD guidelines. Through December 31, 1997, HUD has given HA permission to discontinue accruing interest on a total of \$729.9 million of notes. Interest expense of \$20.4 million and \$19.6 million are included in the statements of operations for the calendar years ended December 31, 1997 and 1996, respectively, but no subsidies are reflected since HUD does not fund and HA has not been required to pay the interest on the Advance Notes. Accrued interest relating to these notes at December 31, 1997 and 1996, was \$416.8 million and \$396.4 million, respectively. Interest rates on Advance Notes issued range from 5.5% to 9.5% for both calendar years 1997 and 1996.

Accrued interest includes interest of \$229,000 and \$608,000 relating to Unsubsidized Improvement Notes at both December 31, 1997 and 1996, respectively. The notes which are currently held by HUD, were used to finance capital improvements and rehabilitations at various projects and are being repaid from commercial rents and State maximum subsidy funds. Related interest expense of \$2.0 million and \$2.6 million was included in the statements of operations for the calendar years ended December 31, 1997 and 1996, respectively.

*Pensions*

HA employees are members of NYCERS (see Note R). The calendar years 1997 and 1996 pension costs reported in the financial statements amounted to \$6.5 million and \$3.4 million, respectively.

*Changes in Fund Equity*

Presented below are the changes in fund equity for the calendar years ended December 31, 1996 and 1997:

	<u>Unreserved (Deficit)</u>	<u>Cumulative Contributions</u> (in thousands)	<u>Total</u>
Balance, December 31, 1995 .....	\$(2,251,452)	\$2,820,610	\$ 569,158
Net deficit .....	(274,584)	—	(274,584)
Allocation of depreciation to cumulative contributions .....	190,760	(190,760)	—
Contributions for payment of debt .....	—	547,390	547,390
Contributions for payment of capital .....	—	405,704	405,704
Balance, December 31, 1996 .....	<u>(2,335,276)</u>	<u>3,582,944</u>	<u>1,247,668</u>
Net deficit .....	(44,804)	—	(44,804)
Allocation of depreciation to cumulative contributions .....	216,558	(216,558)	—
Contributions for payment of debt .....	—	68,194	68,194
Contributions for payment of capital .....	—	600,968	600,968
Balance, December 31, 1997 .....	<u><u>\$(2,163,522)</u></u>	<u><u>\$4,035,548</u></u>	<u><u>\$1,872,026</u></u>

*Unreserved (Deficit)*

The balance in this account represents the cumulative operating deficit for the Federal program, up to the amount of the operating subsidy and the interest on the debt service.

*Cumulative Contributions*

This account represents the cumulative amount of subsidies received to fund annual operating deficits and interest expense, and contributions made available to HA for capital expenditures associated with modernization and improvements of public housing and the payment of the debt.

*Commitments*

HA rents office space under operating leases which expire at various dates. Future minimum lease commitments under these leases as of December 31, 1997 are as follows:

	<u>Amount</u> (in thousands)
Calendar year ending December 31:	
1998 .....	\$11,310
1999 .....	11,310
2000 .....	4,043
2001 .....	3,811
2002 .....	3,151
Thereafter until 2003 .....	<u>1,581</u>
Total future minimum lease commitments ..	<u><u>\$35,206</u></u>

Rental expense approximated \$11.7 and \$11.9 million for the calendar years ended December 31, 1997 and 1996, respectively.



*BNYDC*

BNYDC obtained a note payable for \$85,000, due 2008, \$6,500 maturing annually.

**O. WATER AND SEWER SYSTEM**

*General*

The Water and Sewer System, consisting of two legally separate and independent entities, the New York City Water Board (Water Board) and the New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority (Water Authority), was established on July 1, 1985. The Water and Sewer System provides for water supply and distribution, and sewage collection, treatment, and disposal for the City. The Water Authority was established to issue debt to finance the cost of capital improvements to the water distribution and sewage collection system. The Water Board was established to lease the water distribution and sewage collection system from the City and to establish and collect fees, rates, rents, and other service charges for services furnished by the system to produce cash sufficient to pay debt service on the Water Authority's bonds and to place the Water and Sewer System on a self-sustaining basis.

Under the terms of the Water and Sewer System General Revenue Bond Resolution, which covers all outstanding bonds of the Water Authority, operations are required to be balanced on a cash basis. At June 30, 1998 and 1997, the Water Authority has a cumulative deficit of \$2,572 million and \$2,206 million, respectively, which is more than offset by a surplus in the Water Board.

*Financing Agreement*

As of July 1, 1985, the City, the Water Board, and the Water Authority entered into a Financing Agreement. The Agreement, as amended, provides that the Water Authority will issue bonds to finance the cost of capital investment in the water distribution and sewage collection system serving the City. It also sets forth the funding of the debt service costs of the Water Authority, operating costs of the water distribution and sewage collection system, and the rental payment to the City.

*Lease Agreement*

As of July 1, 1985, the City entered into a long-term lease with the Water Board which leased all the water and sewer related real and personal property valued at historical cost, net of depreciation and all work-in-progress, at cost, to the Water Board for the term of the lease. The City administers, operates, and maintains the water distribution and sewage collection system. The lease provides for payments to the City to cover the City's cost for operation and maintenance, capital costs not otherwise reimbursed, rent, and for other services provided.

*Contributed Capital*

City financed additions for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 amounted to \$20.2 million and \$50.6 million, respectively, and are recorded by the Water Board as contributed capital.

*Utility Plant-in-Service*

All additions to utility plant-in-service are recorded at cost. Depreciation is computed on all utility plant-in-service using the straight-line method based upon estimated useful lives as follows:

	<u>Years</u>
Buildings .....	40-50
Water supply and wastewater treatment system .....	15-50
Water distribution and sewage collection system .....	15-75
Equipment .....	5-35

Depreciation on contributed utility plant-in-service is allocated to contributed capital after the computation of net income.

