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## Fellow Californians:

The recession continues to take a terrible toll on California communities and families. High unemployment plagues most sectors, and the housing market remains depressed. Family income has shrunk, and consumer spending has dropped. All these factors, in turn, continue to erode the revenues of state and local government. And that erosion compounds the economic stresses by fueling further reductions in jobs and public services at the very time both are needed most.

This year's Debt Affordability Report notes once again the increasing percentage of the State's General Fund devoted to debt payment. The increase has occurred in large part because the State has sold more bonds to finance critically-needed, voter-enacted infrastructure projects at a time when the State's overall revenues have dropped precipitously (if temporarily) from their pre-recession levels. This "denominator effect" somewhat skews the analysis of the State's ability to take on more debt over the longer term. The fact remains, however, that California needs to pay serious attention to its growing debt service. And policymakers need to develop a long-term Master Plan to meet California's infrastructure needs with a better blend of state, federal, local and private sector investment.

The 2010 Debt Affordability Report provides useful and straightforward information about the nature and extent of the State's debt. It should be a valuable resource for municipal finance professionals and California policymakers, and all those who want to take a closer look at how the State uses its borrowing authority to meet the objectives set by voters, the Legislature and the Governor.

I commend and thank the staff of the State Treasurer's Office as well as our financial advisors and economists. They are professionals who work very hard and well to protect the interests and pocketbooks of Californians. And they understand the importance of the work they do in creating the kind of future California wants and needs.

On their behalf and mine, thank you for the opportunity to serve.

## Bill Jocker

## BILL LOCKYER

California State Treasurer
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## Preface

The Treasurer must submit an annual debt affordability report to the Governor and Legislature in accordance with the requirement of Government Code Section 12330. The law requires the Treasurer to provide the following information:

- A listing of authorized but unissued debt that the Treasurer intends to sell during the current year (201011) and the budget year (2011-2012) and the projected increase in debt service as a result of those sales.
- A description of the market for State bonds.
- An analysis of the credit ratings of State bonds.
- A listing of outstanding debt supported by the General Fund and a schedule of debt service requirements for this debt.
- A listing of authorized but unissued debt that would be supported by the General Fund.
- Identification of pertinent debt ratios, such as debt service to General Fund revenues, debt to personal income, debt to estimated full value of property and debt per capita.
- A comparison of these debt ratios with the comparable debt ratios for the 10 most populous states.
- A description of the percentage of the State's outstanding general obligation bonds constituting
fixed rate bonds, variable rate bonds, bonds that have an effective fixed interest rate through a hedging contract and bonds that have an effective variable interest rate through a hedging contract.
- A description of any hedging contract, the outstanding face value, the effective date, the expiration date, the name and ratings of the counterparty, the rate or floating index paid by the counterparty, and an assessment of how the performance of the State's hedging contracts met the objectives of the hedging contracts.


## NOTES ON TERMINOLOGY

- This report frequently uses the words "bonds" and "debt" interchangeably, even when the underlying obligation behind the bonds does not constitute debt, subject to limitation, under California's constitution. This conforms to the market convention for the general use of the terms "debt" and "debt service" as applied to a broad variety of instruments in the municipal market, regardless of their precise legal status.
- Fiscal years are referenced without using the term "fiscal year" or "fiscal." For example, 2010-11 means the 201011 fiscal year.
- When referring to the government the word "State" is capitalized. When referring to California, the word "state" is lower-cased.


## SECTION I <br> Market for State Bonds

The State is the largest issuer in the $\$ 2$ trillion U.S. taxexempt municipal bond market. In addition, as a result of the Build America Bonds (BABs) program the State, over the last 18 months, has become one of the largest issuers in the taxable bond market. The market and price for the State's bonds are affected by factors that are specific to the State, as well as factors that affect the wider bond market. These factors include the State's fiscal condition and the amount of bonds it is selling, as well as the rates on alternative, but similar, investment vehicles - namely other bonds.

The financial challenges still confronting the State are similar to those confronting many other entities, both public and private. The severe recession of the last few years has caused significant revenue declines across all sectors. Because of these losses as well as economy-driven increases in service needs, significant and persistent budget deficits will continue to plague most governments, including the State. In addition, recession-related investment losses have substantially increased public pension systems' unfunded liabilities. As a result, over the last year or so, the press and some investors have zeroed in on these municipal credit challenges and the long-term financial health of municipal governments. Notwithstanding the current challenges, two of the three major rating agencies, in April 2010, recalibrated municipal issuer ratings onto a global ratings scale. The recalibrations by Moody's Investors Service (Moody's) and Fitch Ratings (Fitch) produced higher ratings for thousands of municipal governments, including the State. Additionally, they had a positive effect on the prices for the State's bonds. The higher ratings better reflect the fundamental credit strength of municipal bonds, as evidenced by their extremely low default rates and high recovery ratios. However, even
after the recalibrations, municipal bonds still are rated lower than corporate debt with similar historical default rates. Treasurer Lockyer advocates further reform to more directly tie municipal ratings to risk of default. Treasurer Lockyer, in written testimony to the SEC in September 2010, stated "It is important that default risk is the primary basis for the rating."

To provide a better understanding of the market for the State's bonds, the discussion below reviews the larger municipal and taxable bond markets.

## BUILD AMERICA BONDS

In 2009-10, the most significant municipal bond market development was the large number of issuances of BABs, which were authorized in February 2009 as a part of the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). In particular, BABs transformed the way municipal governments access capital in the public debt markets. Under the BABs program, municipal issuers can sell federally taxable bonds to fund projects normally financed with tax-exempt bonds. Because the interest on the BABs would be subject to federal income taxation, the interest rates on these bonds are higher than those on traditional tax-exempt bonds. However, to offset the higher interest rates, the U.S. Treasury Department pays the issuer a direct subsidy equal to 35 percent of the interest paid on the $B A B s$, with the issuer paying only 65 percent. In many instances, the effective rate on the BABs, net of the federal subsidy, has been less than tax-exempt interest rates on comparable maturities. As a result of the significant issuer savings they provide and the relatively high yield, BABs quickly became popular with both issuers and investors. As of August 2010, more than $\$ 120$ billion of BABs had
been issued nationwide. The State accounted for more than $\$ 12$ billion of that total.

The large volume of BABs established closer links between the municipal and taxable bond markets. At first, this resulted in municipal BABs issuers conforming to the technical conventions of the taxable bond market, including maturity structure and call features. In addition, many taxable investors initially evaluated the creditworthiness of municipal governments by drawing parallels to sovereign entities and corporate issuers, despite the real differences between them. For example, the State, with rare exception, issues bonds to finance long-term capital projects, unlike many sovereign governments, which often issue debt to fund operating deficits. Municipal issuers have gradually incorporated a number of the more flexible features of the municipal bond market into their BAB s issues and educated investors about the positive differences between municipal credits and sovereign and corporate credits.

