

---

GENERAL GOVERNMENT SECURITIES MONEY MARKET FUND  
GENERAL MONEY MARKET FUND, INC.  
GENERAL TREASURY PRIME MONEY MARKET FUND  
GENERAL CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL MONEY MARKET FUND  
GENERAL MUNICIPAL MONEY MARKET FUND  
GENERAL NEW YORK MUNICIPAL MONEY MARKET FUND  
(*CLASS A AND CLASS B SHARES*)

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
APRIL 1, 2008  
AS REVISED, AUGUST 27, 2008

---

This Statement of Additional Information, which is not a prospectus, supplements and should be read in conjunction with the current combined Prospectus for Class A or Class B shares of General Government Securities Money Market Fund (the "Government Money Fund"), General Money Market Fund, Inc. (the "Money Fund"), General Treasury Prime Money Market Fund (the "Treasury Money Fund"), General California Municipal Money Market Fund (the "California Municipal Fund"), General Municipal Money Market Fund (the "National Municipal Fund") and General New York Municipal Money Market Fund (the "New York Municipal Fund") (each, a "Fund" and collectively, the "Funds"), dated April 1, 2008, as the Prospectus may be revised from time to time. To obtain a copy of the Prospectus for Class A or Class B shares of a Fund, please call your financial adviser, write to the Fund at 144 Glenn Curtiss Boulevard, Uniondale, New York 11556-0144, visit [www.dreyfus.com](http://www.dreyfus.com), or call one of the following numbers:

Call Toll Free 1-800-645-6561  
In New York City -- Call 1-718-895-1396  
Outside the U.S. -- Call 516-794-5452

The most recent Annual and Semi-Annual Report to Shareholders of each Fund are separate documents supplied with this Statement of Additional Information, and the financial statements, accompanying notes and reports of the independent registered public accounting firm appearing in the Annual Report are incorporated by reference into this Statement of Additional Information. When requesting a copy of this Statement of Additional Information, you will receive the report(s) for the Fund(s) in which you are a shareholder.

**Each Fund is a separate investment portfolio with operations and results that are unrelated to those of each other Fund. The Government Money Fund and the Treasury Money Fund are separate series of General Government Securities Money Market Funds, Inc. (the "Government Company"). The National Municipal Fund is a series of General Municipal Money Market Funds, Inc. (the "Municipal Company"). This combined Statement of Additional Information has been provided for your convenience to provide you with the opportunity to consider six investment choices in one document.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Description of the Funds .....	B-3
Management of the Funds .....	B-20
Management Arrangements .....	B-29
How to Buy Shares .....	B-32
Service Plan and Distribution Plan .....	B-35
Shareholder Services Plans .....	B-37
How to Redeem Shares .....	B-39
Shareholder Services .....	B-41
Determination of Net Asset Value .....	B-45
Dividends, Distributions and Taxes .....	B-46
Portfolio Transactions .....	B-48
Information About the Funds .....	B-51
Counsel and Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm .....	B-56
Appendix A .....	B-57
Appendix B .....	B-60
Appendix C .....	B-65
Appendix D .....	B-97

## DESCRIPTION OF THE FUNDS

Each of the Government Company, the Money Fund and the Municipal Company is a Maryland corporation formed on April 8, 1982, April 8, 1982 and May 15, 1981, respectively. Each of the California Municipal Fund and the New York Municipal Fund is a Massachusetts business trust that commenced operations on March 10, 1987 and December 2, 1986, respectively.

Each Fund is an open-end management investment company, known as a money market mutual fund. Each of the Government Money Fund, the Money Fund, the Treasury Money Fund and the National Municipal Fund is a diversified fund, which means that, with respect to 75% of its total assets, the Fund will not invest more than 5% of its assets in the securities of any single issuer, nor hold more than 10% of the outstanding voting securities of any single issuer (other than, in each case, securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities). Each other Fund is a non-diversified fund, which means that the proportion of the Fund's assets that may be invested in the securities of a single issuer is not limited by the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act").

The Dreyfus Corporation (the "Manager" or "Dreyfus") serves as each Fund's investment adviser.

MBSC Securities Corporation (the "Distributor") is the distributor of each Fund's shares.

### Certain Portfolio Securities

The following information supplements and should be read in conjunction with the Funds' Prospectus.

U.S. Government Securities. (Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund) The Treasury Money Fund normally invests at least 80% of the value of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in U.S. Treasury securities. The Government Money Fund normally invests at least 80% of the value of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes), and the Money Fund may invest, in securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government or its agencies or instrumentalities. U.S. Government securities include Treasury securities that differ in their interest rates, maturities and times of issuance. Some obligations issued or guaranteed by U.S. Government agencies and instrumentalities are supported by the full faith and credit of the Treasury; others by the right of the issuer to borrow from the Treasury; others by discretionary authority of the U.S. Government to purchase certain obligations of the agency or instrumentality; and others only by the credit of the agency or instrumentality. These securities bear fixed, floating or variable rates of interest. Interest may fluctuate based on generally recognized reference rates or the relationship of rates. While the U.S. Government currently provides financial support to such U.S. Government-sponsored agencies or instrumentalities, no assurance can be given that it will always do so, since it is not so obligated by law.

Repurchase Agreements. (Government Money Fund and Money Fund) Each of these Funds may enter into repurchase agreements. In a repurchase agreement, the Fund buys, and the seller agrees to repurchase, a security at a mutually agreed upon time and price. The repurchase agreement thereby determines the yield during the purchaser's holding period, while the seller's obligation to repurchase is secured by the value of the underlying security. The Fund's custodian or sub-custodian engaged in

connection with tri-party repurchase agreement transactions will have custody of, and will segregate, securities acquired by such Fund under a repurchase agreement. In connection with its third-party repurchase transactions, the Fund will engage only eligible sub-custodians that meet the requirements set forth in section 17(f) of the 1940 Act. Repurchase agreements are considered by the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") to be loans by the Fund entering into them. Repurchase agreements could involve risks in the event of a default or insolvency of the other party to the agreement, including possible delays or restrictions upon a Fund's ability to dispose of the underlying securities. Each of these Funds may engage in repurchase agreement transactions that are collateralized by U.S. Government securities (which are deemed to be "collateralized fully" pursuant to the 1940 Act) or collateralized by securities other than U.S. Government securities, such as corporate bonds, asset-backed securities and privately-issued mortgage-related securities, of investment grade or below investment grade credit quality ("corporate collateral"). Transactions that are collateralized fully enable the Fund to look to the collateral for diversification purposes under the 1940 Act. Conversely, transactions secured with credit collateral require the Fund to look to the counterparty to the repurchase agreement for determining diversification. Because credit collateral is subject to certain credit and liquidity risks that U.S. Government securities are not subject to, the amount of collateral posted in excess of the principal value of the repurchase agreement is expected to be higher in the case of repurchase agreements secured with U.S. Government securities. Fixed income securities rated Baa/BBB or higher by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's"), Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ("S&P") or Fitch Ratings ("Fitch") are known as investment grade bonds. Investment grade and below investment grade bonds involve degrees of credit risk, which relate to the likelihood that the bond issuer will pay interest and repay principal on a timely basis. Fixed income securities rated Ba/BB or lower by Moody's, S&P and Fitch are regarded as below investment grade (i.e., "junk" bonds) and are considered speculative in terms of the issuer's creditworthiness. Up to 20% of the value of Government Money Fund's net assets may consist of repurchase agreements collateralized by corporate collateral. In an attempt to reduce the risk of incurring a loss on a repurchase agreement, the Fund will require that additional securities be deposited with it if the value of the securities purchased should decrease below the resale price.

Bank Obligations. (Money Fund) The Money Fund may purchase certificates of deposit, time deposits, bankers' acceptances and other short-term obligations issued by domestic banks, foreign subsidiaries or foreign branches of domestic banks, domestic and foreign branches of foreign banks, domestic savings and loan associations and other banking institutions.

Certificates of deposit ("CDs") are negotiable certificates evidencing the obligation of a bank to repay funds deposited with it for a specified period of time.

Time deposits ("TDs") are non-negotiable deposits maintained in a banking institution for a specified period of time (in no event longer than seven days) at a stated interest rate.

Bankers' acceptances are credit instruments evidencing the obligation of a bank to pay a draft drawn on it by a customer. These instruments reflect the obligation both of the bank and the drawer to pay the face amount of the instrument upon maturity. The other short-term obligations may include uninsured, direct obligations bearing fixed, floating or variable interest rates.

As a result of Federal and state laws and regulations, domestic banks whose CDs may be purchased by the Fund are, among other things, generally required to maintain specified levels of reserves, and are subject to other supervision and regulation designed to promote financial soundness.

Domestic commercial banks organized under Federal law are supervised and examined by the Comptroller of the Currency and are required to be members of the Federal Reserve System and to have their deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the "FDIC"). Domestic banks organized under state law are supervised and examined by state banking authorities but are members of the Federal Reserve System only if they elect to join. In addition, state banks whose CDs may be purchased by the Money Fund are insured by the Bank Insurance Fund administered by the FDIC (although such insurance may not be of material benefit to the Fund, depending upon the principal amount of the CDs of each bank held by the Fund) and are subject to Federal examination and to a substantial body of Federal law and regulation. However, not all of such laws and regulations apply to the foreign branches of domestic banks.

Obligations of foreign branches of domestic banks, foreign subsidiaries of domestic banks and domestic and foreign branches of foreign banks may be general obligations of the parent banks in addition to the issuing branch, or may be limited by the terms of a specific obligation and governmental regulation. Such obligations are subject to different risks than are those of domestic banks. These risks include foreign economic and political developments, foreign governmental restrictions that may adversely affect payment of principal and interest on the obligations, foreign exchange controls and foreign withholding and other taxes on interest income. These foreign branches and subsidiaries are not necessarily subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements as apply to domestic banks, such as mandatory reserve requirements, loan limitations, and accounting, auditing and financial recordkeeping requirements. In addition, less information may be publicly available about a foreign branch of a domestic bank or about a foreign bank than about a domestic bank.

Obligations of United States branches of foreign banks may be general obligations of the parent bank in addition to the issuing branch, or may be limited by the terms of a specific obligation or by Federal and state regulation as well as governmental action in the country in which the foreign bank has its head office. A domestic branch of a foreign bank with assets in excess of \$1 billion may be subject to reserve requirements imposed by the Federal Reserve System or by the state in which the branch is located if the branch is licensed in that state.