*Debt Service*

The following table summarizes future debt service requirements as of June 30, 1998:

	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(in thousands)		
Fiscal year ending June 30:			
1999 .....	\$ 729,134	\$ 439,950	\$ 1,169,084
2000 .....	140,532	432,701	573,233
2001 .....	148,634	425,232	573,866
2002 .....	168,433	417,622	586,055
2003 .....	177,613	410,010	587,623
Thereafter until 2030 .....	<u>7,516,660</u>	<u>6,081,451</u>	<u>13,598,111</u>
Total future debt service requirements .....	<u>\$8,881,006</u>	<u>\$8,206,966</u>	<u>\$17,087,972</u>

The interest rates on the outstanding bonds and commercial paper as of June 30, 1998 and 1997 range from 3.6% to 7.9% and from 3.5% to 7.9%, respectively.

The following is a summary of bond and commercial paper transactions of the Water Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1997 and 1998:

	<u>Balance June 30, 1996</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Defeased or Retired</u>	<u>Balance June 30, 1997</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Defeased or Retired</u>	<u>Balance June 30, 1998</u>
	(in thousands)						
Revenue bonds .....	\$6,726,486	\$1,065,125	\$ 236,255	\$7,555,356	\$1,959,372	\$1,233,722	\$8,281,006
Commercial paper .....	<u>359,100</u>	<u>4,060,000</u>	<u>3,819,100</u>	<u>600,000</u>	<u>4,585,700</u>	<u>4,585,700</u>	<u>600,000</u>
Total summary of bond and commercial paper transactions .....	<u>\$7,085,586</u>	<u>\$5,125,125</u>	<u>\$4,055,355</u>	<u>\$8,155,356</u>	<u>\$6,545,072</u>	<u>\$5,819,422</u>	<u>\$8,881,006</u>

During fiscal year 1998, the Water Authority issued Series A, B, C, and D Water and Sewer System Revenue Bonds, and Series 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 Second Resolution Bonds in the aggregate principal amount of \$1.96 billion to: advance refund a portion of certain outstanding principal amounts of the Water Authority's Water and Sewer System revenue bonds and commercial paper; finance a portion of the capital renovation and improvement program; pay certain costs of issuance; and fund certain reserves.

Although the advance refunding resulted in an accounting loss of \$141.1 million for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998, the Water Authority reduced its aggregate debt service payments by approximately \$110.7 million and obtained an economic gain of \$77.0 million over the next 27 years. This loss will be amortized using the straight-line method through 2021. For fiscal years 1998 and 1997, amortization expense of \$19.0 million and \$10.4 million, respectively, was incurred.

During prior fiscal years, the Water Authority defeased in substance \$1.569 billion of revenue bonds. As of June 30, 1998, \$207.1 million of the defeased bonds have been retired from the assets of the escrow accounts.

In prior years, the Water Authority has issued obligations involving the concurrent issuance of long-term variable rate securities that are matched with long-term floating securities. These obligations when taken together as a whole, yield a fixed rate of interest at all times. These securities have been issued to achieve a lower prevailing fixed rate of interest in relation to traditional fixed rate bonds.

*Restricted Assets*

Proceeds from the issuance of debt and funds set aside for the operation and maintenance of the water distribution and sewage collection system are classified as restricted assets since their use is limited by applicable bond indentures.

*Changes in Contributed Capital*

Changes in contributed capital for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998 and 1997 are as follows:

	<u>1998</u>	<u>1997</u>
	(in thousands)	
Balance, June 30 .....	\$4,907,651	\$4,970,900
Plant and equipment contributed .....	20,155	50,615
Allocation of depreciation to contributed capital ...	(110,138)	(113,864)
Balance, June 30 .....	<u>\$4,817,668</u>	<u>\$4,907,651</u>

*Operating Revenues*

Revenues from metered customers, who represent 75% of water customers, are based on billings at rates imposed by the Water Board that are applied to customers' consumption of water and include accruals based upon estimated usage not billed during the fiscal year.

*Commitments and Contingencies*

*Construction*

The Water and Sewer System has commitments of approximately \$811.8 million at June 30, 1998, for water and sewer projects.

*Legal*

The City is a defendant in a number of lawsuits pertaining to the Water and Sewer System. As of June 30, 1998, the City estimates its potential future liability for these claims to be \$6 million. This amount is included in the City's General Long-term Obligations Account Group.

*Subsequent Events*

On August 11, 1998, the Water Authority issued Fiscal 1999 Series 1 and 2 Water and Sewer Second Resolution Bonds to the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation in the aggregate principal amount of \$121.435 million and \$158.510 million, respectively, to reimburse outstanding commercial paper notes, permanently finance improvements of the System, and to pay certain cost of issuance.

On October 16, 1998, the Water Authority offered to sell Fiscal 1999 Series A Water and Sewer System Revenue Bonds in the aggregate principal amount of \$301.5 million to reimburse outstanding commercial paper notes, pay certain costs of issuance, and to fund certain reserves.

**P. AGENCY FUNDS**

*Deferred Compensation Plan For Employees of The City of New York and Related Agencies and Instrumentalities (DCP)*

The City offers its employees a deferred compensation plan created in accordance with Internal Revenue Code Section 457 (Section 457). DCP is available to certain employees of The City of New York and related agencies and instrumentalities. It permits them to defer a portion of their salary until future years. The compensation deferred is not available to employees until termination, retirement, death, or unforeseen emergency (as defined by the Internal Revenue Service).

All amounts of compensation deferred, all property and rights purchased with those amounts, and all income attributable to those amounts, are (until paid or made available to the employee or beneficiary) solely the property and rights of the City (without being restricted to the provisions of benefits under DCP), subject to the claims of the City's general creditors. Participants' rights under DCP are equal to the fair market value of the deferred account for each participant.

It is the opinion of the City's legal counsel that the City has no liability for losses under DCP but does have the duty of due care that would be required of an ordinary prudent investor. The City believes that it is unlikely that it will use the assets to satisfy the claims of general creditors in the future.

Effective August, 1996, Section 457 was amended and requires amounts maintained under a deferred compensation plan by a state or local government to be held in trust (or custodial account or annuity contract) for the exclusive benefit of plan participants and their beneficiaries. DCP has until calendar year 1999 to implement the new law. DCP anticipates implementing the required changes on January 1, 1999.