Despite being a clear success, the fate of the BABs program remains uncertain. The program is set to expire on January 1, 2011. Current Congressional proposals would extend the program, but they propose lower subsidy levels which likely would reduce the issuance of direct subsidy BABs. The uncertainty hanging over the program negatively affects the willingness of institutional investors to expand or even to continue participating in this new and potentially very large asset class.

## INTEREST RATE VOLATILITY

Interest rates and interest rate relationships for municipal bonds were highly volatile in fiscal 2009-10 through the beginning of fiscal 2010-11. The high volatility reflects shifts in investor sentiment, including their evaluation of international sovereign versus municipal credit risk, the
duration of the current recession, and the direction of equity, commodity and other investments.

As governments grapple with continued economic weakness around the world, many face ongoing budget deficits. In addition, weak investment performance has resulted in significant increases in public pension systems' unfunded liabilities. As a result, over the last year or so, investors have closely scrutinized governments' ability to operate and repay their obligations over the long-term. The sovereign debt crisis in Dubai, Greece, and Spain, and the specter of contagion across Europe, initially had a negative effect on the pricing of municipal bonds. Over time, however, as clear distinctions were recognized between these two types of credits, pricing pressures on municipal bonds subsided. Still, degradation in the European sovereign debt markets did eventually create opportunities for investors seeking higher returns, which led to further pricing volatility.

In addition, many investors have fled to the quality of U.S. Treasuries and high-grade municipal bonds, causing significant rallies in those markets. As U.S. Treasury yields reached historic lows, other types of securities were unable to keep pace, causing dislocations in fundamental ratios and spreads. Similarly, the highgrade municipal bond market rally resulted in widening spreads between various credits in the municipal market. However, at various points in time, when the prospect of economic recovery increased, investors reacted quickly and sought municipal bonds from issuers that were perceived to be distressed, producing significant changes in bond pricing.

The following charts demonstrate the impact that the flight to quality has had on the relationships between U.S. Treasuries and tax-exempt municipal bonds (Figure 1) and corporate taxable bonds (Figure 2).

## FIGURE I

TRENDS OF TAX-EXEMPT INTEREST RATES


Source: Thomson Municipal Market Monitor (TM3)

## FIGURE 2

TRENDS OF TAXABLE INTEREST RATES


## THE STATE'S BONDS

From July 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010, yields on the State's tax exempt and taxable general obligation (GO) bonds have fluctuated along with the yields in the broader municipal and taxable bond markets. In addition, investor perception of the State's creditworthiness, upgrades to the State's credit ratings from recalibrations, and the varying amount of bonds the State has offered at different times have affected the relative pricing of the State's GO Bonds. Yields on the State's 30 -year tax-exempt GO bonds ranged from a low of 4.82 percent to a high of 6.10 percent. Compared
to benchmark "AAA"-rated tax-exempt GO interest rates, these translate to spreads of 87 to 172 basis points. As the BABs market has evolved, yields for the State's 30 -year taxable GO Bonds have been even more volatile. From the beginning of fiscal 2009-10 to August 2010, the yields ranged from approximately 6.50 percent to approximately 8.25 percent, with spreads to the 30 -year U.S. Treasury Bond fluctuating between 210 and 390 basis points.

The following charts illustrate the absolute yields for the State's GO bonds (Figure 3), as well as the yields in relation to benchmark interest rates (Figure 4).

## FIGURE 3

TRENDS OF CALIFORNIA GO BOND YIELDS


Source: Thomson Municipal Market Monitor (TM3) and MSRB

## FIGURE 4

TRENDS OF CALIFORNIA GO BOND SPREADS


Source: Thomson Municipal Market Monitor (TM3) and MSRB

## SECTION 2 Snapshot of State's Debt

## OVERVIEW

Figure 5 summarizes the State's debt as of June 30, 2010. This debt includes GO bonds approved by voters, lease revenue bonds authorized by the Legislature, Proposition

1A Receivables bonds authorized by the 2009-10 State budget ${ }^{1}$ and certain other Special Fund or Self Liquidating bonds ${ }^{2}$. The numbers include both bonds the State already has sold (outstanding) and bonds authorized but not yet sold. A detailed list of the State's outstanding bonds, and

## FIGURE 5

SUMMARY OF THE STATE'S DEBT,
AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN BILLIONS)

| GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES | OUTSTANDING | AUTHORIZED <br> BUT UNISSUED | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Obligation Bonds | $\$ 68.77$ | $\$ 41.58$ | $\$ 110.35$ |
| Lease Revenue Bonds | 9.89 | 9.83 | 19.72 |
| Proposition 1A Receivables Bonds | I .90 | - | 1.90 |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES | $\$ 80.56$ | $\$ 51.4 \mathrm{I}$ | $\$ 131.97$ |

SPECIAL FUND/SELF LIQUIDATING ISSUES

| Economic Recovery Bonds | \$7.94 | \$ - | \$7.94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veterans General Obligation Bonds | 1.00 | I.I4 | 2.14 |
| California Water Resources Development General Obligation Bonds | 0.48 | 0.17 | 0.65 |
| TOTAL SPECIAL FUND/SELF LIQUIDATING ISSUES | \$9.42 | \$I.3I | \$10.73 |
| TOTAL | \$89.98 | \$ 2.72 | \$142.70 |

[^0]their debt service requirements, can be found in Appendices $A$ and $B$.

- Approximately 6.6 percent of all GO bonds carry variable interest rates. The law authorizes up to 20 percent of GO bonds (including Economic Recovery Bonds) to be variable rate. The remaining 93.4 percent of the State's GO bonds have fixed interest rates.
- The State has no interest rate hedging contracts on any debt discussed in this report.


## INTENDED ISSUANCE OF GENERAL FUND-BACKED BONDS

The State Treasurer's Office intended issuance estimates are based on Department of Finance (DOF) projections
of State departments' funding needs as of April 1, 2010. These projections are updated from time to time, and are therefore subject to change. Other factors that could impact the amount of issuance include the timing of budget enactment as well as market conditions. Figure 6 shows intended issuances over the next two fiscal years of General Fund-backed bonds ${ }^{3}$.

Only currently authorized but unissued GO bonds are reflected in Figure 6's numbers. The intended issuances may increase should new bond programs be approved.