In addition, Federal branches licensed by the Comptroller of the Currency and branches licensed by certain states ("State Branches") may be required to: (1) pledge to the regulator, by depositing assets with a designated bank within the state, a certain percentage of their assets as fixed from time to time by the appropriate regulatory authority; and (2) maintain assets within the state in an amount equal to a specified percentage of the aggregate amount of liabilities of the foreign bank payable at or through all of its agencies or branches within the state. The deposits of Federal or State Branches generally must be insured by the FDIC if such branches take deposits of less than \$100,000.

In view of the foregoing factors associated with the purchase of CDs and TDs issued by foreign branches of domestic banks, by foreign subsidiaries of domestic banks, by foreign branches of foreign banks or by domestic branches of foreign banks, the Manager carefully evaluates such investments on a case-by-case basis.

The Fund may purchase CDs issued by banks, savings and loan associations and similar thrift institutions with less than \$1 billion in assets, the deposits of which are insured by the FDIC, provided the Fund purchases any such CD in a principal amount of no more than \$100,000, which amount would be fully insured by the Bank Insurance Fund or the Savings Association Insurance Fund

administered by the FDIC. Interest payments on such a CD are not insured by the FDIC. The Fund will not own more than one such CD per such issuer.

Commercial Paper. (Money Fund) The Money Fund may purchase commercial paper consisting of short-term, unsecured promissory notes issued to finance short-term credit needs. The commercial paper purchased by the Fund will consist only of direct obligations issued by domestic and foreign entities. The other corporate obligations in which the Fund may invest consist of high quality, U.S. dollar denominated short-term bonds and notes (including variable amount master demand notes) issued by domestic and foreign corporations, including banks.

Floating and Variable Rate Obligations. (Money Fund) The Money Fund may purchase floating and variable rate demand notes and bonds, which are obligations ordinarily having stated maturities in excess of 13 months, but which permit the holder to demand payment of principal at any time, or at specified intervals not exceeding 13 months, in each case upon not more than 30 days' notice. Variable rate demand notes include master demand notes which are obligations that permit the Fund to invest fluctuating amounts, at varying rates of interest, pursuant to direct arrangements between the Fund, as lender, and the borrower. These obligations permit daily changes in the amounts borrowed. Because these obligations are direct lending arrangements between the lender and borrower, it is not contemplated that such instruments generally will be traded, and there generally is no established secondary market for these obligations, although they are redeemable at face value, plus accrued interest. Accordingly, where these obligations are not secured by letters of credit or other credit support arrangements, the Fund's right to redeem is dependent on the ability of the borrower to pay principal and interest on demand.

Participation Interests. (Money Fund) The Money Fund may purchase from financial institutions participation interests in securities in which the Fund may invest. A participation interest gives the Fund an undivided interest in the security in the proportion that the Fund's participation interest bears to the total principal amount of the security. These instruments may have fixed, floating or variable rates of interest, with remaining maturities of 13 months or less. If the participation interest is unrated, or has been given a rating below that which is permissible for purchase by the Fund, the participation interest will be backed by an irrevocable letter of credit or guarantee of a bank, or the payment obligation otherwise will be collateralized by U.S. Government securities, or, in the case of unrated participation interests, the Manager must have determined that the instrument is of comparable quality to those instruments in which the Fund may invest.

Asset-Backed Securities. (Money Fund) The Money Fund may purchase asset-backed securities, which are securities issued by special purpose entities whose primary assets consist of a pool of mortgages, loans, receivables or other assets. Payment of principal and interest may depend largely on the cash flows generated by the assets backing the securities and, in certain cases, supported by letters of credit, surety bonds or other forms of credit or liquidity enhancements. The value of these asset-backed securities also may be affected by the creditworthiness of the servicing agent for the pool of assets, the originator of the loans or receivables or the financial institution providing the credit support.

Municipal Obligations. (California Municipal Fund, National Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund (collectively, the "Municipal Funds")) As a fundamental policy, each Municipal Fund normally invests at least 80% of the value of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in debt securities issued by states, territories and possessions of the United States and the

District of Columbia and their political subdivisions, agencies and instrumentalities, or multistate agencies or authorities, and certain other specified securities, the interest from which is, in the opinion of bond counsel to the issuer, exempt from Federal and, with respect to the California Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund, California State and New York State and New York City, respectively, personal income taxes (collectively, "Municipal Obligations"). Municipal Obligations generally include debt obligations issued to obtain funds for various public purposes as well as certain industrial development bonds issued by or on behalf of public authorities. Municipal Obligations are classified as general obligation bonds, revenue bonds and notes. General obligation bonds are secured by the issuer's pledge of its full faith, credit and taxing power for the payment of principal and interest. Revenue bonds are payable from the revenue derived from a particular facility or class of facilities or, in some cases, from the proceeds of a special excise or other specific revenue source, but not from the general taxing power. Tax exempt industrial development bonds, in most cases, are revenue bonds that do not carry the pledge of the credit of the issuing municipality, but generally are guaranteed by the corporate entity on whose behalf they are issued. Notes are short-term instruments which are obligations of the issuing municipalities or agencies and are sold in anticipation of a bond sale, collection of taxes or receipt of other revenues. Municipal Obligations include municipal lease/purchase agreements which are similar to installment purchase contracts for property or equipment issued by municipalities. Municipal Obligations bear fixed, floating or variable rates of interest.

With respect to the National Municipal Fund, for the purpose of diversification under the 1940 Act, the identification of the issuer of Municipal Obligations depends on the terms and conditions of the security. When the assets and revenues of an agency, authority, instrumentality or other political subdivision are separate from those of the government creating the subdivision and the security is backed only by the assets and revenues of the subdivision, such subdivision would be deemed to be the sole issuer. Similarly, in the case of an industrial development bond, if that bond is backed only by the assets and revenues of the non-governmental user, then such non-governmental user would be deemed to be the sole issuer. If, however, in either case, the creating government or some other entity guarantees a security, such a guaranty would be considered a separate security and will be treated as an issue of such government or other entity.

The yields on Municipal Obligations are dependent on a variety of factors, including general economic and monetary conditions, money market factors, conditions in the Municipal Obligations market, size of a particular offering, maturity of the obligation and rating of the issue.

Municipal Obligations include certain private activity bonds (a type of revenue bond), the income from which is subject to the alternative minimum tax ("AMT"). Each Municipal Fund may invest without limitation in such Municipal Obligations if the Manager determines that their purchase is consistent with the Municipal Fund's investment objective.

Certain Tax Exempt Obligations. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may purchase floating and variable rate demand notes and bonds, which are tax exempt obligations ordinarily having stated maturities in excess of 13 months, but which permit the holder to demand payment of principal at any time or at specified intervals not exceeding 13 months, in each case upon not more than 30 days' notice. Variable rate demand notes include master demand notes which are obligations that permit the Fund to invest fluctuating amounts, at varying rates of interest, pursuant to direct arrangements between the Fund, as lender, and the borrower. These obligations permit daily changes in the amount borrowed. Because these obligations are direct lending arrangements between the lender and

borrower, it is not contemplated that such instruments generally will be traded, and there generally is no established secondary market for these obligations, although they are redeemable at face value, plus accrued interest. Accordingly, where these obligations are not secured by letters of credit or other credit support arrangements, the Fund's right to redeem is dependent on the ability of the borrower to pay principal and interest on demand. Each obligation purchased by the Fund will meet the quality criteria established for the purchase of Municipal Obligations.

Derivative Products. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may purchase various derivative products whose value is tied to underlying Municipal Obligations. A Municipal Fund will purchase only those derivative products that are consistent with its investment objective and policies and comply with the quality, maturity and diversification standards of Rule 2a-7 under the 1940 Act. The principal types of derivative products are described below.

(1) Tax Exempt Participation Interests. Tax exempt participation interests (such as industrial development bonds and municipal lease/purchase agreements) give the Fund an undivided interest in a Municipal Obligation in the proportion that the Fund's participation interest bears to the total principal amount of the Municipal Obligation. Participation interests may have fixed, floating or variable rates of interest, and are frequently backed by an irrevocable letter of credit or guarantee of a bank.

(2) Tender Option Bonds. Tender option bonds grant the holder an option to tender an underlying Municipal Obligation at par plus accrued interest at specified intervals to a financial institution that acts as a liquidity provider. The holder of a tender option bond effectively holds a demand obligation that bears interest at the prevailing short-term tax-exempt rate.

(3) Custodial Receipts. In a typical custodial receipt arrangement, an issuer of a Municipal Obligation deposits it with a custodian in exchange for two classes of custodial receipts. One class has the characteristics of a typical auction rate security, where at specified intervals its interest rate is adjusted and ownership changes. The other class's interest rate also is adjusted, but inversely to changes in the interest rate of the first class.

(4) Structured Notes. Structured notes typically are purchased in privately negotiated transactions from financial institutions and, therefore, may not have an active trading market. When the Fund purchases a structured note, it will make a payment of principal to the counterparty. Some structured notes have a guaranteed repayment of principal while others place a portion (or all) of the principal at risk. The possibility of default by the counterparty or its credit provider may be greater for structured notes than for other types of money market instruments.

Ratings of Municipal Obligations. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may invest only in those Municipal Obligations which are rated in one of the two highest rating categories for debt obligations by at least two rating organizations (or one rating organization if the instrument was rated by only one such organization) or, if unrated, are of comparable quality as determined by the Manager in accordance with procedures established by the Fund's Board.

The average distribution of each Municipal Fund's investments (at value) in Municipal Obligations (including notes) by ratings as of the fiscal year ended November 30, 2007, computed on a monthly basis, was as follows:



Fitch	or	Moody's	or	S&P	Percentage of Value		
					California Municipal Fund	National Municipal Fund	New York Municipal Fund
F1+/F1		VMIG1/MIG1, P1		SP1+/SP1, A1+/A1	95.4%	86.9%	81.6%
F2+/F2		VMIG2/MIG2, P2		SP2+/SP2	--	--	--
AAA/AA		Aaa/Aa		AAA/AA	4.5%	3.6%	1.4%
Not Rated		Not Rated		Not Rated	<u>0.1%*</u>	<u>9.5%*</u>	<u>17.0%*</u>
					<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

If, subsequent to its purchase by a Fund, (a) an issue of rated Municipal Obligations ceases to be rated in the highest rating category by at least two rating organizations (or one rating organization if the instrument was rated by only one such organization) or the Fund's Board determines that it is no longer of comparable quality or (b) the Manager becomes aware that any portfolio security not so highly rated or any unrated security has been given a rating by any rating organization below the rating organization's second highest rating category, the Fund's Board will reassess promptly whether such security presents minimal credit risk and will cause the Fund to take such action as it determines is in the best interest of the Fund and its shareholders; provided that the reassessment required by clause (b) is not required if the portfolio security is disposed of or matures within five business days of the Manager becoming aware of the new rating and the Fund's Board is subsequently notified of the Manager's actions.