Investments are managed by DCP's trustee under one of eight investment options or a combination thereof. The choices of the investment options are made by the participants.

The following is a summary of the increases and decreases of the fund for the calendar years ended December 31, 1997 and 1996:

	<u>1997</u>	<u>1996</u>
	(in thousands)	
Fund assets, December 31 .....	\$2,005,656	\$1,575,778
Deferrals of compensation .....	284,923	256,497
Earnings and adjustment to market value .....	400,158	230,114
Payments to eligible participants and beneficiaries .	(61,226)	(53,109)
Administrative expenses .....	(3,639)	(3,624)
Fund assets, December 31 .....	<u>\$2,625,872</u>	<u>\$2,005,656</u>

*Other Agency Funds*

Other Agency Funds account for miscellaneous assets held by the City for other funds, governmental units, and individuals.

**Q. OTHER POSTEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS**

In accordance with collective bargaining agreements, the City provides Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) which include basic medical and hospitalization (health care) benefits to eligible retirees and dependents at no cost to 96.4% of the participants. Basic health care premium costs which are partially paid by the remaining participants vary according to the terms of their elected plans. To qualify, retirees must: (i) have worked for the City with at least five years of credited service as a member of an approved pension system (requirement does not apply if retirement is as a result of accidental disability); (ii) have been employed by the City or a City related agency prior to retirement; (iii) have worked regularly for at least twenty hours a week prior to retirement; and (iv) be receiving a pension check from a retirement system maintained by the City or another system approved by the City. The City's OPEB expense is recorded on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The amounts expended for health care benefits for fiscal years 1998 and 1997 are as follows:

	<u>1998</u>		<u>1997</u>	
	<u>Active</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Retired</u>
Number of employees .....	329,406	180,308	321,538	177,125
Cost of health care (in thousands)* .....	<u>\$1,176,778</u>	<u>\$411,830</u>	<u>\$1,137,948</u>	<u>\$402,249</u>

\* The amounts reflected are based on average headcounts.

In addition, the City sponsors a supplemental (Superimposed Major Medical) benefit plan for City managerial employees to refund medical and hospital bills that are not reimbursed by the regular health insurance carriers.

The amounts expended for supplemental benefits for fiscal years 1998 and 1997 are as follows:

	<u>1998</u>		<u>1997</u>	
	<u>Active</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Retired</u>
Number of claims .....	13,380	3,124	13,079	3,183
Cost of Superimposed Major Medical (in thousands) . .	<u>\$ 2,537</u>	<u>\$ 401</u>	<u>\$ 2,652</u>	<u>\$ 464</u>

**R. PENSION AND SIMILAR TRUST FUNDS**

*Pension Systems*

*Plan Descriptions*

The City sponsors or participates in pension systems providing benefits to its employees. The pension systems function in accordance with existing State statutes and City laws. Each system combines features of a defined benefit pension plan with those of a defined contribution pension plan. Contributions are made by the employers and the employees.

The majority of City employees are members of one of the following five major actuarial pension systems:

1. New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS), a cost-sharing multiple-employer public employee retirement system, for employees of the City not covered by one of the other pension systems and employees of certain component units of the City and certain other government units.
2. New York City Teachers' Retirement System-Qualified Pension Plan (TRS), a cost-sharing multiple-employer public employee retirement system for teachers in the public schools of the City and certain other specified school and college employees.
3. New York City Board of Education Retirement System-Qualified Pension Plan (BERS), a cost-sharing multiple-employer public employee retirement system, for nonpedagogical employees of the Board of Education and certain employees of the School Construction Authority.
4. New York Police Department, Subchapter Two Pension Fund (POLICE), a single-employer public employee retirement system, for full-time uniformed employees of the Police Department.
5. New York Fire Department, Subchapter Two Pension Fund (FIRE), a single-employer public employee retirement system, for full-time uniformed employees of the Fire Department.

The actuarial pension systems provide pension benefits to retired employees based on salary and length of service. In addition, the actuarial pension systems provide cost-of-living and other supplemental pension benefits to certain retirees and beneficiaries. In the event of disability during employment, participants may receive retirement allowances based on satisfaction of certain service requirements and other provisions. The actuarial pension systems also provide death benefits.

Subject to certain conditions, members become fully vested as to benefits upon the completion of 10 or 15 years of service. Subsequently, vesting service requirements for benefit eligibility were shortened to 5 years of service for certain members. Except for NYCERS, permanent, full-time employees are generally required to become members of the actuarial pension systems upon employment. Permanent full-time employees who are eligible to participate in NYCERS are required to become members within six months of their permanent employment status but may elect to become members earlier. Other employees who are eligible to participate in NYCERS may become members at their option. Upon termination of employment before retirement, certain members are entitled to refunds of their own contributions including accumulated interest less any loans outstanding.

*Plan Membership*

At June 30, 1997 and 1996, the membership of the actuarial pension systems consisted of:

	1997					
	NYCERS	TRS	BERS	POLICE	FIRE	TOTAL
Retirees and beneficiaries receiving benefits . . . . .	121,538	50,308	8,624	35,280	16,305	232,055
Terminated vested members not yet receiving benefits . . . . .	4,906	1,982	186	31	4	7,109
Active members . . . . .	<u>163,560</u>	<u>78,335</u>	<u>21,755</u>	<u>38,217</u>	<u>11,258</u>	<u>313,125</u>
Total plan membership . . . . .	<u>290,004</u>	<u>130,625</u>	<u>30,565</u>	<u>73,528</u>	<u>27,567</u>	<u>552,289</u>
	1996					
	NYCERS	TRS	BERS	POLICE	FIRE	TOTAL
Retirees and beneficiaries receiving benefits . . . . .	118,464	47,169	8,115	35,435	16,316	225,499
Terminated vested members not yet receiving benefits . . . . .	6,558	3,141	176	13	7	9,895
Active members . . . . .	<u>163,834</u>	<u>76,672</u>	<u>20,710</u>	<u>36,778</u>	<u>11,329</u>	<u>309,323</u>
Total plan membership . . . . .	<u>288,856</u>	<u>126,982</u>	<u>29,001</u>	<u>72,226</u>	<u>27,652</u>	<u>544,717</u>

*Funding Policy*

The City's funding policy for periodic employer contributions to the actuarial pension systems is to provide for actuarially-determined rates that, expressed as percentages of annualized covered payroll, are designed to accumulate sufficient assets to pay benefits when due.