As shown in Figure 6, the State intends to issue $\$ 26.78$ billion of General Fund-backed bonds in 2010-11 and 2011-12. The STO estimates this issuance will increase debt service payments from the General Fund by $\$ 193.80$ million in 2010-11 and $\$ 1.25$ billion in 2011-12.

## FIGURE 6

INTENDED ISSUANCES
GENERAL FUND-SUPPORTED BONDS
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

|  | $2010-2011$ | $2011-2012$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| General Obligation Bonds | $\$ 13,000$ | $\$ 9,903$ |
| Lease Revenue Bonds | $\$ 1,523$ | $\$ 2,352$ |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND-SUPPORTED BONDS | $\$ 14,523$ | $\$ 12,255$ |

[^1]
## SECTION 3 <br> Measuring Debt Burden

## DEBT RATIOS

Measuring California's debt level with various ratios while not particularly helpful in assessing debt affordability - does provide a way to compare the State's burden to those of other borrowers. The three most commonly-used ratios are: debt service as a percentage of General Fund revenues; debt as a percentage of personal income; and debt per capita.

Debt as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has not historically been used to measure a municipal issuer's debt burden. However, with the development of the BABs program and the increasing amount of municipal issuers selling debt in the taxable market, this ratio can be a useful tool to compare an issuer's debt burden to other borrowers.

## DEBT SERVICE AS A PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL FUND REVENUES

Because debt service is considered a fixed part of a State's budget, credit analysts compare a state's General Fundsupported debt service to its General Fund revenues as a measure of the state's fiscal flexibility. California's ratio of debt service to General Fund revenues was 6.69 percent in 2009-10, based on $\$ 5.790$ billion $^{4}$ in GO, lease revenue
and Proposition 1A Receivables debt service payments versus $\$ 86.521$ billion in General Fund revenues. This ratio is projected to be 7.17 percent in 2010-11, based on $\$ 6.558$ billion $^{5}$ in debt service payments versus $\$ 91.451$ billion in General Fund revenues as projected by the Department of Finance. ${ }^{6}$

## DEBT AS A PERCENTAGE OF PERSONAL INCOME

Comparing a state's level of debt to the total personal income of its residents measures a borrower's ability to repay its obligations because it provides one indicator of a state's ability to generate revenues. In its 2010 State Debt Medians report, Moody's lists the State's ratio of net taxsupported debt to personal income at 5.6 percent.

## DEBT PER CAPITA

Debt per capita measures residents' average share of a state's total outstanding debt. It does not account for the employment status, income or financial resources of residents. As a result, debt per capita does not reflect a state's ability to repay its obligations as well as the debt service as a percentage of General Fund revenues or debt

[^2]as a percentage of personal income. In its 2010 State Debt Medians report, Moody's lists the State's debt per capita at $\$ 2,362$.

## DEBT AS A PERCENTAGE OF GDP

Debt as a percentage of GDP generally is used to measure the financial leverage of an issuer's economy. Specifically, this debt ratio compares what an issuer owes versus what it produces. Since California has one of the world's largest and most diverse economies, ranking eighth, this debt ratio can be a useful tool to compare the State's debt burden to other issuers. Using Moody's 2010 State Debt Medians report and the California GDP figure produced by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, California's debt to GDP ratio is 4.73 percent.

## CALIFORNIA'S DEBT LEVELS COMPARED TO OTHER LARGE STATES

Moody's calculates the ratios of debt to personal income and debt per capita for each state and publishes an annual report containing the median ratios (State Debt Medians report). In addition, the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis publishes GDP figures for each state and publishes the statistics annually. It's useful to compare California's debt levels with those of its "peer group" of the 10 most populous states. As shown in Figure 7, the debt to personal income and debt per capita ratios of these 10 states are, on average, higher than the Moody's median for all states combined. California's ratios of debt to personal income, debt per capita, and debt as a percentage of GDP rank well above the medians for the 10 most populous states.

## FIGURE 7

DEBT RATIOS OF 10 MOST POPULOUS STATES
RANKED BY RATIO OF DEBT TO PERSONAL INCOME

| STATE | MOODY'S/S\&P/ FITCH (1) | DEBT TO PERSONAL INCOME (2) | DEBT PER <br> CAPITA (3) | DEBT AS A \% OF STATE GDP (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Texas | Aaa/AA+/AAA | 1.4\% | \$520 | 1.05\% |
| Michigan | Aa2/AA-/AA- | 2.1\% | \$748 | 1.96\% |
| Pennsylvania | Aa1/AA/AA ${ }^{+}$ | 2.3\% | \$938 | 2.13\% |
| North Carolina | Aaa/AAA/AAA | 2.3\% | \$765 | 1.80\% |
| Ohio | Aa1/AA + / AA + | 2.4\% | \$933 | 2.29\% |
| Florida | Aa1/AAA/AAA | 2.9\% | \$I,I23 | 2.80\% |
| Georgia | Aaa/AAA/AAA | 3.3\% | \$I,120 | 2.77\% |
| Illinois | A1/A+/A | 4.4\% | \$I,856 | 3.79\% |
| California | A1/A-/A- | 5.6\% | \$2,362 | 4.73\% |
| New York | Aa2/AA/AA | 6.5\% | \$3,135 | 5.36\% |
| Moody's Median all States |  | 2.5\% | \$936- |  |
| Median for the 10 Most Populous States |  | 2.7\% | \$I,029 | 2.53\% |

(1) Moody's Investors Service, Standard \& Poor's, and Fitch Ratings, as of August 2010.
(2) Figures as reported by Moody's Investors Service in their 2010 State Debt Median Report released May 2010. Debt as of calendar year end 2009 . Personal income as of 2008.
(3) Figures as reported by Moody's Investors Service in their 2010 State Debt Median Report released May 2010. Amounts as of calendar year end 2009.
(4) Debt as reported by Moody's Investors Service in their 2010 State Debt Median Report released May 2010. Debt amounts as of calendar year end 2009. GDP as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis for 2008.

# Analysis of State's Credit Ratings 

The State's current GO bond ratings are 'A-' from Fitch, 'A1' from Moody's and 'A-' from Standard \& Poor's (S\&P). These ratings continue to be the lowest GO bond ratings of all 50 states. The action taken on the State's credit rating in 2010 is summarized in Figure 8. In lowering the State's rating in January 2010, S\&P cited the State's fiscal imbalance and cash flow weakness. In addition, S\&P stated that an integral part to the State's rating outlook hinges on the State's ability and willingness to raise revenues or reduce expenditures in a timely manner through tax increases or program reductions.