To the extent that the ratings given by Moody's, S&P or Fitch (collectively, the "Rating Agencies") for Municipal Obligations may change as a result of changes in such organizations or their rating systems, each Fund will attempt to use comparable ratings as standards for its investments in accordance with its stated investment policies described in the Funds' Prospectus and this Statement of Additional Information. The ratings of the Rating Agencies represent their opinions as to the quality of the Municipal Obligations which they undertake to rate. It should be emphasized, however, that ratings are relative and subjective and are not absolute standards of quality. Although these ratings may be an initial criterion for selection of portfolio investments, the Manager also will evaluate these securities and the creditworthiness of the issuers of such securities.

**Taxable Investments.** (Municipal Funds) From time to time, on a temporary basis other than for temporary defensive purposes (but not to exceed 20% of the value of the Fund's net assets) or for temporary defensive purposes, each Municipal Fund may invest in taxable short-term investments ("Taxable Investments") consisting of: notes of issuers having, at the time of purchase, a quality rating within the two highest grades of a Rating Agency; obligations of the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities; commercial paper rated not lower than P-2 by Moody's, A-2 by S&P or F-2 by Fitch; certificates of deposit of U.S. domestic banks, including foreign branches of domestic banks, with assets of \$1 billion or more; time deposits; bankers' acceptances and other short-term bank obligations; and repurchase agreements in respect of any of the foregoing. Dividends paid by the Fund that are attributable to income earned by the Fund from Taxable Investments will be taxable to investors. Except for temporary defensive purposes, at no time will more than 20% of the value of the Fund's net assets be invested in Taxable Investments. If the Fund purchases Taxable Investments, it will value them using the amortized cost method and comply with the provisions of Rule 2a-7 relating to purchases of taxable instruments. When the California Municipal Fund or the New York Municipal

\* Included in the Not Rated category are securities which, while not rated, have been determined by the Manager to be of comparable quality to securities in the VMIG1/MIG1 or SP-1+/SP-1 rating categories.

Fund has adopted a temporary defensive position, including when acceptable California or New York Municipal Obligations, respectively, are unavailable for investment by the relevant Fund, in excess of 20% of the Fund's net assets may be invested in securities that are not exempt from California or New York State and New York City income taxes, respectively. Under normal market conditions, each Municipal Fund anticipates that not more than 5% of the value of its total assets will be invested in any one category of Taxable Investments.

Investment Companies. (Municipal Funds) Each Fund may invest in securities issued by other investment companies. Under the 1940 Act, the Fund's investment in such securities, subject to certain exceptions, currently is limited to (i) 3% of the total voting stock of any one investment company, (ii) 5% of the Fund's total assets with respect to any one investment company and (iii) 10% of the Fund's total assets in the aggregate. As a shareholder of another investment company, the Fund would bear, along with other shareholders, its pro rata portion of the other investment company's expenses, including advisory fees. These expenses would be in addition to the advisory fees and other expenses that the Fund bears directly in connection with its own operations. The Fund also may invest its uninvested cash reserves in shares of one or more money market funds advised by the Manager. Such investments will not be subject to the limitations described above.

Illiquid Securities. (All Funds) Each Fund may invest up to 10% of the value of its net assets in securities as to which a liquid trading market does not exist, provided such investments are consistent with the Fund's investment objective. These securities may include securities that are not readily marketable, such as securities that are subject to legal or contractual restrictions on resale, and repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice. As to these securities, the Fund is subject to a risk that should the Fund desire to sell them when a ready buyer is not available at a price the Fund deems representative of their value, the value of the Fund's net assets could be adversely affected.

### Investment Techniques

In addition to the principal investment strategies discussed in the Funds' Prospectus, the Funds also may engage in the investment techniques described below.

Borrowing Money. (All Funds) Each Municipal Fund is permitted to borrow to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act, which permits an investment company to borrow in an amount up to 33-1/3% of the value of its total assets. Each Municipal Fund currently intends to, and each other Fund may, borrow money from banks for temporary or emergency (not leveraging) purposes in an amount up to 15% of the value of its total assets (including the amount borrowed) valued at the lesser of cost or market, less liabilities (not including the amount borrowed) at the time the borrowing is made. While such borrowings exceed 5% of the value of a Fund's total assets, the Fund will not make any additional investments.

Stand-By Commitments. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may acquire "stand-by commitments" with respect to Municipal Obligations held in its portfolio. Under a stand-by commitment, the Fund obligates a broker, dealer or bank to repurchase, at the Fund's option, specified securities at a specified price and, in this respect, stand-by commitments are comparable to put options. The exercise of a stand-by commitment, therefore, is subject to the ability of the seller to make payment on demand. A Municipal Fund will acquire stand-by commitments solely to facilitate its portfolio liquidity and does not intend to exercise its rights thereunder for trading purposes. The Fund

may pay for stand-by commitments if such action is deemed necessary, thus increasing to a degree the cost of the underlying Municipal Obligation and similarly decreasing such security's yield to investors. Gains realized in connection with stand-by commitments will be taxable.

Forward Commitments. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may purchase Municipal Obligations and other securities on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery basis, which means that delivery and payment take place in the future after the date of the commitment to purchase. The payment obligation and the interest rate receivable on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery security are fixed when the Fund enters into the commitment, but the Fund does not make payment until it receives delivery from the counterparty. A Fund will commit to purchase such securities only with the intention of actually acquiring the securities, but the Fund may sell these securities before the settlement date if it is deemed advisable. Each Municipal Fund will segregate permissible liquid assets at least equal at all times to the amount of its purchase commitments.

Municipal Obligations and other securities purchased on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery basis are subject to changes in value (generally changing in the same way, i.e., appreciating when interest rates decline and depreciating when interest rates rise) based upon the public's perception of the creditworthiness of the issuer and changes, real or anticipated, in the level of interest rates. Securities purchased on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery basis may expose a Fund to risks because they may experience such fluctuations prior to their actual delivery. Purchasing securities on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery basis can involve the additional risk that the yield available in the market when the delivery takes place actually may be higher than that obtained in the transaction itself. Purchasing securities on a forward commitment, when-issued or delayed-delivery basis when a Fund is fully or almost fully invested may result in greater potential fluctuation in the value of the Fund's net assets and its net asset value per share.

#### Certain Investment Considerations and Risks

General. Each Fund attempts to increase yields by trading to take advantage of short-term market variations. This policy is expected to result in high portfolio turnover but should not adversely affect the Funds since the Funds usually do not pay brokerage commissions when purchasing short-term obligations. The value of the portfolio securities held by a Fund will vary inversely to changes in prevailing interest rates. Thus, if interest rates have increased from the time a security was purchased, such security, if sold, might be sold at a price less than its purchase cost. Similarly, if interest rates have declined from the time a security was purchased, such security, if sold, might be sold at a price greater than its purchase cost. In either instance, if the security was purchased at face value and held to maturity, no gain or loss would be realized.

Even though interest-bearing securities are investments which promise a stable stream of income, the prices of such securities are inversely affected by changes in interest rates and, therefore, are subject to the risk of market price fluctuations. The values of fixed-income securities also may be affected by changes in the credit rating or financial condition of the issuing entities. Each Fund seeks to maintain a stable \$1.00 share price.

Bank Securities. (Money Fund) To the extent the Money Fund's investments are concentrated in the banking industry, the Fund will have correspondingly greater exposure to the risk factors which

are characteristic of such investments. Sustained increases in interest rates can adversely affect the availability or liquidity and cost of capital funds for a bank's lending activities, and a deterioration in general economic conditions could increase the exposure to credit losses. In addition, the value of and the investment return on the Fund's shares could be affected by economic or regulatory developments in or related to the banking industry, which industry also is subject to the effects of competition within the banking industry as well as with other types of financial institutions. The Fund, however, will seek to minimize its exposure to such risks by investing only in debt securities which are determined to be of high quality.

Foreign Securities. (Money Fund) Since the Money Fund's portfolio may contain U.S. dollar denominated securities issued by foreign governments, or any of their political subdivisions, agencies or instrumentalities, and by foreign subsidiaries and foreign branches of domestic banks, domestic and foreign branches of foreign banks, and commercial paper issued by foreign issuers, the Fund may be subject to additional investment risks with respect to those securities that are different in some respects from those incurred by a fund which invests only in debt obligations of U.S. domestic issuers. Such risks include possible future political and economic developments, seizure or nationalization of foreign deposits, imposition of foreign withholding taxes on interest income payable on the securities, establishment of exchange controls or adoption of other foreign governmental restrictions which might adversely affect the payment of principal and interest on these securities.

Investing in Municipal Obligations. (Municipal Funds) Each Municipal Fund may invest more than 25% of the value of its total assets in Municipal Obligations which are related in such a way that an economic, business or political development or change affecting one such security also would affect the other securities; for example, securities the interest upon which is paid from revenues of similar types of projects. As a result, each Municipal Fund may be subject to greater risk as compared to a municipal money market fund that does not follow this practice.

Certain municipal lease/purchase obligations in which the Municipal Funds may invest may contain "non-appropriation" clauses which provide that the municipality has no obligation to make lease payments in future years unless money is appropriated for such purpose on a yearly basis. Although "non-appropriation" lease/purchase obligations are secured by the leased property, disposition of the leased property in the event of foreclosure might prove difficult. In evaluating the credit quality of a municipal lease/purchase obligation that is unrated, the Manager will consider, on an ongoing basis, a number of factors including the likelihood that the issuing municipality will discontinue appropriating funding for the leased property.

Certain provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), relating to the issuance of Municipal Obligations may reduce the volume of Municipal Obligations qualifying for Federal tax exemption. One effect of these provisions could be to increase the cost of the Municipal Obligations available for purchase by the Fund and thus reduce available yield. Shareholders should consult their tax advisers concerning the effect of these provisions on an investment in the Fund. Proposals that may restrict or eliminate the income tax exemption for interest on Municipal Obligations may be introduced in the future. If any such proposal were enacted that would reduce the availability of Municipal Obligations for investment by the Fund so as to adversely affect Fund shareholders, the Fund would reevaluate its investment objective and policies and submit possible changes in the Fund's structure to shareholders for their consideration. If legislation were enacted that would treat a type of Municipal Obligation as taxable, the Municipal Funds would treat such security as a permissible Taxable Investment within the applicable limits set forth herein.