Member contributions are established by law and vary by Plan. Employer contributions are accrued by the actuarial pension systems and are funded by the employers on a current basis.

*Annual Pension Costs*

For fiscal year 1998, the City's annual pension costs of approximately \$1.5 billion were equal to the City's required and actual contributions. Annual pension costs for the actuarial pension systems were equal to the amounts computed by the systems' Actuary. The required contributions were determined as part of the June 30, 1997 actuarial valuations using the frozen entry age actuarial cost method.

The City's pension costs, including those computed by the Actuary for the actuarial pension systems, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1998, 1997, and 1996 were as follows:

	<u>1998</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1996</u>
	(in millions)		
NYCERS* .....	\$ 166.6	\$ 152.5	\$ 139.8
TRS* .....	426.5	350.5	384.8
BERS* .....	34.2	33.6	35.6
POLICE .....	544.2	539.8	562.4
FIRE .....	261.3	255.0	252.1
OTHER** .....	38.7	42.0	40.3
Total pension costs .....	<u>\$1,471.5</u>	<u>\$1,373.4</u>	<u>\$1,415.0</u>

\* NYCERS, TRS, and BERS are cost-sharing multiple-employer public employee retirement systems. The City's total actuarially-determined contributions as a percentage of contributions for all employers to NYCERS, TRS, and BERS were:

	<u>1998</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1996</u>
NYCERS .....	69.85%	66.65%	63.95%
TRS .....	96.51	96.25	96.81
BERS .....	96.88	96.78	97.19

\*\* Other pension expenditures represent contributions to other actuarial and pay-as-you-go pension systems for certain employees, retirees, and beneficiaries not covered by any of the five major actuarial pension systems. The City also contributes per diem amounts into certain union-administered annuity funds.

The following is three-year trend information for the City's actuarially-funded single-employer pension plans:

	<u>Fiscal Year Ending</u>	<u>Annual Pension Cost (APC)</u>	<u>Percentage of APC Contributed</u>	<u>Net Pension Obligation</u>
	(in millions)			
POLICE .....	6/30/98	\$544.2	100%	\$ —
	6/30/97	539.8	100	—
	6/30/96	562.4	100	—
FIRE .....	6/30/98	261.3	100	—
	6/30/97	255.0	100	—
	6/30/96	252.1	100	—

The more significant actuarial assumptions and methods used in the calculations of employer contributions to the actuarial pension systems for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1998 and 1997 are as follows:

	<u>1998</u>	<u>1997</u>
Valuation Date .....	June 30, 1997	June 30, 1996
Actuarial Cost Method .....	Frozen entry age.	Frozen entry age.
Amortization Method for Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liabilities (UAAL) .....	Increasing dollar, except for UAAL attributable to ERI 95, ERI 96 and 1995 Retiree Supplementation.	Increasing dollar, except for UAAL attributable to ERI 95 and 1995 Retiree Supplementation.
Remaining Amortization Period .....	4, 5, 9, and 13 years.	5, 10, and 14 years.
Actuarial Asset Valuation Method .....	Modified 5-year average of Market Value with Market Value Restart as of June 30, 1995.	Modified 5-year average of Market Value with Market Value Restart as of June 30, 1995.
Assumed Rate of Return On Investments .....	8.75% per annum (4.0% per annum for benefits payable under the variable annuity programs of TRS and BERS).	8.75% per annum (4.0% per annum for benefits payable under the variable annuity programs of TRS and BERS).
Post-Retirement Mortality .....	Tables based on recent experience.	Tables based on recent experience.
Active Service Withdrawal, Death, Disability, Service Retirement .....	Tables based on recent experience.	Tables based on recent experience.
Salary Increases .....	In general, Merit and Promotion Increases plus assumed General Wage Increases of 4.0% per year.	In general, Merit and Promotion Increases plus assumed General Wage Increases of 4.0% per year.
Cost-of-Living Adjustments .....	Provided by the legislature on an ad-hoc basis.	Provided by the legislature on an ad-hoc basis.

The investment return assumptions used for determining employer contributions to the actuarial pension systems are enacted by the New York State Legislature upon the recommendations of the Boards of Trustees and the Actuary.

The Actuarial Asset Valuation Method (AAVM) was changed as of June 30, 1995 to reflect a market basis for investments held by the Plan and was made as one component of an overall revision of actuarial assumptions and methods as of June 30, 1995.

Under this AAVM, the Actuarial Asset Value (AAV) was reset to Market Value i.e., "Market Value Restart" as of June 30, 1995. This AAVM recognized expected investment returns immediately and phased in investment returns greater or less than expected i.e., Unexpected Investment Returns (UIR) over five years at a rate of 20% per year (or at a cumulative rate of 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, and 100% over five years).

The AAVM used as of June 30, 1996 is a modified version of that used as of June 30, 1995.

Under this modified AAVM, any UIR for fiscal years 1997 or later will be phased into the AAV beginning the following June 30 at a rate of 10%, 15%, 20%, 25%, and 30% per year (or at a cumulative rate of 10%, 25%, 45%, 70%, and 100% over five years). The UIR for fiscal year 1996 will be phased into AAV beginning June 30, 1996 at a cumulative rate of 20%, 35%, 45%, 70%, and 100% over five years.

The Frozen Entry Age actuarial cost method of funding is utilized by the Plan's Actuary to calculate the contributions required of the employer. Under this method, the excess of the actuarial present value of projected benefits of members as of the valuation date, over the sum of the actuarial value of assets plus the unfunded frozen actuarial accrued liability is allocated on a level basis over the future earnings of members who are on the payroll as of the valuation date. Actuarial gains and losses are reflected in the employer normal contribution rate.