In April 2010, Moody's and Fitch implemented their widespread recalibration of credit ratings for municipal
issuers. The rating agencies stated that the recalibration did not constitute rating upgrades, but rather a move to standardize municipal bond credits to sovereign governments and private corporations. As a result of the recalibration, Moody's increased the State's rating three notches, from 'Baal' to 'A1', while Fitch increased the State's rating two notches, from 'BBB' to 'A-'. S\&P has stated that it currently uses a single global scale. Although the recalibration of municipal credit ratings was a step in the right direction, municipal debt continues to be rated lower than corporate debt with similar historical default rates. Treasurer Lockyer advocates further ratings reform to more directly tie municipal ratings to risk of default.

## FIGURE 8

RATING ACTIONS IN 2010

| RATING AGENCY | ACTION | DATE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| S\&P | Lowered GO Rating from 'A' to 'A-' | January 2010 |
| Fitch | Recalibrated GO Rating from 'BBB' to 'A-' | April 2010 |
| Moody's | Recalibrated GO Rating from 'Baa1' to 'A1' | April 2010 |

A summary of the rating agencies' opinion of the State's credit strengths and challenges is presented in Figure 9.

## FIGURE 9

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GENERAL OBLIGATION RATING AGENCY COMMENTARY

|  | FITCH RATINGS | MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE | STANDARD \& POOR'S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RATING STRENGTHS | - Broad and diverse economy despite the current economic contraction <br> - Manageable debt levels | - Large, diverse and wealthy economy <br> - High likelihood of bond repayment due to the state's hierarchy of priority payments | - Indications of economic stabilization and revenue performance compared to the state's budget assumptions <br> - Cash management legislation which improves cash balances throughout the year <br> - A conservatively structured, albeit growing, debt burden |
| RATING CHALLENGES | - A large and persistent structural imbalance combined with pronounced revenue cyclicality <br> - Institutional weakness, including inflexibility imposed by voter initiatives and a partisan policy-making environment <br> - Significant expenditure pressures and cash flow stress | - Political environment in which making timely and productive budget decisions is difficult <br> - Reliance on one-time solutions (including past deficit borrowing) for longer-term problems <br> - Limited financial and budgetary flexibility | - Two-thirds constitutional requirement for both budget approval and tax increases <br> - General Fund revenue composition, which is sensitive to economic and equity market performance <br> - Constitutional amendments that limit discretion over major portions of General Fund spending |

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING
NON-SELF LIQUIDATING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

|  | VOTER | VOTER | LONG TERM | LONG TERM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BONDS |  |  |  |  |

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

## AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING

## NON-SELF LIQUIDATING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS) CONTINUED

| GENERAL FUND BONDS (NON-SELF LIQUIDATING) | VOTER AUTHORIZATION DATE | VOTER AUTHORIZATION AMOUNT | LONG TERM BONDS OUTSTANDING (a) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG TERM } \\ & \text { BONDS } \\ & \text { UNISSUED (b) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clean Water Bond Law of 1984 | II/06/84 | 325,000 | 22,195 | - |
| Clean Water and Water Conservation Bond Law of 1978 | 06/06/78 | 375,000 | 8,200 | - |
| Clean Water and Water Reclamation Bond Law of 1988 | II/08/88 | 65,000 | 32,750 | - |
| Community Parklands Act of 1986 | 06/03/86 | 100,000 | 9,285 | - |
| County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986 | 06/03/86 | 495,000 | 57,105 | - |
| County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure and Youth Facility Bond Act of 1988 | II/08/88 | 500,000 | 152,870 | - |
| County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1981 | II/02/82 | 280,000 | 800 | - |
| Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006 | II/07/06 | 4,090,000 | I,577,470 | 2,512,060 |
| Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990 | 06/05/90 | 300,000 | 178,015 | 12,410 |
| Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Act of 1984 | 06/05/84 | 85,000 | 8,750 | - |
| Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986 | II/04/86 | 400,000 | 3,800 | - |
| Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988 | II/08/88 | 600,000 | 89,670 | - |
| Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990 | 06/05/90 | 450,000 | 115,285 | 550 |
| Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1992 | 06/02/92 | 900,000 | 469,865 | 1,305 |
| Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 | 11/07/06 | 19,925,000 | 6,952,215 | 12,952,510 |
| Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002 | II/OS/02 | 2,100,000 | 1,759,070 | 191,270 |
| Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 | II/07/06 | 2,850,000 | 1,472,595 | 1,377,405 |
| Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990 | 06/05/90 | 150,000 | 3,790 | - |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (Hi-Ed) | II/OS/O2 | 1,650,000 | 1,556,105 | 8,820 |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (K-12) | II/O5/02 | II,400,000 | 9,898,580 | 645,150 |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004 (Hi-Ed) | 03/02/04 | 2,300,000 | 2,088,475 | 167,505 |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004 (K-12) | 03/02/04 | 10,000,000 | 8,016,4) | 1,738,630 |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (Hi-Ed) | II/07/06 | 3,087,000 | 2,492,255 | 593,305 |
| Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (K-12) | II/07/06 | 7,329,000 | 3,604,520 | 3,717,595 |
| Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act | 08/02/82 | 85,000 | 4,660 | - |
| New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986 | II/04/86 | 500,000 | 26,025 | - |
| New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1988 | II/08/88 | 817,000 | 111,095 | 3,170 |
| New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990 | 06/05/90 | 450,000 | 100,025 | 605 |
| Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990 | 06/05/90 | 1,000,000 | 284,960 | - |
| Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996 (Higher Education) | 03/26/96 | 975,000 | 666,380 | 37,465 |
| Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996 (K-12) | 03/26/96 | 2,025,000 | I,287,045 | 12,965 |
| Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection, and Flood Protection Act | 03/07/00 | 1,970,000 | 1,500,180 | 277,190 |
| Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, <br> Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 | II/07/06 | 5,388,000 | 2,038,940 | 3,348,140 |
| Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000 | 03/07/00 | 2,100,000 | 1,677,680 | 172,900 |