Investing in California Municipal Obligations. (California Municipal Fund) Since the California Municipal Fund is concentrated in securities issued by California or entities within California, an investment in the Fund may involve greater risk than investments in certain other types of money market funds. You should consider carefully the special risks inherent in the Fund's investment in California Municipal Obligations. You should review the information in "Appendix C" which provides a brief summary of special investment considerations and risk factors relating to investing in California Municipal Obligations.

Investing in New York Municipal Obligations. (New York Municipal Fund) Since the New York Municipal Fund is concentrated in securities issued by New York or entities within New York, an investment in the Fund may involve greater risk than investments in certain other types of money market funds. You should consider carefully the special risks inherent in the Fund's investment in New York Municipal Obligations. You should review the information in "Appendix D" which provides a brief summary of special investment considerations and risk factors relating to investing in New York Municipal Obligations.

Simultaneous Investments. (All Funds) Investment decisions for each Fund are made independently from those of the other investment companies advised by the Manager. If, however, such other investment companies desire to invest in, or dispose of, the same securities as a Fund, the Manager will ordinarily seek to aggregate (or "bunch") orders that are placed or received concurrently for more than one investment company and available investments or opportunities for sales will be allocated equitably to each investment company. In some cases, this procedure may adversely affect the size of the position obtained for or disposed of by a Fund or the price paid or received by a Fund.

Certain Investments. From time to time, to the extent consistent with its investment objective, policies and restrictions, each Fund may invest in securities of companies with which The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation, the Manager's parent company has a lending relationship.

### Investment Restrictions

**Government Money Fund.** Under normal circumstances, the Government Money Fund invests at least 80% of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in securities issued or guaranteed as to principal and interest by the U.S. Government or its agencies or instrumentalities, and repurchase agreements (including tri-party repurchase agreements) collateralized by such securities. The Fund has adopted a policy to provide its shareholders with at least 60 days' prior notice of any change in its policy to so invest its assets.

The Government Money Fund's investment objective is a fundamental policy, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the Government Money Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 10 as fundamental policies. Investment restrictions numbered 11 and 12 are not fundamental policies and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The Government Money Fund may not:

1. Purchase common stocks, preferred stocks, warrants or other equity securities, or purchase corporate bonds or debentures, state bonds, municipal bonds or industrial revenue bonds.

2. Borrow money, except from banks for temporary or emergency (not leveraging) purposes in an amount up to 15% of the value of the Fund's total assets (including the amount borrowed) based on the lesser of cost or market, less liabilities (not including the amount borrowed) at the time the borrowing is made. While borrowings exceed 5% of the value of the Fund's total assets, the Fund will not make any additional investments.
3. Sell securities short or purchase securities on margin.
4. Write or purchase put or call options.
5. Underwrite the securities of other issuers.
6. Purchase or sell real estate, real estate investment trust securities, commodities, or oil and gas interests.
7. Make loans to others (except through the purchase of debt obligations referred to in the Fund's Prospectus and this Statement of Additional Information).
8. Invest in companies for the purpose of exercising control.
9. Invest in securities of other investment companies, except as they may be acquired as part of a merger, consolidation or acquisition of assets.
10. Invest more than 25% of its assets in the securities of issuers in any industry, provided that there shall be no limitation on investments in obligations issued or guaranteed as to principal and interest by the U.S. Government.
11. Pledge, mortgage, hypothecate or otherwise encumber its assets, except to the extent necessary to secure permitted borrowings.
12. Enter into repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice or purchase securities which are illiquid, if, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be so invested.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Treasury Money Fund.** Under normal circumstances, the Treasury Money Fund invests at least 80% of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in U.S. Treasury securities. The Fund has adopted a policy to provide its shareholders with at least 60 days' prior notice of any change in its policy to so invest its assets.

The Treasury Money Fund's investment objective is a fundamental policy, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the Treasury Money Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 9 as fundamental policies. Investment restrictions numbered 10 and 11 are not fundamental policies and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The Treasury Money Fund may not:

1. Invest in commodities.
2. Borrow money, except for temporary or emergency (not leveraging) purposes in an amount up to 15% of the value of the Fund's total assets (including the amount borrowed) based on the lesser of cost or market, less liabilities (not including the amount borrowed) at the time the borrowing is made. While borrowings exceed 5% of the value of the Fund's total assets, the Fund will not make any additional investments.
3. Purchase or sell securities on margin.
4. Issue any senior security (as such term is defined in Section 18(f) of the 1940 Act).
5. Act as underwriter of securities of other issuers, except to the extent the Fund may be deemed an underwriter under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, by virtue of disposing of portfolio securities.
6. Purchase, hold or deal in real estate, or oil, gas, or other mineral leases or exploration or development programs, but the Fund may purchase and sell securities that are secured by real estate or issued by companies that invest in or deal in real estate.
7. Make loans to others, except through the purchase of debt obligations.
8. Invest more than 5% of its assets in the obligations of any one issuer, except that up to 25% of the value of the Fund's total assets may be invested without regard to any such limitations. This restriction does not apply to the purchase of U.S. Government securities.
9. Invest more than 25% of its assets in the securities of issuers in any industry, provided that there shall be no limitation on the purchase of obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government.
10. Pledge, mortgage, hypothecate or otherwise encumber its assets, except to the extent necessary to secure permitted borrowings.
11. Enter into repurchase agreements.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Money Fund.** The Money Fund's investment objective is a fundamental policy, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the Money Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 12 as fundamental policies. Investment restriction number 13 is not a fundamental policy and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The Money Fund may not:

1. Purchase common stocks, preferred stocks, warrants or other equity securities, or purchase corporate bonds or debentures, state bonds, municipal bonds or industrial revenue bonds

(except through the purchase of debt obligations referred to in the Fund's Prospectus and this Statement of Additional Information).

2. Borrow money, except from banks for temporary or emergency (not leveraging) purposes in an amount up to 15% of the value of the Fund's total assets (including the amount borrowed) based on the lesser of cost or market, less liabilities (not including the amount borrowed) at the time the borrowing is made. While borrowings exceed 5% of the value of the Fund's total assets, the Fund will not make any additional investments.

3. Pledge its assets, except in an amount up to 15% of the value of its total assets but only to secure borrowings for temporary or emergency purposes.

4. Sell securities short.

5. Write or purchase put or call options.

6. Underwrite the securities of other issuers.

7. Purchase or sell real estate investment trust securities, commodities, or oil and gas interests.

8. Make loans to others (except through the purchase of debt obligations referred to in the Fund's Prospectus and this Statement of Additional Information).

9. Invest more than 15% of its assets in the obligations of any one bank, or invest more than 5% of its assets in the commercial paper of any one issuer. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent required by the rules of the SEC, the Fund will not invest more than 5% of its assets in the obligations of any one bank.

10. Invest less than 25% of its assets in securities issued by banks or invest more than 25% of its assets in the securities of issuers in any other industry, provided that there shall be no limitation on the purchase of obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities.

11. Invest in companies for the purpose of exercising control.

12. Invest in securities of other investment companies, except as they may be acquired as part of a merger, consolidation or acquisition of assets.

13. Enter into repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice or purchase securities which are illiquid, if, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be so invested.

\* \* \* \* \*

**California Municipal Fund.** The California Municipal Fund's investment objective, and its policy to normally invest at least 80% of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in California Municipal Obligations (or other instruments with similar economic characteristics), are



fundamental policies, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the California Municipal Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 5 as fundamental policies. Investment restrictions numbered 6 through 10 are not fundamental policies and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The California Municipal Fund may not:

1. Borrow money, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act (which currently limits borrowing to no more than 33-1/3% of the value of the Fund's total assets).
2. Act as underwriter of securities of other issuers, except (i) the Fund may bid separately or as part of a group for the purchase of Municipal Obligations directly from an issuer for its own portfolio to take advantage of the lower purchase price available, and (ii) to the extent the Fund may be deemed an underwriter under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, by virtue of disposing of portfolio securities.
3. Purchase or sell real estate, real estate investment trust securities, commodities or commodity contracts, or oil and gas interests, but this shall not prevent the Fund from investing in Municipal Obligations secured by real estate or interests therein.
4. Lend any security or make loans to others if, as a result, more than 33-1/3% of its total assets would be lent to others, except that this limitation does not apply to the purchase of qualified debt obligations and the entry into repurchase agreements.
5. Invest more than 25% of its total assets in the securities of issuers in any single industry; provided that there shall be no such limitation on the purchase of Municipal Obligations and, for temporary defensive purposes, securities issued by domestic banks and obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities.
6. Sell securities short or purchase securities on margin.
7. Invest in companies for the purpose of exercising control.
8. Invest in securities of other investment companies, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act.
9. Pledge, hypothecate, mortgage or otherwise encumber its assets, except to the extent necessary to secure permitted borrowings.
10. Enter into repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice or purchase securities which are illiquid if, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be so invested.

\* \* \* \* \*

**National Municipal Fund.** The National Municipal Fund's investment objective, and its policy to normally invest at least 80% of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in Municipal Obligations (or other instruments with similar economic characteristics), are fundamental policies, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the

1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the National Municipal Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 7 as fundamental policies. Investment restrictions numbered 8 through 12 are not fundamental policies and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The National Municipal Fund may not:

1. Borrow money, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act (which currently limits borrowing to no more than 33-1/3% of the value of the Fund's total assets).
2. Act as underwriter of securities of other issuers, except (i) the Fund may bid separately or as part of a group for the purchase of Municipal Obligations directly from an issuer for its own portfolio to take advantage of the lower purchase price available, and (ii) to the extent the Fund may be deemed an underwriter under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, by virtue of disposing of portfolio securities.
3. Purchase or sell real estate, real estate investment trust securities, commodities or commodity contracts, or oil and gas interests, but this shall not prevent the Fund from investing in Municipal Obligations secured by real estate or interests therein.
4. Lend any security or make loans to others if, as a result, more than 33-1/3% of its total assets would be lent to others, except that this limitation does not apply to the purchase of qualified debt obligations and the entry into repurchase agreements.
5. Invest more than 25% of its assets in the securities of issuers in any single industry; provided that there shall be no limitation on the purchase of Municipal Obligations and, for defensive purposes, securities issued by banks and obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities.
6. Purchase more than 10% of the voting securities of any issuer. This restriction applies only with respect to 75% of the Fund's total assets.
7. Invest more than 15% of its assets in the obligations of any one bank, or invest more than 5% of its assets in the obligations of any other issuer, except that up to 25% of the value of the Fund's total assets may be invested, and securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government or its agencies or instrumentalities may be purchased, without regard to any such limitations. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent required by the rules of the SEC, the Fund will not invest more than 5% of its assets in the obligations of any one bank, except that up to 25% of the value of the Fund's total assets may be invested without regard to such limitation.
8. Pledge, hypothecate, mortgage or otherwise encumber its assets, except to the extent necessary to secure permitted borrowings and in connection with the purchase of securities on a when-issued or forward commitment basis.
9. Sell securities short or purchase securities on margin.
10. Invest in companies for the purpose of exercising control.
11. Invest in securities of other investment companies, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act.