There are two types of UAAL: the Consolidated Unfunded Accrued Liability (CUAL) and the Balance Sheet Liability (BSL). The employer carries part of the UAAL as an accounting liability. This accounting liability is referred to as the BSL.

Chapter 249 of the Laws of 1996 reestablished total UAAL and consolidated most of those UAAL as of June 30, 1995 for NYCERS, TRS, BERS, and FIRE.

Chapter 598 of the Laws of 1996 reestablished and consolidated total UAAL as of June 30, 1995 for POLICE.

Chapter 157 of the Laws of 1997 provided for an increase of the Actuarial Interest Rate assumption from 8.50% to 8.75% per annum for POLICE and a change in UAAL to be established as of June 30, 1996.

The schedules of payments toward the UAAL and the BSL provide that the UAAL and BSL as of June 30, 1995 be amortized over a period of 15 years beginning in fiscal year 1996, where each annual payment after the first annual payment would equal 103% of its preceding annual payment.

Chapter 12 of the Laws of 1995 established a UAAL for the Early Retirement Incentive Program to be amortized on a level dollar amount over a period of 5 years.

Chapter 119 of the Laws of 1995 established a UAAL for the Retiree Supplementation increases to be amortized on a level dollar amount over a period of 10 years.

Chapter 30 of the Laws of 1996 established a UAAL for the Early Retirement Incentive Program to be amortized on a level dollar amount over a period of 5 years.

#### *Similar Trust Funds*

##### *Fund Descriptions*

Per enabling State legislation, certain retirees of POLICE, FIRE, and NYCERS are eligible to receive a schedule of supplemental benefits from certain Variable Supplements Funds (VSFs).

Under current law, VSFs are not to be construed as constituting pension or retirement system funds. Instead, they provide scheduled supplemental payments, other than pension or retirement system allowances, in accordance with applicable statutory provisions. While most of these payments are guaranteed by the City, the Legislature has reserved to itself and the State of New York, the right and power to amend, modify, or repeal the VSFs and the payments they provide.

The New York City Police Department maintains the Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (POVSF) and the Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (PSOVSF). These funds operate pursuant to the provisions of Title 13, Chapter 2 of the Administrative Code of The City of New York.

1. POVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retired for service with 20 or more years as police officers of the New York Police Department, Subchapter 1 or Subchapter 2, Pension Fund and who retired on or after October 1, 1968.
2. PSOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retired for service with 20 or more years holding the rank of sergeant or higher, or detective, of the New York Police Department, Subchapter 1 or Subchapter 2, Pension Fund and who retired on or after October 1, 1968.

The New York City Fire Department maintains the Firefighters' Variable Supplements Fund (FFVSF) and the Fire Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (FOVSF). These funds operate pursuant to the provisions of Title 13, Chapter 3 of the Administrative Code of The City of New York.

3. FFVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years as firefighters (or wipers) of the New York Fire Department, Subchapter 1 or Subchapter 2, Pension Fund and who retired on or after October 1, 1968.
4. FOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years holding the rank of lieutenant or higher and all pilots and marine engineers (uniformed) of the New York Fire Department, Subchapter 1 or Subchapter 2, Pension Fund and who retired on or after October 1, 1968.

The New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS) maintains the Transit Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (TPOVSF), the Transit Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (TPSOVSF), the Housing Police Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (HPOVSF) and the Housing Police Superior Officers' Variable Supplements Fund (HPSOVSF). These funds operate pursuant to the provisions of Title 13, Chapter 1 of the Administrative Code of The City of New York.



5. TPOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years as Transit Police Officers on or after July 1, 1987. Prior to calendar year 2007, when this plan provides for guaranteed schedules of defined supplemental benefits, total supplemental benefit payments cannot exceed the assets of the fund unless the City guarantee becomes effective. As a result of calculations performed by the Funds' Actuary during November, 1993, the City guarantee became effective.
6. TPSOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years as Transit Police Superior Officers on or after July 1, 1987. Prior to calendar year 2007, when this plan provides for guaranteed schedules of defined supplemental benefits, total supplemental benefit payments cannot exceed the assets of the fund.
7. HPOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years as Housing Police Officers on or after July 1, 1987. Prior to calendar year 2007, when this plan provides for guaranteed schedules of defined supplemental benefits, total supplemental benefit payments cannot exceed the assets of the fund. Chapter 719 of the Laws of 1994 amended the defined schedules of benefits for certain Housing Police Officers and guaranteed the schedules of defined supplemental benefits.
8. HPSOVSF provides supplemental benefits to retirees who retire for service with 20 or more years as Housing Police Superior Officers on or after July 1, 1987. Prior to calendar year 2007, when this plan provides for guaranteed schedules of defined supplemental benefits, total supplemental benefit payments cannot exceed the assets of the fund.

*Funding Policy and Contributions*

The Administrative Code of The City of New York provides that POLICE, FIRE, and NYCERS pay to their respective VSFs amounts equal to certain excess earnings on equity investments, generally limited to the unfunded accumulated benefit obligation for each VSF. The excess earnings are defined as the amount by which earnings on equity investments exceed what the earnings would have been had such funds been invested at a yield comparable to that available from fixed income securities, less any cumulative deficiencies.

For fiscal years 1998 and 1997, no excess earnings on equity investments is estimated to be transferable to the VSFs. The actual amounts transferred are based on final calculations and will be recognized in the financial statements when paid or when the actual amounts of the transfers are known.