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

## AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING

## NON-SELF LIQUIDATING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS) CONTINUED

| GENERAL FUND BONDS (NON-SELF LIQUIDATING) | VOTER <br> AUTHORIZATION DATE | VOTER <br> AUTHORIZATION AMOUNT | LONG TERM BONDS <br> OUTSTANDING (a) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG TERM } \\ & \text { BONDS } \\ & \text { UNISSUED (b) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act | II/O5/96 | 995,000 | 733,505 | 101,820 |
| Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the $21^{\text {st }}$ Century | II/04/08 | 9,950,000 | 258,395 | 9,691,605 |
| School Building and Earthquake Bond Act of 1974 | II/05/74 | 40,000 | 21,310 | - |
| School Facilities Bond Act of 1988 | 06/07/88 | 800,000 | 47,335 | - |
| School Facilities Bond Act of 1990 | II/06/90 | 800,000 | 282,870 | - |
| School Facilities Bond Act of 1992 | 06/02/92 | 1,900,000 | 844,630 | 10,280 |
| Seismic Retrofit Bond Act of 1996 | 03/26/96 | 2,000,000 | 1,531,445 | - |
| State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984 | II/06/84 | 450,000 | 4,600 | - |
| State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1986 | II/04/86 | 800,000 | 20,550 | - |
| State, Urban, and Coastal Park Bond Act of 1976 | II/02/76 | 280,000 | 6,505 | - |
| Stem Cell Research and Cures Bond Act of 2004 | II/02/04 | 3,000,000 | I,028,545 | 1,971,455 |
| Veterans Homes Bond Act of 2000 | 03/07/00 | 50,000 | 40,345 | 975 |
| Voting Modernization Bond Act of 2002 | 03/05/02 | 200,000 | 72,70) | 64,495 |
| Water Conservation Bond Law of 1988 | II/08/88 | 60,000 | 31,580 | 5,235 |
| Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986 | 06/03/86 | 150,000 | 50,230 | 15,535 |
| Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 | II/OS/02 | 3,440,000 | 2,512,410 | 843,745 |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND BONDS |  | \$130,782,000 | \$68,766,304 | 41,578,049 |

(a) Includes the initial value of capital appreciation bonds rather than the accreted value.
(b) A portion of unissued bonds may be issued initially in the form of commercial paper notes, as authorized from time to time by the respective Finance Committees. A total of not more than $\$ 2$ billion of commercial paper principal plus accrued interest may be owing at one time.

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING
SELF LIQUIDATING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| ENTERPRISE FUND BONDS (SELF LIQUIDATING) | VOTER AUTHORIZATION DATE | VOTER AUTHORIZATION AMOUNT | LONG TERM BONDS OUTSTANDING (a) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG TERM } \\ & \text { BONDS } \\ & \text { UNISSUED (b) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| California Water Resources Development Bond Act | II/08/60 | \$1,750,000 | \$476,915 | \$167,600 |
| Veterans Bond Act of 1984 | II/06/84 | 650,000 | 22,820 | - |
| Veterans Bond Act of 1986 | 06/03/86 | 850,000 | 173,295 | - |
| Veterans Bond Act of 1988 | 06/07/88 | 510,000 | 169,010 | - |
| Veterans Bond Act of 1990 | II/06/90 | 400,000 | 143,545 | - |
| Veterans Bond Act of 1996 | II/05/96 | 400,000 | 242,665 | - |
| Veterans Bond Act of 2000 | 11/07/00 | 500,000 | 250,890 | 238,610 |
| Veterans Bond Act of 2008 | II/04/08 | 900,000 | - | 900,000 |
| TOTAL ENTERPRISE FUND BONDS |  | 5,960,000 | 1,479,140 | 1,306,210 |

SPECIAL REVENUE FUND BONDS (SELF LIQUIDATING)

| Economic Recovery Bond Act | $04 / 10 / 04$ | $15,000,000$ | $7,939,005$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TOTAL SPECIAL REVENUE FUND BONDS | $15,000,000$ | $7,939,005$ |  |
| TOTAL SELF LIQUIDATING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS | $\$ 20,960,000$ | $\$ 9,418,145$ | - |

(a) Includes the initial value of capital appreciation bonds rather than the accreted value.
(b) A portion of unissued bonds may be issued initially in the form of commercial paper notes, as authorized from time to time by the respective Finance Committees. A total of not more than $\$ 2$ billion of commercial paper principal plus accrued interest may be owing at one time.

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

OUTSTANDING AND AUTHORIZED BUT UNISSUED BONDS
LEASE REVENUE BONDS
AS OF JUNE 30, 2010 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES | BONDS <br> OUTSTANDING | AUTHORIZED BUT <br> UNISSUED |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD |  |  |
| University of California (a) | $\$ 2,323,650$ | $\$ 46,6 \mathrm{I}$, |
| California State University | 841,785 | $93,03 \mathrm{I}$ |
| California Community Colleges | 491,600 | - |
| Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation | $2,302,400$ | $7,630,176$ |
| State Buildings (b) | $3,393,855$ | $2,064,875$ |
| Energy Efficiency Revenue Bonds (c) | 7,960 | - |
| TOTAL STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD | $9,361,250$ | $9,834,701$ |
| TOTAL OTHER STATE BUILDING LEASE-REVENUE (d) | 526,350 | - |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES | $\$ 9,887,600$ | $\$ 9,834,701$ |

(a) The Regents' obligations to the State Public Works Board are payable from lawfully available funds of The Regents which are held in The Regents' treasury funds are separate from the State General Fund. A portion of The Regents' annual budget is derived from General Fund appropriations.
(b) Includes $\$ 277$ Million Appropriated for the FI\$Cal project
(c) This program is self-liquidating based on energy cost savings.
(d) Includes $\$ 134,670,000$ Sacramento City Financing Authority Lease-Revenue Bonds State of California - Cal/EPA Building, 1998 Series A, which are supported by lease rentals from the California Environmental Protection Agency; these rental payments are subject to annual appropriation by the State Legislature.

## appendix b The State's Debt Service

## SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS FOR GENERAL OBLIGATION NON-SELF LIQUIDATING BONDS FIXED RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

|  |  | CURRENT DEBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISCAL YEAR | INTEREST (a) |  | PRINCIPAL (b) |

(a) The amounts do not reflect any interest subsidy under the Build America Bonds program. Subsidy not pledged to the repayment of debt service. (b) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments.

## SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

FOR GENERAL OBLIGATION NON-SELF LIQUIDATING BONDS
VARIABLE RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTEREST (a)(b) | PRINCIPAL (c) | TOTAL |
| 2011 | \$56,008,662.37 | \$ - | \$ $56,008,662.37$ |
| 2012 | 52,890,103.41 | - | 52,890,103.41 |
| 2013 | 52,903,898.42 | - | 52,903,898.42 |
| 2014 | 52,863,783.98 | - | 52,863,783.98 |
| 2015 | 52,863,783.98 | - | 52,863,783.98 |
| 2016 | 52,884,437.02 | 32,000,000.00 | 84,884,437.02 |
| 2017 | 52,729,88I.30 | 326,945,000.00 | 379,674,88I. 30 |
| 2018 | 51,842,654.12 | 431,245,000.00 | 483,087,654.12 |
| 2019 | 50,745,172.40 | 197,450,000.00 | 248,195,172.40 |
| 2020 | 50,191,298.46 | 184,250,000.00 | 234,44I,298.46 |
| 2021 | 49,741,104.94 | 108,600,000.00 | 158,341,104.94 |
| 2022 | 49,536,601. 87 | 58,000,000.00 | 107,536,601. 87 |
| 2023 | 49,414,731.57 | 88,200,000.00 | 137,614,731.57 |
| 2024 | 49,228,690.86 | 270,600,000.00 | 319,828,690.86 |
| 2025 | 48,717,067.09 | 174,200,000.00 | 222,917,067.09 |
| 2026 | 48,371,592.20 | 318,000,000.00 | 366,371,592.20 |
| 2027 | 47,828,330.50 | 46,100,000.00 | 93,928,330.50 |
| 2028 | 47,732,004.56 | 49,700,000.00 | 97,432,004.56 |
| 2029 | 47,620,409.34 | 87,500,000.00 | 135,120,409.34 |
| 2030 | 46,946,508.59 | 106,440,000.00 | 153,386,508.59 |
| 2031 | 45,327,757.05 | 129,335,000.00 | 174,662,757.05 |
| 2032 | 43,390,676.70 | 132,435,000.00 | 175,825,676.70 |
| 2033 | 41,445,824.43 | 135,335,000.00 | 176,780,824.43 |
| 2034 | 39,510,175.03 | 54,235,000.00 | 93,745,175.03 |
| 2035 | 37,731,323.62 | 52,635,000.00 | 90,366,323.62 |
| 2036 | 35,955,311.82 | 52,635,000.00 | 88,590,3II. 82 |
| 2037 | 34,179,263.87 | 52,635,000.00 | 86,814,263.87 |
| 2038 | 32,403,252.07 | 52,635,000.00 | 85,038,252.07 |
| 2039 | 30,627,228.22 | 557,600,000.00 | 588,227,228.22 |
| 2040 | 320,232.35 | 20,960,000.00 | 21,280,232.35 |
| TOTAL | \$I,351,951,762.16 | \$3,719,670,000.00 | \$5,071,621,762.16 |

(a) The estimate of future interest payments is based on rates in effect as of June 30, 2010. The interest rates for the daily and weekly rate bonds range from $0.10-0.90 \%$. The 2009 Stem Cell Bonds, 2009B and 2009C Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Private Placement Bonds, the 2009A Solano County Private Placement Bonds and the 2009A UC Private Placement Bonds currently bear interest at fixed rates of $5.65 \%, 3.77 \%, 3.30 \%, 3.18 \%$, and $3.183 \%$ respectively, until reset date, and are assumed to bear those rates from reset until maturity.
(b) The amounts do not reflect any interest subsidy under the Build America Bonds program. Subsidy not pledged to the repayment of debt service.
(c) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments for the 2009 Stem Cell Bonds, the Series 2009B and 2009C of the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Private Placement Bonds, the 2009A Solano County Private Placement Bonds and the 2009A UC Private Placement Bonds.

SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS FOR
SPECIAL REVENUE FUND SELF LIQUIDATING BONDS
(ECONOMIC RECOVERY BONDS)
FIXED RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTEREST | PRINCIPAL (a) | TOTAL |
| 2011 | \$315,832,132.50 | \$439,955,000.00 | \$755,787,132.50 |
| 2012 | 294,816,967.50 | 240,330,000.00 | 535,146,967.50 |
| 2013 | 278,116,960.00 | 476,470,000.00 | 754,586,960.00 |
| 2014 | 253,545,855.00 | 500,470,000.00 | 754,015,855.00 |
| 2015 | 227,360,123.75 | 525,615,000.00 | 752,975,123.75 |
| 2016 | 199,987,330.00 | 556,690,000.00 | 756,677,330.00 |
| 2017 | 172,061,875.00 | 584,210,000.00 | 756,271,875.00 |
| 2018 | 142,939,488.75 | 6I2,540,000.00 | 755,479,488.75 |
| 2019 | 113,287,497.50 | 592,955,000.00 | 706,242,497.50 |
| 2020 | 86,381,762.50 | 496,145,000.00 | 582,526,762.50 |
| 2021 | 61,485,062.50 | 507,445,000.00 | 568,930,062.50 |
| 2022 | 36,945,093.75 | 451,575,000.00 | 488,520,093.75 |
| 2023 | 12,591,250.00 | 500,000,000.00 | 512,591,250.00 |
| 2024 | 45,625.00 | 2,000,000.00 | 2,045,625.00 |
| TOTAL | \$2,195,397,023.75 | \$6,486,400,000.00 | \$8,68I,797,023.75 |

(a) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments

SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS FOR
SPECIAL REVENUE FUND SELF LIQUIDATING BONDS
(ECONOMIC RECOVERY BONDS)
VARIABLE RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTEREST (a) | PRINCIPAL (b) | TOTAL |
| 2011 | \$25,903,896.00 | \$ - | \$25,903,896.00 |
| 2012 | 25,907,188.01 | - | 25,907,188.01 |
| 2013 | 25,911,864.5I | - | 25,911,864.5I |
| 2014 | 25,898,265.74 | - | 25,898,265.74 |
| 2015 | 23,973,840.74 | - | 23,973,840.74 |
| 2016 | 22,058,338.01 | - | 22,058,338.01 |
| 2017 | 22,051,753.99 | - | 22,051,753.99 |
| 2018 | 22,055,046.00 | 25,000,000.00 | 47,055,046.00 |
| 2019 | 20,566,306.53 | II5,000,000.00 | 135,566,306.53 |
| 2020 | 14,657,077.49 | 189,500,000.00 | 204,157,077.49 |
| 2021 | 6,798,016.34 | 240,155,000.00 | 246,953,016.34 |
| 2022 | 2,611,502.96 | 219,190,000.00 | 221,801,502.96 |
| 2023 | 1,443,810.12 | 271,160,000.00 | 272,603,810.12 |
| 2024 | 105,083.84 | 392,600,000.00 | 392,705,083.84 |
| TOTAL | \$239,941,990.28 | \$1,452,605,000.00 | \$1,692,546,990.28 |

(a) The estimate of future interest payments is based on rates in effect as of June 30,2010 . The interest rates for the daily and weekly rate bonds range from $0.10-0.35 \%$. $\$ 500,000,000$ of the series 2009B Economic Recovery Bonds bear interest at fixed rates ranging from $3.50-5.00 \%$ until reset date, and are assumed to bear interest at the rate of $4.00 \%$ from each reset date to maturity.
(b) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments.

SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS
FOR ENTERPRISE FUND SELF LIQUIDATING BONDS
FIXED RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTEREST | PRINCIPAL (a) | TOTAL |
| 2011 | \$64,670,412.46 | \$86,480,000.00 | \$151,150,412.46 |
| 2012 | 60,523,753.50 | 100,080,000.00 | 160,603,753.50 |
| 2013 | 56,820,458.50 | 86,055,000.00 | 142,875,458.50 |
| 2014 | 53,240,590.00 | 107,040,000.00 | 160,280,590.00 |
| 2015 | 49,806,454.33 | 80,775,000.00 | 130,581,454.33 |
| 2016 | 46,710,240.38 | 75,620,000.00 | I22,330,240.38 |
| 2017 | 43,958,180.13 | 63,900,000.00 | 107,858,180.13 |
| 2018 | 40,890,657.39 | 74,470,000.00 | II5,360,657.39 |
| 2019 | 37,149,798.92 | 85,090,000.00 | 122,239,798.92 |
| 2020 | 33,786,877.36 | 52,590,000.00 | 86,376,877.36 |
| 2021 | 31,116,133.75 | 45,615,000.00 | 76,731,133.75 |
| 2022 | 28,773,350.03 | 41,240,000.00 | 70,013,350.03 |
| 2023 | 27,185,822.62 | 20,690,000.00 | 47,875,822.62 |
| 2024 | 26,078,422.38 | 25,145,000.00 | 51,223,422.38 |
| 2025 | 24,674,3II.7I | 32,470,000.00 | 57,144,3II.71 |
| 2026 | 23,239,696.05 | 26,825,000.00 | 50,064,696.05 |
| 2027 | 21,909,018.65 | 28,940,000.00 | 50,849,018.65 |
| 2028 | 20,514,605.30 | 29,490,000.00 | 50,004,605.30 |
| 2029 | 18,695,830.30 | 46,130,000.00 | 64,825,830.30 |
| 2030 | 16,324,896.19 | 52,400,000.00 | 68,724,896.19 |
| 2031 | 13,86I,787.28 | 50,490,000.00 | 64,351,787.28 |
| 2032 | II,371,757.50 | 53,235,000.00 | 64,606,757.50 |
| 2033 | 8,761,341.25 | 55,095,000.00 | 63,856,341.25 |
| 2034 | 6,889,425.00 | 22,940,000.00 | 29,829,425.00 |
| 2035 | 5,786,720.00 | 23,560,000.00 | 29,346,720.00 |
| 2036 | 4,731,100.00 | 21,210,000.00 | 25,941,100.00 |
| 2037 | 3,670,842.50 | 23,885,000.00 | 27,555,842.50 |
| 2038 | 2,756,210.00 | 15,590,000.00 | 18,346,210.00 |
| 2039 | 2,028,212.50 | 16,330,000.00 | 18,358,212.50 |
| 2040 | 1,257,530.00 | 17,IIO,000.00 | 18,367,530.00 |
| 2041 | 450,087.50 | 17,925,000.00 | 18,375,087.50 |
| 2042 | 28,050.00 | 350,000.00 | 378,050.00 |
| 2043 | 9,562.50 | 375,000.00 | 384,562.50 |
| TOTAL | \$787,672,135.98 | \$1,479,140,000.00 | \$2,266,8I2,135.98 |

(a) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments.

SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS
FOR STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PROPOSITION IA RECEIVABLES PROGRAM (a)
REVENUE BONDS, FIXED RATE
AS OF JUNE 30,2010

|  | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISCAL YEAR <br> ENDING JUNE 30 | INTEREST |  |  |  | PRINCIPAL | TOTAL |
| 2011 | $\$ 90,800,000.00$ |  | $\$-$ |  |  |  |
| 2012 | $90,800,000.00$ |  | $\$ 90,800,000.00$ |  |  |  |
| 2013 | $90,800,000.00$ | $1,895,000,000.00$ | $90,800,000.00$ <br> $1,985,800,000.00$ |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | $\$ 272,400,000.00$ | $\$ 1,895,000,000.00$ | $\$ 2,167,400,000.00$ |  |  |  | 6584) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code of the State of California.

## SCHEDULE OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

FOR LEASE-REVENUE BONDS
FIXED RATE, AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | CURRENT DEBT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTEREST (a) | PRINCIPAL (b) | TOTAL |
| 2011 | \$512,520,374.16 | \$460,470,000.00 | \$972,990,374.16 |
| 2012 | 495,875,683.49 | 456,785,000.00 | 952,660,683.49 |
| 2013 | 473,550,326.05 | 483,720,000.00 | 957,270,326.05 |
| 2014 | 449,223,020.20 | 510,475,000.00 | 959,698,020.20 |
| 2015 | 423,393,890.32 | 535,190,000.00 | 958,583,890.32 |
| 2016 | 396,623,581. 88 | 525,545,000.00 | 922,168,581. 88 |
| 2017 | 369,804,676.59 | 538,170,000.00 | 907,974,676.59 |
| 2018 | 342,611,419.67 | 559,140,000.00 | 901,751,419.67 |
| 2019 | 314,649,639.45 | 528,080,000.00 | 842,729,639.45 |
| 2020 | 287,918,642.71 | 508,940,000.00 | 796,858,642.71 |
| 2021 | 263,296,001. 20 | 457,430,000.00 | 720,726,001.20 |
| 2022 | 239,730,203.33 | 440,100,000.00 | 679,830,203.33 |
| 2023 | 218,309,540.75 | 400,850,000.00 | 619,159,540.75 |
| 2024 | 198,317,716.13 | 327,230,000.00 | 525,547,716.13 |
| 2025 | 181,094,870.06 | 344,460,000.00 | 525,554,870.06 |
| 2026 | 163,234,543.32 | 344,535,000.00 | 507,769,543.32 |
| 2027 | 144,390,317.60 | 363,370,000.00 | 507,760,317.60 |
| 2028 | 124,442,938.38 | 367,595,000.00 | 492,037,938.38 |
| 2029 | 104,835,813.79 | 319,840,000.00 | 424,675,813.79 |
| 2030 | 86,992,738.82 | 300,625,000.00 | 387,617,738.82 |
| 2031 | 70,057,388.41 | 255,565,000.00 | 325,622,388.4I |
| 2032 | 54,587,907.75 | 239,695,000.00 | 294,282,907.75 |
| 2033 | 39,039,859.95 | 229,840,000.00 | 268,879,859.95 |
| 2034 | 23,594,827.23 | 211,880,000.00 | 235,474,827.23 |
| 2035 | 8,504,034.62 | 178,070,000.00 | 186,574,034.62 |
| TOTAL | \$5,986,599,955. 86 | \$9,887,600,000.00 | \$15,874,199,955.86 |

(a) The amounts do not reflect any interest subsidy under the Build America Bonds program. Subsidy not pledged to the repayment of debt service.
(b) Includes scheduled mandatory sinking fund payments.