12. Enter into repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice or purchase securities which are illiquid, if, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be so invested.

\* \* \* \* \*

**New York Municipal Fund.** The New York Municipal Fund's investment objective, and its policy to normally invest at least 80% of its net assets (plus any borrowings for investment purposes) in New York Municipal Obligations (or other instruments with similar economic characteristics), are fundamental policies, which cannot be changed without approval by the holders of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the New York Municipal Fund has adopted investment restrictions numbered 1 through 5 as fundamental policies. Investment restrictions numbered 6 through 10 are not fundamental policies and may be changed by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members at any time. The New York Municipal Fund may not:

1. Borrow money, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act (which currently limits borrowing to no more than 33-1/3% of the value of the Fund's total assets).

2. Act as underwriter of securities of other issuers, except (i) the Fund may bid separately or as part of a group for the purchase of Municipal Obligations directly from an issuer for its own portfolio to take advantage of the lower purchase price available, and (ii) to the extent the Fund may be deemed an underwriter under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, by virtue of disposing of portfolio securities.

3. Purchase or sell real estate, real estate investment trust securities, commodities or commodity contracts, or oil and gas interests, but this shall not prevent the Fund from investing in Municipal Obligations secured by real estate or interests therein.

4. Lend any security or make loans to others if, as a result, more than 33-1/3% of its total assets would be lent to others, except that this limitation does not apply to the purchase of qualified debt obligations and the entry into repurchase agreements.

5. Invest more than 25% of its total assets in the securities of issuers in any single industry; provided that there shall be no such limitation on the purchase of Municipal Obligations and, for temporary defensive purposes, securities issued by domestic banks and obligations issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, its agencies or instrumentalities.

6. Sell securities short or purchase securities on margin.

7. Invest in companies for the purpose of exercising control.

8. Invest in securities of other investment companies, except to the extent permitted under the 1940 Act.

9. Pledge, hypothecate, mortgage or otherwise encumber its assets, except to the extent necessary to secure permitted borrowings.

10. Enter into repurchase agreements providing for settlement in more than seven days after notice or purchase securities which are illiquid if, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the value of the Fund's net assets would be so invested.

\* \* \* \* \*

Municipal Funds. For purposes of investment restriction No. 5 for each Municipal Fund, industrial development bonds, where the payment of principal and interest is the ultimate responsibility of companies within the same industry, are grouped together as an industry.

All Funds. If a percentage restriction is adhered to at the time of investment, a later change in percentage resulting from a change in values or assets will not constitute a violation of such restriction. With respect to investment restriction No. 1 for each Municipal Fund, however, if borrowings exceed 33-1/3% of the value of a Municipal Fund's total assets as a result of a change in values or assets, the Fund must take steps to reduce such borrowings at least to the extent of such excess.

## MANAGEMENT OF THE FUNDS

Each Fund's Board is responsible for the management and supervision of the Fund, and approves all significant agreements with those companies that furnish services to the Fund. These companies are as follows:

The Dreyfus Corporation .....	Investment Adviser
MBSC Securities Corporation .....	Distributor
Dreyfus Transfer, Inc. ....	Transfer Agent
The Bank of New York Mellon .....	Custodian

Board members of each Fund, together with information as to their positions with the Fund, principal occupations and other board memberships and affiliations, are shown below.

### Board Members of the Funds<sup>1</sup>

<u>Name (Age)</u> <u>Position with the Funds (Since)</u>	<u>Principal Occupation</u> <u>During Past 5 Years</u>	<u>Other Board Memberships and Affiliations</u>
Joseph S. DiMartino (64) Chairman of the Board (1995) – All Funds	Corporate Director and Trustee	The Muscular Dystrophy Association, <i>Director</i> Century Business Services, Inc., a provider of outsourcing functions for small and medium sized companies, <i>Director</i> The Newark Group, a provider of a national market of paper recovery facilities, paperboard mills and paperboard converting plants, <i>Director</i> Sunair Services Corporation, a provider of certain outdoor-related services to homes and businesses, <i>Director</i>

---

<sup>1</sup> None of the Board members are "interested persons" of the Funds, as defined in the 1940 Act.

<u>Name (Age)</u> <u>Position with the Funds (Since)</u>	<u>Principal Occupation</u> <u>During Past 5 Years</u>	<u>Other Board Memberships and Affiliations</u>
Clifford L. Alexander, Jr. (74) Board Member (1981) – Money Fund (1982) – Municipal Company and Government Company (1986) – California Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund	President of Alexander & Associates, Inc., a management consulting firm (January 1981 – present) Chairman of the Board of Moody's Corporation (October 2000 – October 2003)	Mutual of America Life Insurance Company, <i>Director</i>
David W. Burke (71) Board Member (2007) – All Funds	Corporate Director and Trustee	John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, <i>Director</i>
Peggy C. Davis (65) Board Member (1990) – All Funds	Shad Professor of Law, New York University School of Law (1983 – present) Writer and teacher in the fields of evidence, constitutional theory, family law, social sciences and the law, legal process and professional methodology and training	None
Diane Dunst (68) Board Member (2007) – All Funds	President, Hunting House Antiques	None
Ernest Kafka (75) Board Member (1981) – Money Fund (1982) – Municipal Company and Government Company (1986) – California Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund	Physician engaged in private practice specializing in the psychoanalysis of adults and adolescents (1962-present) Instructor, The New York Psychoanalytic Institute (1981 – present)	None
Nathan Leventhal (65) Board Member (1987) – Municipal Company (1989) – California Municipal Fund, Government Company, Money Fund and New York Municipal Fund	Commissioner, NYC Planning Commission (March 2007- Present) Chairman, Avery Fisher Artist Program (November 1997 – present)	Movado Group, Inc., <i>Director</i> Mayor's Committee on Appointments, <i>Chairman</i>
Jay I. Meltzer (79) Board Member (2007) – All Funds	Physician, Internist and Specialist in Clinical Hypertension Clinical Professor of Medicine at Columbia University & College of Physicians and Surgeons Faculty Associate, Center for Bioethics, Columbia	None

<u>Name (Age)</u> <u>Position with the Funds (Since)</u>	<u>Principal Occupation</u> <u>During Past 5 Years</u>	<u>Other Board Memberships and Affiliations</u>
Daniel Rose (78) Board Member (2007) - All Funds	Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Rose Associates, Inc., a New York based real estate development and management firm	Baltic-American Enterprise Fund, <i>Vice Chairman and Director</i> Harlem Educational Activities Fund, Inc., <i>Chairman</i> Housing Committee of the Real Estate Board of New York, Inc., <i>Director</i>
Warren B. Rudman (77) Board Member (2007) – All Funds	Stonebridge International LLC, Co-Chairman Of Counsel to (from January 1993 to December 31, 2003, Partner in) the law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, LLP	D.B Zwirn & Co., <i>Vice Chairman of the International Advisory Board</i> Boston Scientific, <i>Director</i>

Board members are elected to serve for an indefinite term. Each Fund has standing audit, nominating and compensation committees, each comprised of its Board members who are not "interested persons" of the Fund, as defined in the 1940 Act. The function of the audit committee is (i) to oversee the Fund's accounting and financial reporting processes and the audits of the Fund's financial statements and (ii) to assist in the Board's oversight of the integrity of the Fund's financial statements, the Fund's compliance with legal and regulatory requirements and the independent registered public accounting firm's qualifications, independence and performance. Each Fund's nominating committee is responsible for selecting and nominating all persons as members of the Board for election or appointment by the Board and for election by shareholders. In evaluating potential nominees, including any nominees recommended by shareholders, the committee takes into consideration various factors listed in the nominating committee charter, including character and integrity, business and professional experience, and whether the committee believes the person has the ability to apply sound and independent business judgment and would act in the interest of the Fund and its shareholders. The nominating committee will consider recommendations for nominees from shareholders submitted to the Secretary of the Fund, c/o The Dreyfus Corporation Legal Department, 200 Park Avenue, 8th Floor East, New York, New York 10166, which includes information regarding the recommended nominee as specified in the nominating committee charter. The function of the compensation committee is to establish the appropriate compensation for serving on the Board. Each Fund also has a standing evaluation committee comprised of any one Board member. The function of the evaluation committee is to assist in valuing the Fund's investments. The audit committee met four times, the nominating committee met once, and the compensation committee met twice during the fiscal year ended November 30, 2007. The pricing committee had no meetings during the last fiscal year.

The table below indicates the dollar range of each Board member's ownership of Fund shares and shares of other funds in the Dreyfus Family of Funds for which he or she is a Board member, in each case as of December 31, 2007.

<u>Name of Board Member</u>	California Municipal <u>Fund</u>	Government Money Fund	Treasury Money <u>Fund</u>	<u>Money Fund</u>
Joseph S. DiMartino	None	None	None	None
Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.	None	None	None	None
David W. Burke	None	None	None	None
Peggy C. Davis	None	None	None	None
Diane Dunst	None	None	None	None
Ernest Kafka	None	None	None	None
Nathan Leventhal	None	None	None	None
Jay I. Meltzer	None	None	None	None
Daniel Rose	None	None	None	None
Warren B. Rudman	None	None	None	None

<u>Name of Board Member</u>	National Municipal Fund	New York Municipal Fund	Aggregate Holding of Funds in the Dreyfus Family of Funds for which Responsible as a Board Member
Joseph S. DiMartino	None	None	Over \$100,000
Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.	None	None	None
David W. Burke	None	None	None
Peggy C. Davis	None	None	None
Diane Dunst	None	Over \$100,000	Over \$100,000
Ernest Kafka	None	None	Over \$100,000
Nathan Leventhal	None	None	None
Jay I. Meltzer	None	None	None
Daniel Rose	None	None	Over \$100,000
Warren B. Rudman	None	None	None

As of December 31, 2007, none of the Board members or their immediate family members owned securities of the Manager, the Distributor or any person (other than a registered investment company) directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by or under common control with the Manager or the Distributor.