*Required Supplementary Information*

The following schedule of funding progress is presented as required supplementary information for the five major actuarial pension systems as of June 30, 1997, 1996, and 1995:

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Fiscal Year Ending (A)	Actuarial Value of Assets (B)	Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) Frozen Entry Age (B) & (C)	Unfunded AAL (UAAL) (D)	Funded Ratio (1)+(2)	Covered Payroll	UAAL As A Percentage of Covered Payroll (3)+(5)
				(2)-(1) (in millions)			
NYCERS .....	6/30/97	\$27,222.9	\$26,296.3	\$( 926.6)	103.5%	\$6,752.9	(13.7)%
	6/30/96	25,809.7	24,799.0	(1,010.7)	104.1	6,580.4	(15.4)
	6/30/95	24,623.3	23,231.3	(1,392.0)	106.0	6,432.3	(21.6)
TRS .....	6/30/97	24,354.9	25,972.6	1,617.7	93.8	3,535.7	45.8
	6/30/96	22,176.1	23,749.1	1,573.0	93.4	3,507.8	44.8
	6/30/95	20,412.8	21,751.7	1,338.9	93.8	3,593.0	37.3
BERS .....	6/30/97	1,146.8	1,257.1	110.3	91.2	512.5	21.5
	6/30/96	1,055.9	1,167.4	111.5	90.4	475.5	23.4
	6/30/95	984.7	1,085.5	100.8	90.7	477.2	21.1
POLICE .....	6/30/97	11,237.6	12,475.7	1,238.1	90.1	2,036.5	60.8
	6/30/96	10,342.9	11,603.4	1,260.5	89.1	1,920.0	65.6
	6/30/95	9,632.9	10,955.9	1,323.0	87.9	1,844.9	71.7
FIRE .....	6/30/97	4,157.1	5,473.0	1,315.9	76.0	660.8	199.1
	6/30/96	3,859.0	5,200.8	1,341.8	74.2	647.7	207.2
	6/30/95	3,617.4	4,880.0	1,262.6	74.1	642.9	196.4

(A) For the year ended June 30, 1995 and later, the valuation method was changed from an end of year to a beginning of year convention.

(B) As of June 30, 1995, the economic and non-economic assumptions were revised due to experience review. AAVM was changed as of June 30, 1995 to reflect a market basis for investments held by the Plan and was made as one component of an overall revision of actuarial assumptions and methods as of June 30, 1995. Under this AAVM, AAV was reset to Market Value i.e., Market Value Restart as of June 30, 1995. This AAVM recognized expected investment returns immediately and phased in investment returns greater or less than expected i.e., UIR over five years at a rate of 20% per year (or at a cumulative rate of 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, and 100% over five years). The AAVM used as of June 30, 1996 is a modified version of that used as of June 30, 1995. Under this modified AAVM, any UIR for fiscal years 1997 or later will be phased into the AAV beginning the following June 30 at a rate of 10%, 15%, 20%, 25%, and 30% per year (or at a cumulative rate of 10%, 25%, 45%, 70%, and 100% over five years). The UIR for fiscal year 1996 will be phased into AAV beginning June 30, 1996 at a cumulative rate of 20%, 35%, 45%, 70%, and 100% over five years.

(C) To effectively assess the funding progress of the Plan, it is necessary to compare the actuarial value of assets and the AAL calculated in a manner consistent with the Plan's funding method over a period of time. The AAL is the portion of the actuarial present value of pension plan benefits and expenses which is not provided for by future normal costs and future member contributions.

(D) The UAAL is the excess of the AAL over the actuarial value of assets. This is the same as unfunded frozen AAL, which is not adjusted from one actuarial valuation to the next to reflect actuarial gains and losses.

**S. YEAR 2000 COMPUTER SYSTEMS**

The Year 2000 presents potential operational problems for computerized data files and computer programs which may recognize the Year 2000 as the Year 1900, resulting in possible system failures or miscalculations. The City established a Year 2000 Project Office to develop a project methodology, coordinate the efforts of City agencies, review plans, and oversee implementation of Year 2000 projects. The City has thousands of computer systems that are in various stages of assessment, remediation, and validation and testing as part of the City's overall strategy to ensure that its systems are Year 2000 compliant. The City evaluated the capabilities of its central accounting and budgeting system. Based on the potential impact of the Year 2000 on this system, the City developed a plan to replace this system, along with several related systems, prior to July 1, 1999 with a new financial management system which is expected to be Year 2000 compliant. Programming changes to the City's central payroll system which the City expects will allow it to operate beyond the Year 2000 have already been made and implemented.

The City's computer systems may not all be Year 2000 compliant in a timely manner and there could be an adverse impact on City operations or revenues as a result. The City is in the process of developing contingency plans for all mission-critical and high priority systems, if such systems are not Year 2000 compliant by pre-determined dates. The City is also in the process of contacting its significant third party vendors, including Federal and State governments, regarding the Year 2000 issue and the status of their compliance. Year 2000 compliance by third parties is not within the City's control, and therefore the City cannot assure the timing of such efforts or that there will not be any adverse effects on the City resulting from any failure of these third parties to achieve Year 2000 compliance.

**T. COMMITMENTS**

At June 30, 1998, the outstanding commitments relating to projects of the Capital Projects Funds amounted to approximately \$7.4 billion.

To address the need for significant infrastructure and public facility capital investments, the City has prepared a ten-year capital spending program which contemplates expenditures of \$40.8 billion over the remaining fiscal years 1999 through 2007. To help meet its capital spending program, the City and TFA borrowed \$2.6 billion in the public credit market in fiscal year 1998. The City and/or TFA plan to borrow \$3 billion in the public credit market in fiscal year 1999.

[This page intentionally left blank]

B R O W N & W O O D L L P

ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER  
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10048-0557

TELEPHONE: 212-839-5300  
FACSIMILE: 212-839-5599

April 21, 1999

HONORABLE ALAN G. HEVESI  
Comptroller  
The City of New York  
Municipal Building  
New York, New York 10007

Dear Comptroller Hevesi:

We have acted as bond counsel to The City of New York (the "City"), a municipal corporation of the State of New York (the "State"), in its issuance of \$250,000,000 General Obligation Bonds, Fiscal 1999 Series I (the "Bonds").

The Bonds are issued pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution of the State, the Local Finance Law of the State, and the Charter of the City, and in accordance with a certificate of the Deputy Comptroller for Public Finance and related proceedings (the "Certificate").

Based on our examination of existing law, such legal proceedings and such other documents as we deem necessary to render this opinion, we are of the opinion that:

1. The Bonds have been duly authorized, executed and issued in accordance with the Constitution and statutes of the State and the Charter of the City and constitute valid and legally binding obligations of the City for the payment of which the City has validly pledged its faith and credit, and all real property within the City subject to taxation by the City is subject to the levy by the City of ad valorem taxes, without limit as to rate or amount, for payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds.