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA ESTIMATED DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

 ON INTENDED SALES OF AUTHORIZED BUT UNISSUED BONDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 20I0-II AND 20II-I2| FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2010-11 } \\ \text { GO SALES } \\ \text { DEBT SERVICE } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2011-12 <br> GO SALES <br> DEBT SERVICE | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2010-11 } \\ \text { LRB SALES } \\ \text { DEBT SERVICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2011-12 } \\ \text { LRB SALES } \\ \text { DEBT SERVICE } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL DEBT SERVICE ALL SALES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | \$173,250,000 | \$ - | \$20,554,525 | \$ - | \$193,804,525 |
| 2012 | 914,806,988 | 155,059,500 | 123,150,975 | 58,450,425 | 1,251,467,888 |
| 2013 | 721,307,513 | 594,163,500 | 123,158,085 | 192,714,125 | 1,631,343,223 |
| 2014 | 914,803,563 | 724,427,900 | 123,151,548 | 192,717,735 | 1,955,100,745 |
| 2015 | 914,806,488 | 724,428,450 | 123,154,390 | 192,719,960 | 1,955,109,288 |
| 2016 | 914,806,288 | 724,432,150 | 123,144,323 | 192,714,085 | 1,955,096,845 |
| 2017 | 914,806,375 | 724,429,000 | 123,147,963 | 192,717,735 | 1,955,101,073 |
| 2018 | 914,803,625 | 724,427,650 | 123,151,503 | 192,716,885 | 1,955,099,663 |
| 2019 | 914,802,225 | 724,429,050 | 123,155,401 | 192,712,180 | 1,955,098,856 |
| 2020 | 914,809,125 | 724,427,350 | 123,150,349 | 192,713,275 | 1,955,100,099 |
| 2021 | 914,803,588 | 724,429,750 | 123,150,963 | 192,713,505 | 1,955,097,805 |
| 2022 | 914,803,200 | 724,430,600 | 123,155,734 | 192,715,050 | 1,955,104,584 |
| 2023 | 914,806,738 | 724,427,300 | 123,143,023 | 192,714,100 | 1,955,091,160 |
| 2024 | 914,805,588 | 724,429,700 | 123,150,075 | 192,715,525 | 1,955,100,888 |
| 2025 | 914,803,038 | 724,429,200 | 123,148,045 | 192,717,875 | 1,955,098,158 |
| 2026 | 914,804,288 | 724,430,100 | 123,152,451 | 192,713,050 | 1,955,099,889 |
| 2027 | 914,805,588 | 724,427,950 | 123,157,448 | 192,711,795 | 1,955,102,780 |
| 2028 | 914,805,100 | 724,425,450 | 123,147,24I | 192,712,875 | 1,955,090,666 |
| 2029 | 914,807,038 | 724,431,550 | 123,149,126 | 192,713,240 | 1,955,100,954 |
| 2030 | 914,806,250 | 724,426,150 | I23,148,879 | 192,713,025 | 1,955,094,304 |
| 2031 | 914,803,938 | 724,431,000 | 123,146,640 | 192,715,220 | 1,955,096,798 |
| 2032 | 914,806,225 | 724,427,900 | 123,145,989 | 192,716,000 | 1,955,096,114 |
| 2033 | 914,804,738 | 724,424,900 | 123,148,603 | 192,713,900 | 1,955,092,140 |
| 2034 | 914,806,025 | 724,424,800 | 123,154,880 | 192,715,310 | 1,955,101,015 |
| 2035 | 914,806,013 | 724,430,450 | 123,149,016 | 192,713,650 | 1,955,099,129 |
| 2036 | 914,810,425 | 724,429,150 | 123,148,054 | 192,714,700 | 1,955,102,329 |
| 2037 | 914,808,638 | 724,428,400 | - | 192,716,435 | 1,831,953,473 |
| 2038 | 914,809,125 | 724,429,100 | - | - | 1,639,238,225 |
| 2039 | 914,803,600 | 724,425,850 | - | - | 1,639,229,450 |
| 2040 | 914,806,600 | 724,426,800 | - | - | 1,639,233,400 |
| 2041 | 914,800,200 | 724,427,600 | - | - | 1,639,227,800 |
| 2042 | - | 724,431,250 | - | - | 724,431,250 |
| TOTAL: | \$27,423,918,125 | \$21,757,649,500 | \$3,099,315,225 | \$4,876,321,660 | \$57,157,204,510 |
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[^0]:    1 The Proposition 1A Receivables bonds were issued by the California Statewide Communities Development Authority pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 6584) of Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code of the State of California.
    ${ }^{2}$ Debt obligations not included in Figure 5: Any short-term obligations such as commercial paper, revenue anticipation notes or revenue anticipation warrants; revenue bonds issued by state agencies which are repaid from specific revenues outside of the General Fund; and "conduit" bonds, such as those issued by state financing authorities on behalf of other governmental or private entities whose obligations secure the bonds.

[^1]:    3 Debt issuances not included in Figure 6: Any short-term obligations such as commercial paper, revenue anticipation notes or revenue anticipation warrants; revenue bonds issued by state agencies which are repaid from specific revenues outside of the General Fund; and "conduit" bonds, such as those issued by state financing authorities on behalf of other governmental or private entities whose obligations secure the bonds.

[^2]:    4 Reflects interest subsidies received under the BABs program.
    5 Reflects interest subsidies received under the BABs program.
    6 Excludes Special Fund bonds, for which debt service each year is paid from dedicated funds. Ratio reflects debt service from only a portion of the bond sales listed in Figure 6 . For example, $\$ 6.3$ billion of the $\$ 13$ billion in general obligation bonds planned for fiscal year 2010-11 will be sold during the first half of the fiscal year. These bonds will have interest payments in the second half of the fiscal year. The remaining $\$ 6.7$ billion in general obligation bonds will not have a debt service payment during the 2010-11 fiscal year and will therefore not affect the ratio. The lease revenue bond sales planned for the spring of fiscal year 2010-11 also are not expected to have any net debt service payments during fiscal year 2010-11. When the debt service on the Economic Recovery Bonds (ERB's) is added to General Fund-supported debt service and the revenue from the quarter-cent sales tax (that is dedicated for payment of the ERB's) is added to General Fund revenues, the resulting ratio of debt service to General Fund revenues increases to 7.77 percent in 2009-10 and 7.92 percent in 2010-11.