Each Fund currently pays its Board members its allocated portion of an annual retainer fee of \$62,500 and a fee of \$8,000 per meeting (with a minimum fee of \$1,000 per meeting and per telephone meeting) attended for the Fund and 14 other funds (comprised of 23 portfolios) in the Dreyfus Family of Funds, and reimburses them for these expenses. The Chairman of the Board receives an additional 25% of such compensation. Emeritus Board members generally are entitled to receive one-half of the Fund's then effective annual retainer fee at the time the Director achieves emeritus status and meeting fee of one-half the amount in effect for Board members. The aggregate amount of compensation paid to each Board member by each Fund for the fiscal year ended November 30, 2007, and by all funds in the Dreyfus Family of Funds for which such person is a Board member (the number of portfolios of

such funds is set forth in parenthesis next to each Board member's total compensation) for the year ended December 31, 2007, is set forth below:

<u>Name of Board Member and Fund</u>	<u>Aggregate Compensation From the Fund*</u>	<u>Total Compensation From the Funds and Fund Complex Paid to Board Member(**)</u>
Joseph S. DiMartino		\$819,865 (196)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 7,867	
Money Fund	\$55,559	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 3,144	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 4,372	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,873	
Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.		\$235,000 (67)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 6,280	
Money Fund	\$44,306	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,504	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,487	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,499	
David W. Burke		\$347,479 (105)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,650	
Money Fund	\$40,377	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,295	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,172	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,351	
Peggy C. Davis		\$243,500 (81)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 6,280	
Money Fund	\$44,306	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,504	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,487	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,499	



<u>Name of Board Member and Fund</u>	<u>Aggregate Compensation From the Fund*</u>	<u>Total Compensation From the Funds and Fund Complex Paid to Board Member(**)</u>
Diane Dunst		\$103,500 (32)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,650	
Money Fund	\$40,377	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,295	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,172	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,351	
Ernest Kafka		\$102,500 (32)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 6,280	
Money Fund	\$44,306	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,504	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,487	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,499	
Saul B. Klamon***		\$25,000 (32)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 1,810	
Money Fund	\$12,281	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 666	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 968	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 422	
Nathan Leventhal		\$103,500 (32)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 6,280	
Money Fund	\$44,306	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,504	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,487	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,499	
Jay I. Meltzer		\$102,500 (32)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,650	
Money Fund	\$40,377	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,295	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,172	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,351	

<u>Name of Board Member and Fund</u>	<u>Aggregate Compensation From the Fund*</u>	<u>Total Compensation From the Funds and Fund Complex Paid to Board Member(**)</u>
Daniel Rose		\$155,213 (43)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,118	
Money Fund	\$36,973	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,154	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 2,895	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,237	
Warren B. Rudman		\$149,750 (42)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,650	
Money Fund	\$40,377	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,295	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,172	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,351	
Sander Vanocur****		\$156,713 (43)
Government Money Fund/ Treasury Money Fund	\$ 5,650	
Money Fund	\$40,377	
California Municipal Fund	\$ 2,295	
National Municipal Fund	\$ 3,172	
New York Municipal Fund	\$ 1,351	

\* Amount does not include the cost of office space, secretarial services and health benefits for the Chairman and expenses reimbursed to Board members for attending Board meetings, which in the aggregate amounted to \$2,092 for the Government Company, \$2,849 for the Money Fund, \$3,462 for the California Municipal Fund, \$2,633 for the National Municipal Fund and \$1,818 for the New York Municipal Fund.

\*\* Represents the number of separate portfolios comprising the investment companies in the Fund Complex, including the Funds, for which the Board members serve.

\*\*\* Emeritus Board member as of January 18, 2000.

\*\*\*\* Emeritus Board member as of January 8, 2008.

### Officers of the Funds

J. DAVID OFFICER, President since December 2006. Chief Operating Officer, Vice Chairman and a director of the Manager, and an officer of 78 investment companies (comprised of 163 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 59 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since April, 1998.

PHILLIP N. MAISANO, Executive Vice President since July 2007. Chief Investment Officer, Vice Chair and a director of the Manager, and an officer of 78 investment companies (comprised of 163 portfolios) managed by the Manager. Mr. Maisano also is an officer and/or board member of certain other investment management subsidiaries of The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation, each of which is an affiliate of the Manager. He is 60 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since November 2006. Prior to joining the Manager, Mr. Maisano served as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of EACM Advisors, an affiliate of the Manager, since August 2004, and served as Chief Executive Officer of Evaluation Associates, a leading institutional investment consulting firm, from 1988 until 2004.

JAMES WINDELS, Treasurer since November 2001. Director – Mutual Fund Accounting of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 49 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since April 1985.

MICHAEL A. ROSENBERG, Vice President and Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 48 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since October 1991.

JANETTE E. FARRAGHER, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. She is 45 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since February 1984.

JAMES BITETTO, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel and Secretary of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 41 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since December 1996.

JONI LACKS CHARATAN, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. She is 52 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since October 1988.

JOSEPH M. CHIOFFI, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 46 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since June 2000.

JOHN B. HAMMALIAN, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 44 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since February 1991.

ROBERT R. MULLERY, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 56 years old and has been an employee of the

Manager since May 1986.

JEFF PRUSNOFSKY, Vice President and Assistant Secretary since August 2005. Associate General Counsel of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 42 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since October 1990.

RICHARD CASSARO, Assistant Treasurer since January 2008. Senior Accounting Manager – Money Market and Municipal Bond Funds of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 49 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since 1982.

GAVIN C. REILLY, Assistant Treasurer since August 2005. Tax Manager of the Investment Accounting and Support Department of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 39 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since April 1991.

ROBERT S. ROBOL, Assistant Treasurer since August 2003. Senior Accounting Manager – Fixed Income Funds of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 43 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since October 1988.

ROBERT SALVIOLO, Assistant Treasurer. Senior Accounting Manager – Equity Funds of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 40 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since June 1989.

ROBERT SVAGNA, Assistant Treasurer since August 2005. Senior Accounting Manager – Equity Funds of the Manager, and an officer of 79 investment companies (comprised of 180 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 40 years old and has been an employee of the Manager since November 1990.

WILLIAM GERMENIS, Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Officer since September 2002. Vice President and Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Officer of the Distributor, and the Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Officer of 75 investment companies (comprised of 176 portfolios) managed by the Manager. He is 37 years old and has been an employee of the Distributor since October 1998.

JOSEPH W. CONNOLLY, Chief Compliance Officer since October 2004. Chief Compliance Officer of the Manager and The Dreyfus Family of Funds (79 investment companies, comprised of 180 portfolios). From November 2001 through March 2004, Mr. Connolly was first Vice-President, Mutual Fund Servicing for Mellon Global Securities Services. In that capacity, Mr. Connolly was responsible for managing Mellon's Custody, Fund Accounting and Fund Administration services to third-party mutual fund clients. He is 50 years old and has served in various capacities with the Manager since 1980, including manager of the firm's Fund Accounting Department from 1997 through October 2001.

The address of each Board member and officer of the Fund is 200 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10166.

The Fund's Board members and officers, as a group, owned less than 1% of the Fund shares outstanding on March 14, 2008. See "Information About the Funds" for a list of shareholders known by the Fund to own of record 5% or more of the Fund's outstanding voting securities as of March 14, 2008.

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Investment Adviser. The manager is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation ("BNY Mellon"), a global financial services company focused on helping clients move and manage their financial assets, operating in 34 countries and serving more than 100 markets. BNY Mellon is a leading provider of financial services for institutions, corporations and high-net-worth individuals, providing asset and wealth management, asset servicing, issuer services, and treasury services through a worldwide client-focused team.

The Manager provides management services pursuant to separate Management Agreements (respectively, the "Agreement") between the Fund and the Manager. As to each Fund, the Agreement is subject to annual approval by (i) the Fund's Board or (ii) vote of a majority (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund's outstanding voting securities, provided that in either event the continuance also is approved by a majority of the Fund's Board members who are not "interested persons" (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund or the Manager, by vote cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on such approval. As to each Fund, the Agreement is terminable without penalty, on 60 days' notice, by the Fund's Board or by vote of the holders of a majority of the Fund's shares or, upon not less than 90 days' notice, by the Manager. Each Agreement will terminate automatically, as to the relevant Fund, in the event of its assignment (as defined in the 1940 Act).

The following persons are officers and/or directors of the Manager: Jonathan Little, Chair of the Board; Jonathan Baum, Chief Executive Officer and a director; J. Charles Cardona, President and a director; Diane P. Durnin, Vice Chair and a director; Phillip N. Maisano, Chief Investment Officer, Vice Chair and a director; J. David Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Vice Chair and a director; Patrice M. Kozlowski, Senior Vice President – Corporate Communications; Jill Gill, Vice President-Human Resources; Anthony Mayo, Vice President-Information Systems; Theodore A. Schachar, Vice President-Tax; John E. Lane, Vice President; Jeanne M. Login, Vice President; Gary Pierce, Controller; Joseph W. Connolly, Chief Compliance Officer; James Bitetto, Secretary; and Mitchell E. Harris, Ronald P. O'Hanley III and Scott E. Wennerholm, directors.

BNY Mellon and its affiliates may have deposit, loan and commercial banking or other relationships with the issuers of securities purchased by the Fund. Dreyfus has informed management of the Funds that in making its investment decisions it does not obtain or use material inside information that BNY Mellon or its affiliates may possess with respect to such issuers.

The Fund, the Manager and the Distributor each have adopted a Code of Ethics that permits its personnel, subject to the Code of Ethics, to invest in securities, including securities that may be purchased or held by the Fund. The Manager's Code of Ethics subjects its employees' personal securities transactions to various restrictions to ensure that such trading does not disadvantage any fund advised by the Manager. In that regard, portfolio managers and other investment personnel of the Manager must preclear and report their personal securities transactions and holdings, which are reviewed for compliance with the Code of Ethics, and are also subject to the oversight of BNY Mellon's Investment Ethics Committee (the "Committee"). Portfolio managers and other investment

personnel of the Manager who comply with the preclearance and disclosure procedures of the Code of Ethics and the requirements of the Committee, may be permitted to purchase, sell or hold securities which also may be or are held in fund(s) they manage or for which they otherwise provide investment advice.

The Manager maintains office facilities on behalf of each Fund, and furnishes statistical and research data, clerical help, accounting, data processing, bookkeeping and internal auditing and certain other required services to the Funds. The Manager may pay the Distributor for shareholder services from the Manager's own assets, including past profits but not including the management fee paid by the Funds. The Distributor may use part or all of such payments to pay certain financial institutions (which may include banks), securities dealers and other industry professionals (collectively, "Service Agents") in respect of these services. The Manager also may make such advertising and promotional expenditures using its own resources, as it from time to time deems appropriate.