2. Interest on the Bonds is exempt from personal income taxes imposed by the State or any political subdivision thereof, including the City.

3. Except as provided in the following sentence, interest on the Bonds is not includable in the gross income of the owners of the Bonds for purposes of Federal income taxation under existing law. Interest on the Bonds will be includable in the gross income of the owners thereof retroactive to the date of issue of the Bonds in the event of a failure by the City to comply with the applicable requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), and the covenants regarding use, expenditure and investment of bond proceeds and the timely payment of certain investment earnings to the United States Treasury; and we render no opinion as to the exclusion from gross income of interest on the Bonds for Federal income tax purposes on or after the date on which any action is taken under the Certificate upon the approval of counsel other than ourselves.

4. Interest on the Bonds is not a specific preference item for purposes of the Federal individual or corporate alternative minimum tax. The Code contains other provisions that could result in tax consequences, upon which we render no opinion, as a result of ownership of such Bonds or the inclusion in certain computations (including without limitation those related to the corporate alternative minimum tax) of interest that is excluded from gross income.

5. The excess, if any, of the amount payable at maturity of any maturity of the Bonds over the initial offering price of such Bonds to the public at which price a substantial amount of such maturity is sold represents original issue discount which is excluded from gross income for Federal income tax purposes to the same extent as interest on the Bonds. The Code further provides that such original issue discount excluded as interest accrues in accordance with a constant interest method based on the compounding of interest, and that a holder's adjusted basis for purposes of determining a holder's gain or loss on disposition of the Bonds with original issue discount will be increased by the amount of such accrued interest.

The rights of the owners of the Bonds and the enforceability thereof may be subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights heretofore or hereafter enacted, to the extent constitutionally applicable, and the enforcement of related contractual and statutory covenants of the City and the State may also be subject to the exercise of the State's police powers and of judicial discretion in appropriate cases.

The opinions expressed herein are based on an analysis of existing laws, regulations, rulings and court decisions. Such opinions may be adversely affected by actions taken or events occurring, including a change in law, regulation or ruling (or in the application or official interpretation of any law, regulation or ruling) after the date hereof. We have not undertaken to determine, or to inform any person, whether such actions are taken or such events occur and we have no obligation to update this opinion in light of such actions or events.

Very truly yours,



# FINANCIAL GUARANTY INSURANCE POLICY

MBIA Insurance Corporation  
Armonk, New York 10504

MBIA Insurance Corporation (the "Insurer"), in consideration of the payment of the premium and subject to the terms of this policy, hereby unconditionally and irrevocably guarantees to any owner, as hereinafter defined, of the following described obligations, the full and complete payment required to be made by or on behalf of the Issuer to

[NUMBER]

or its successor (the "Paying Agent ") of an amount equal to (i) the principal of (either at the stated maturity or by any advancement of maturity pursuant to a mandatory sinking fund payment) and interest on, the Obligations (as that term is defined below) as such payments shall become due but shall not be so paid (except that in the event of any acceleration of the due date of such principal by reason of mandatory or optional redemption or acceleration resulting from default or otherwise, other than any advancement of maturity pursuant to a mandatory sinking fund payment, the payments guaranteed hereby shall be made in such amounts and at such times as such payments of principal would have been due had there not been any such acceleration), and (ii) the reimbursement of any such payment which is subsequently recovered from any owner pursuant to a final judgment by a court of competent jurisdiction that such payment constitutes an avoidable preference to such owner within the meaning of any applicable bankruptcy law. The amounts referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be referred to herein collectively as the "Insured Amounts." "Obligations" shall mean:

[PAR]  
[LEGAL NAME OF ISSUE]

Upon receipt of telephonic or telegraphic notice, such notice subsequently confirmed in writing by registered or certified mail, or upon receipt of written notice by registered or certified mail, by the Insurer from the Paying Agent or any owner of an Obligation the payment of an Insured Amount for which is then due, that such required payment has not been made, the Insurer on the due date of such payment or within one business day after receipt of notice of such nonpayment, whichever is later, will make a deposit of funds, in an account with State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A., in New York, New York, or its successor, sufficient for the payment of any such Insured Amounts which are then due. Upon presentment and surrender of such Obligations or presentment of such other proof of ownership of the Obligations, together with any appropriate instruments of assignment to evidence the assignment of the Insured Amounts due on the Obligations as are paid by the Insurer, and appropriate instruments to effect the appointment of the Insurer as agent for such owners of the Obligations in any legal proceeding related to payment of Insured Amounts on the Obligations, such instruments being in a form satisfactory to State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A., State Street Bank and Trust Company, N.A. shall disburse to such owners, or the Paying Agent payment of the Insured Amounts due on such Obligations, less any amount held by the Paying Agent for the payment of such Insured Amounts and legally available therefor. This policy does not insure against loss of any prepayment premium which may at any time be payable with respect to any Obligation.

As used herein, the term "owner" shall mean the registered owner of any Obligation as indicated in the books maintained by the Paying Agent, the Issuer, or any designee of the Issuer for such purpose. The term owner shall not include the Issuer or any party whose agreement with the Issuer constitutes the underlying security for the Obligations.

Any service of process on the Insurer may be made to the Insurer at its offices located at 113 King Street, Armonk, New York 10504 and such service of process shall be valid and binding.

This policy is non-cancellable for any reason. The premium on this policy is not refundable for any reason including the payment prior to maturity of the Obligations.

This policy is not covered by the Property/Casualty Insurance Security Fund specified in Article 76 of the New York Insurance Law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Insurer has caused this policy to be executed in facsimile on its behalf by its duly authorized officers, this [DAY] day of [MONTH, YEAR].