Portfolio Managers. The Manager manages each Fund's portfolio of investments in accordance with the stated policies of the Fund, subject to the approval of the Fund's Board. The Manager is responsible for investment decisions and provides each Fund with portfolio managers who are authorized by the Board to execute purchases and sales of securities. The portfolio managers of the Government Money Fund, the Money Fund and the Treasury Money Fund are Bernard W. Kiernan, Patricia A. Larkin, James G. O'Connor and Thomas Riordan. The portfolio managers of the Municipal Funds are Joseph P. Darcy, A. Paul Disdier, Douglas J. Gaylor, Joseph Irace, Colleen Meehan, W. Michael Petty, Bill Vasiliou, James Welch and Monica S. Wieboldt. The Manager also maintains a research department with a professional staff of portfolio managers and securities analysts who provide research services for each Fund and for other funds advised by the Manager.

Expenses. All expenses incurred in the operation of a Fund are borne by such Fund, except to the extent specifically assumed by the Manager. The expenses borne by each Fund include: taxes, interest, brokerage fees and commissions, if any, fees of Board members who are not officers, directors, employees or holders of 5% or more of the outstanding voting securities of the Manager, Securities and Exchange Commission fees, state Blue Sky qualification fees, charges of custodians, transfer and dividend disbursing agents' fees, certain insurance premiums, industry association fees, outside auditing and legal expenses, costs of maintaining the Fund's existence, investor services (including, without limitation, telephone and personnel expenses), costs of shareholder reports and meetings, costs of preparing and printing prospectuses and statements of additional information for regulatory purposes and for distribution to existing shareholders, and any extraordinary expenses. In addition, each class of shares of a Fund bears any class specific expenses allocated to such class, such as expenses related to the distribution and/or shareholder servicing of such class. The Funds' Class B shares are subject to an annual distribution fee, and Class A shares of the Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund are subject to an annual service fee. See "Service Plan and Distribution Plan." Expenses attributable to a particular Fund are charged against the assets of that Fund; other expenses of the Government Company are allocated between the Government Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund on the basis determined by the Board, including, but not limited to, proportionately in relation to the net assets of each such Fund.

As compensation for the Manager's services under the Agreement, each Fund has agreed to pay the Manager a monthly management fee at the annual rate of 0.50% of the value of such Fund's average daily net assets. All fees and expenses are accrued daily and deducted before declaration of

dividends to investors. Set forth below are the total amounts paid by each Fund indicated below to the Manager for the Fund's last three fiscal years:

	<u>Fiscal Year Ended November 30,</u>		
	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2005</u>
Money Fund	\$49,987,097	\$44,881,395	\$37,539,857
California Municipal Fund	\$2,861,757	\$4,209,925	\$4,056,769
National Municipal Fund	\$4,039,789	\$6,526,940	\$6,665,439
New York Municipal Fund	\$1,700,559	\$2,406,342	\$2,389,029
Treasury Money Fund	\$457,827	\$340,228	\$228,348
Government Money Fund	\$6,431,642	\$7,383,719	\$6,892,693

As to each Fund, the Manager has agreed that if in any fiscal year the aggregate expenses of the Fund, exclusive of taxes, brokerage, interest and (with the prior written consent of the necessary state securities commissions) extraordinary expenses, but including the management fee, exceed 1 ½% of the average market value of the net assets of such Fund for that fiscal year, the Fund may deduct from the payment to be made to the Manager under the Agreement, or the Manager will bear, such excess expense. Such deduction or payment, if any, will be estimated daily and reconciled and effected or paid, as the case may be, on a monthly basis. As to each Fund, no such deduction or payment was required for the most recent fiscal year end.

As to each Fund, the aggregate of the fees payable to the Manager is not subject to reduction as the value of the Fund's net assets increases.

Distributor. The Distributor, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Manager, located at 200 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10166, serves as each Fund's distributor on a best efforts basis pursuant to an agreement with the Fund which is renewable annually. The Distributor also acts as distributor for other funds in the Dreyfus Family of Funds, BNY Mellon Funds Trust and Mellon Institutional Funds. Before June 30, 2007, the Distributor was known as "Dreyfus Service Corporation."

With respect to each Fund, except the Municipal Funds, the Distributor may pay certain Service Agents that have entered into agreements with the Distributor a fee based on the amount invested through such Service Agents in Fund shares by employees participating in qualified or non-qualified employee benefit plans, including pension, profit-sharing and other deferred compensation plans, whether established by corporations, partnerships, non-profit entities or state and local governments ("Retirement Plans"), or other programs. The term "Retirement Plans" does not include IRAs, IRA "Rollover Accounts" or IRAs set up under Simplified Employee Pension Plans ("SEP-IRAs"). Generally, the Distributor may pay such Service Agents a fee of up to 1% of the amount invested through the Service Agents. The Distributor, however, may pay Service Agents a higher fee and reserves the right to cease paying these fees at any time. The Distributor will pay such fees from its own funds, other than amounts received from the Fund, including past profits or any other source

available to it. Sponsors of such Retirement Plans or the participants therein should consult their Service Agent for more information regarding any such fee payable to the Service Agent.

The Manager or the Distributor may provide cash payments out of its own resources to financial intermediaries that sell shares of the Funds or provide other services. Such payments are separate from any 12b-1 fees and/or shareholder services fees or other expenses paid by the Funds to those intermediaries. Because those payments are not made by you or a Fund, the Fund's total expense ratio will not be affected by any such payments. These additional payments may be made to certain Service Agents, including affiliates, that provide shareholder servicing, sub-administration, recordkeeping and/or sub-transfer agency services, marketing support and/or access to sales meetings, sales representatives and management representatives of the Service Agent. Cash compensation also may be paid from the Manager's or the Distributor's own resources to Service Agents for inclusion of a Fund on a sales list, including a preferred or select sales list or in other sales programs. These payments sometimes are referred to as "revenue sharing". From time to time, the Manager or the Distributor also may provide cash or non-cash compensation to Service Agents in the form of: occasional gifts; occasional meals, tickets, or other entertainment; support for due diligence trips; educational conference sponsorship; support for recognition programs; and other forms of cash or non-cash compensation permissible under broker-dealer regulations. In some cases, these payments or compensation may create an incentive for a Service Agent to recommend or sell shares of a Fund to you. Please contact your Service Agent for details about any payments they may receive in connection with the sale of Fund shares or the provision of service to the Funds.

Transfer and Dividend Disbursing Agent and Custodian. Dreyfus Transfer, Inc. (the "Transfer Agent"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Manager, 200 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10166, is each Fund's transfer and dividend disbursing agent. Under a separate transfer agency agreement with each Fund, the Transfer Agent arranges for the maintenance of shareholder account records for the Fund, the handling of certain communications between shareholders and the Fund and the payment of dividends and distributions payable by the Fund. For these services, the Transfer Agent receives a monthly fee from each Fund computed on the basis of the number of shareholder accounts it maintains for such Fund during the month, and is reimbursed for certain out-of-pocket expenses.

The Bank of New York Mellon (the "Custodian"), an affiliate of the Manager, One Wall Street, New York, New York 10286, is each Fund's custodian. The Custodian has no part in determining the investment policies of the Fund or which securities are to be purchased or sold by the Fund. Under a separate custody agreement with each Fund, the Custodian holds the Fund's securities and keeps all necessary accounts and records. For its custody services, the Custodian receives a monthly fee from each Fund based on the market value of the Fund's assets held in custody and receives certain securities transactions charges.

## HOW TO BUY SHARES

General. Each Fund's shares may be purchased only by clients of certain Service Agents including the Distributor. You will be charged a fee if an investment check is returned unpayable. Share certificates are issued only upon your written request. No certificates are issued for fractional shares.

Each Fund reserves the right to reject any purchase order. None of the Funds will establish an account for a "foreign financial institution," as that term is defined in Department of the Treasury rules



implementing section 312 of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001. Foreign financial institutions include: foreign banks (including foreign branches of U.S. depository institutions); foreign offices of U.S. securities broker-dealers, futures commission merchants, and mutual funds; non-U.S. entities that, if they were located in the United States, would be securities broker-dealers, futures commission merchants or mutual funds; and non-U.S. entities engaged in the business of a currency dealer or exchanger or a money transmitter.

The minimum initial investment in each Fund is \$2,500, or \$1,000 if you are a client of a Service Agent which maintains an omnibus account in the relevant Fund and has made an aggregate minimum initial purchase in the Fund for its customers of \$2,500. Subsequent investments must be at least \$100. For the Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund, however, the minimum initial investment is \$750 for Dreyfus-sponsored Keogh Plans, IRAs (including regular IRAs, spousal IRAs for a non-working spouse, Roth IRAs, SEP-IRAs and rollover IRAs) and 403(b)(7) Plans with only one participant and \$500 for Dreyfus-sponsored Education Savings Accounts, with no minimum for subsequent purchases. It is not recommended that the Municipal Funds be used as a vehicle for Keogh, IRA or other qualified Retirement Plans. The initial investment must be accompanied by the Account Application. For full-time or part-time employees of the Manager or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries, directors of the Manager, Board members of a fund advised by the Manager, including members of each Fund's Board, or the spouse or minor child of any of the foregoing, the minimum initial investment is \$1,000. For full-time or part-time employees of the Manager or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries who elect to have a portion of their pay directly deposited into their Fund accounts, the minimum initial investment is \$50. Class A shares of each Fund are offered without regard to the minimum initial investment requirements to Board members of a fund advised by the Manager, including members of each Fund's Board, who elect to have all or a portion of their compensation for serving in that capacity automatically invested in a Fund. The Government Money Fund and the Money Fund reserve the right to offer Fund shares without regard to minimum purchase requirements to employees participating in certain Retirement Plans or other programs where contributions or account information can be transmitted in a manner and form acceptable to such Fund. Fund shares are offered without regard to the minimum initial or subsequent investment amount requirements to investors purchasing fund shares through the wrap fee accounts or other fee based programs. Each Fund reserves the right to vary further the initial and subsequent investment minimum requirements at any time.

Fund shares also may be purchased through Dreyfus-Automatic Asset Builder®, the Government Direct Deposit Privilege or the Payroll Savings Plan described under "Shareholder Services." These services enable you to make regularly scheduled investments and may provide you with a convenient way to invest for long-term financial goals. You should be aware, however, that periodic investment plans do not guarantee a profit and will not protect you against loss in a declining market.