MBIA Insurance Corporation

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Secretary

**SPECIMEN**





101565

DO NOT STAPLE THIS FORM

S R B

FORM G - 36 (OS) - FOR OFFICIAL STATEMENTS

SECTION I - MATERIALS SUBMITTED

THIS FORM IS SUBMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH (check one):

1. [X] A FINAL OFFICIAL STATEMENT RELATING TO A PRIMARY OFFERING OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES (enclose two (2) copies)

(a) DATE RECEIVED FROM ISSUER: 04/16/1999

(b) DATE SENT TO MSRB: 04/16/1999

2. [ ] AN AMENDED OFFICIAL STATEMENT WITHIN THE MEANING OF RULE G-36(d) (enclose two (2) copies)

(a) DATE RECEIVED FROM ISSUER: \_\_\_\_\_

(b) DATE SENT TO MSRB: \_\_\_\_\_

IF MATERIALS SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM CONSIST OF MORE THAN ONE DOCUMENT (e.g. preliminary official statement and wrap, even if physically attached), PLEASE CHECK HERE: [X]

C. IF THIS FORM AMENDS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FORM WITHOUT CHANGING MATERIALS SUBMITTED, PLEASE CHECK HERE (include copy of original form G-36 (OS)): [ ]

SECTION II - IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUE(S)

Each issue must be listed separately.

If more space is needed to list additional issues, please include on a separate sheet and check here: [ ]

NAME OF ISSUER CITY OF NEW YORK GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, FISCAL 1999 SERIES I

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE CITY OF NEW YORK GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, FISCAL 1999 SERIES I

STATE: NY
DATED
DATE: 04/21/1999

NAME OF ISSUER
DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

STATE:
DATED
DATE:

NAME OF ISSUER
DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

STATE:
DATED
DATE:

SECTION III - TRANSACTION INFORMATION

LATEST FINAL MATURITY DATE OF ALL SECURITIES IN OFFERING: 04/15/2029

DATE OF FINAL AGREEMENT TO PURCHASE, OFFER OR SELL SECURITIES (Date of Sale): 04/14/1999

ACTUAL OR EXPECTED DATE OF DELIVERY OF SECURITIES TO UNDERWRITER(S) (Bond Closing): 04/21/1999

IF THESE SECURITIES ADVANCE REFUND ALL OR A PORTION OF ANOTHER ISSUE, PLEASE CHECK HERE: [ ]

A separate Form G-36(ARD) and copies of the advance refunding documents must be submitted for each issue advance refunded.

SECTION IV - UNDERWRITER ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

The information will be used by the MSRB to compute any rule A-13 underwriting assessment that may be due on this offering. The managing underwriter will be sent an invoice if a rule A-13 assessment is due on the offering.

MANAGING

UNDERWRITER Merrill Lynch & Co.

SEC REG.

NUMBER: 007691

TOTAL PAR VALUE OF ALL SECURITIES IN OFFERING \$ 250,000,000

PAR AMOUNT OF SECURITIES UNDERWRITTEN (if different from the amount shown in item B above): \$

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- 1. [ ] At the option of the holder thereof, all securities in this offering may be tendered to the issuer of such securities or its designated agent for redemption or purchase at par value of more at least as frequently as every nine months until maturity, earlier redemption, or purchase by the issuer or its designated agent.
2. [ ] At the option of the holder thereof, all securities in this offering may be tendered to the issuer of such securities or its designated agent for redemption or purchase at par value of more at least as frequently as every two years until maturity, earlier redemption, or purchase by the issuer or its designated agent.
3. [ ] This offering is exempt from SEC rule 15c2-12 under section (c)(1) of that rule. Section (c)(1) of SEC rule 15c2-12 states that an offering is exempt from the requirements of the rule if the securities offered have authorized denominations of \$100,000 or more and sold to no more than 35 persons each of whom the participating underwriter believes: (1) has the knowledge and expertise necessary to evaluate the merits and risks of the investment; and (2) is not purchasing for more than one account, or with a view toward distributing the securities.

SECTION V - CUSIP INFORMATION

MSRB rule G-34 requires that CUSIP numbers be assigned to each new issue of municipal securities unless the issue is ineligible for CUSIP number assignment under the eligibility criteria of the CUSIP Service Bureau.

1. CUSIP-9 NUMBERS OF THE ISSUE(S)

Maturity Date	CUSIP Number	Maturity Date	CUSIP Number	Maturity Date	CUSIP Number
04/15/2001	649669N79	04/15/2002	649669N87	04/15/2003	649669N95
04/15/2004	649669P28	04/15/2005	649669P36	04/15/2006	649669P44
04/15/2007	649669P51	04/15/2008	649669P69	04/15/2009	649669P77
04/15/2010	649669P85	04/15/2011	649669P93	04/15/2012	649669Q27
04/15/2013	649669Q35	04/15/2014	649669Q43	04/15/2015	649669Q50
04/15/2016	649669Q68	04/15/2017	649669Q76	04/15/2018	649669Q84
04/15/2019	649669Q92	04/15/2020	649669R26	04/15/2021	649669U30
04/15/2024	649669R34	04/15/2029	649669R42		

2. IF ANY OF THE ABOVE SECURITIES HAS A "CUSIP-6" BUT NO "CUSIP-9", CHECK HERE AND LIST THEM BELOW:

(Please see instructions in Form G-36 Manual)

LIST ALL CUSIP-6 NUMBERS ASSIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_

State the reason why such securities have not been assigned a "CUSIP-9": \_\_\_\_\_

3. IF ANY OF THESE SECURITIES IS INELIGIBLE FOR CUSIP NUMBER ASSIGNMENT, PLEASE CHECK HERE:

State the reason why such securities are ineligible for CUSIP number assignment: \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION VI - MANAGING UNDERWRITER'S CERTIFICATION AND SIGNATURE

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFIES THAT THE MATERIALS ACCOMPANYING THIS FORM ARE AS DESCRIBED IN SECTION I ABOVE AND THAT ALL OTHER INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT. THE UNDERSIGNED ACKNOWLEDGES THAT SAID MATERIALS WILL BE PUBLICLY DISSEMINATED.

APR 19 1999

ON

SECTION IV ABOVE

SI

NA

(E

ing underwriter)

FAX:

PI

ost lik

orm and

NOTE:

instru

oted

RETURNED FOR

d two

cial statement must

within the meaning of rule G-36.

MSRB, MSIL System, 1640 King Street, Suite 300, Alexandria, Virginia