Service Agents may receive different levels of compensation for selling different Classes of shares. As discussed under "Management Arrangements-Distributor," Service Agents may receive revenue sharing payments from the Manager or the Distributor. The receipt of such payments could create an incentive for a Service Agent to recommend or sell shares of a Fund instead of other mutual funds where such payments are not received. Please contact your Service Agent for details about any payments it may receive in connection with the sale of Fund shares or the provision of services to the Funds.

Shares are sold on a continuous basis at the net asset value per share next determined after an order in proper form and Federal Funds (monies of member banks within the Federal Reserve System which are held on deposit at a Federal Reserve Bank) are received by the Transfer Agent or other entity authorized to receive orders on behalf of the Fund in written or telegraphic form. If you do not remit Federal Funds, your payment must be converted into Federal Funds. This usually occurs within one business day of receipt of a bank wire and within two business days of receipt of a check drawn on a member bank of the Federal Reserve System. Checks drawn on banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System may take considerably longer to convert into Federal Funds. Prior to receipt of Federal Funds, your money will not be invested. Net asset value per share of each Class is computed by dividing the value of the Fund's net assets represented by such Class (i.e., the value of its assets less liabilities) by the total number of shares of such Class outstanding. See "Determination of Net Asset Value."

**Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund**--Each of these Funds determines its net asset value per share twice each day the New York Stock Exchange or the Transfer Agent is open for regular business: as of 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, and as of 8:00 p.m., Eastern time. Each Fund also may process purchase and sale orders and calculate its net asset value on days that the Fund's primary trading markets are open and the Fund's management determines to do so.

An order placed with the Distributor or its designee in New York will become effective at the price determined at 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, and the shares purchased will receive the dividend on Fund shares declared on that day, if the order is placed in proper form with the Distributor or its designee prior to 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, for the Treasury Money Fund, and prior to 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, for the Government Money Fund or Money Fund, and Federal Funds are received by 6:00 p.m., Eastern time, on that day. An order placed between 3:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, for the Treasury Money Fund, will not be accepted and executed, and notice of the purchase order being rejected will be given to the institution placing the order, and any funds received will be returned promptly to the sending institution. An order placed in proper form with the Distributor or its designee in New York after 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, but prior to 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, on a given day will become effective at the price determined at 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, on that day, and the shares purchased will begin to accrue dividends on the next business day, if Federal Funds are received by 11:00 a.m., Eastern time, on the next business day.

**California Municipal Fund, National Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund**--Each of these Funds determines its net asset value per share three times each day the New York Stock Exchange or the Transfer Agent is open for regular business: as of 12:00 noon, Eastern time, as of 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, and as of 8:00 p.m., Eastern time. Each Fund also may process purchase and sale orders and calculate its net asset value on days that the Fund's primary trading markets are open and the Fund's management determines to do so.

An order placed with the Distributor or its designee in New York will become effective at the price determined at 12:00 noon or 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, depending on when the order is accepted on a given day, and the shares purchased will receive the dividend on Fund shares declared on that day, if the order is placed with the Distributor or its designee prior to 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, and Federal Funds are received by 4:00 p.m., Eastern time, on that day. An order placed with the Distributor or its designee in New York after 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, but prior to 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, on a given day will become effective at the price determined at 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, on that day, and the

shares purchased will begin to accrue dividends on the next business day, if Federal Funds are received by 11:00 a.m., Eastern time, on the next business day.

Using Federal Funds. The Transfer Agent or the Fund may attempt to notify you upon receipt of checks drawn on banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System as to the possible delay in conversion into Federal Funds and may attempt to arrange for a better means of transmitting the money. If you are a customer of a Service Agent and your order to purchase Fund shares is paid for other than in Federal Funds, the Service Agent, acting on your behalf, will complete the conversion into, or itself advance, Federal Funds, generally on the business day following receipt of your order. The order is effective only when so converted and received by the Transfer Agent. If you have sufficient Federal Funds or a cash balance in your brokerage account with a Service Agent, your order to purchase Fund shares will become effective on the day that the order, including Federal Funds, is received by the Transfer Agent.

Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege. You may purchase shares by telephone or, with respect to Class A shares of the Funds, online, if you have checked the appropriate box and supplied the necessary information on the Account Application or have filed a Shareholder Services Form with the Transfer Agent. The proceeds will be transferred between the bank account designated in one of these documents and your Fund account. Only a bank account maintained in a domestic financial institution which is an Automated Clearing House ("ACH") member may be so designated.

Dreyfus TeleTransfer purchase orders may be made at any time. If purchase orders are received by 4:00 p.m., Eastern time, on any day that the Transfer Agent and the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") are open for regular business, Fund shares will be purchased at the share price determined on that day. If purchase orders are made after 4:00 p.m., Eastern time, on any day the Transfer Agent and the NYSE are open for regular business, or made on Saturday, Sunday or any Fund holiday (e.g., when the NYSE is not open for business), Fund shares will be purchased at the share price determined on the next bank business day following such purchase order. To qualify to use the Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege, the initial payment for purchase of Fund shares must be drawn on, and redemption proceeds paid to, the same bank and account as are designated on the Account Application or Shareholder Services Form on file. If the proceeds of a particular redemption are to be sent to an account at any other bank, the request must be in writing and signature-guaranteed. See "How to Redeem Shares—Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege."

Reopening an Account. You may reopen an account with a minimum investment of \$100 without filing a new Account Application during the calendar year the account is closed or during the following calendar year, provided the information on the old Account Application is still applicable.

## SERVICE PLAN AND DISTRIBUTION PLAN

Class A shares of each of the Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund are subject to a Service Plan and Class B shares of each Fund are subject to a Distribution Plan.

Rule 12b-1 (the "Rule") adopted by the SEC under the 1940 Act provides, among other things, that an investment company may bear expenses of distributing its shares only pursuant to a plan adopted in accordance with the Rule. The Board of each of the Government Money Fund, the Money Fund and the Treasury Money Fund has adopted separate plans with respect to Class A and Class B of such Funds and the Board of each of the Municipal Funds has adopted a plan with respect to Class B

of such Funds (each, a "Plan"). Under each Plan, the respective Fund bears directly the costs of preparing, printing and distributing prospectuses and statements of additional information and of implementing and operating the Plan. Under each Plan adopted with respect to Class A of the Government Money Fund, the Money Fund and the Treasury Money Fund (the "Service Plan"), the Fund pays the Distributor for distributing Class A shares, servicing shareholder accounts ("Servicing") and advertising and marketing relating to the Fund at an aggregate annual rate of 0.20% of the value of the Fund's average daily net assets attributable to Class A. Under each Service Plan, the Distributor may pay one or more Service Agents a fee in respect of Class A shares of the Fund owned by shareholders with whom the Service Agent has a Servicing relationship or for whom the Service Agent is the dealer or holder of record. Under each Fund's Plan adopted with respect to Class B (the "Distribution Plan"), the Fund reimburses the Distributor for payments made to third parties for distributing (within the meaning of the Rule) Class B shares at an annual rate of up to 0.20% of the value of the Fund's average daily net assets attributable to Class B. The Distributor may pay one or more Service Agents in respect of distribution services for Class B shares, and determines the amounts, if any, to be paid to Service Agents and the basis on which such payments are made. Each Fund's Board believes that there is a reasonable likelihood that each Plan will benefit the Fund and holders of the relevant Class of shares.

A quarterly report of the amounts expended under each Plan, and the purposes for which such expenditures were incurred, must be made to the Fund's Board for its review. In addition, each Plan provides that it may not be amended to increase materially the costs which the Fund may bear for distribution pursuant to the Plan without shareholder approval of the affected Class and that other material amendments of the Plan must be approved by the Board, and by the Fund's Board members who are not "interested persons" (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund or the Manager and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operation of the Plan or in any related agreements entered into in connection with such Plan, by vote cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of considering such amendments. Each Plan is subject to annual approval by such vote of the Board members cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on the Plan. Each Plan is terminable at any time by vote of a majority of the Fund's Board members who are not "interested persons" and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operation of the Plan or in any of the related agreements or by vote of a majority of the relevant class of shares.

Set forth below are the total amounts paid by each of the Government Money Fund, the Money Fund and the Treasury Money Fund pursuant to its Service Plan with respect to Class A (i) to the Distributor ("Distributor Payments") as payment for distributing Class A shares and Servicing and (ii) for costs of preparing, printing and distributing prospectuses and statement of additional information and of implementing and operating the Service Plan ("Printing and Implementation"), and amounts reimbursed to each Fund by the Manager pursuant to undertakings in effect, if any, and the net amount paid by each Fund for each Fund's fiscal year ended November 30, 2007:

	<u>Distributor Payments</u>	<u>Printing and Implementation</u>	<u>Total Amount Paid Pursuant to Service Plan</u>
Government Money Fund			
- Class A	\$306,595	\$1,494	\$308,089
Money Fund			

- Class A	\$1,748,249	\$14,241	\$1,762,490
-----------	-------------	----------	-------------

	<u>Distributor Payments</u>	<u>Printing and Implementation</u>	<u>Reduction in fee</u>	<u>Total Amount Paid Pursuant to Service Plan</u>
Treasury Money Fund				
- Class A	\$1,861	\$20	\$1,840	\$41

Set forth below are the total amounts paid by each Fund pursuant to its Distribution Plan with respect to Class B (i) to the Distributor ("Distributor Payments") and (ii) for the costs of preparing, printing and distributing prospectus and statement of additional information and of implementing and operating the Distribution Plan ("Printing and Implementation") for each Fund's fiscal year ended November 30, 2007:

<u>Name of Fund</u>	<u>Distributor Payments</u>	<u>Printing and Implementation</u>	<u>Total Amount paid Pursuant to Distribution Plan</u>
Government Money Fund			
- Class B	\$2,266,061	\$13,034	\$2,279,095
Money Fund			
- Class B	\$18,246,590	\$149,107	\$18,395,697
California Municipal Fund			
- Class B	\$179,665	\$2,939	\$182,604
National Municipal Fund			
- Class B	\$1,421,354	\$9,445	\$1,430,799
New York Municipal Fund			
- Class B	\$195,283	\$0	\$195,283
Treasury Money Fund			
- Class B	\$181,270	\$2,230	\$183,500

## SHAREHOLDER SERVICES PLANS

Each Fund has adopted a Shareholder Services Plan with respect to Class A pursuant to which the Fund reimburses the Distributor an amount not to exceed an annual rate of 0.25% of the value of the Fund's average daily net assets attributable to Class A for certain allocated expenses of providing certain services to the holders of Class A shares. Each Fund also has adopted a Shareholder Services Plan with respect to Class B pursuant to which the Fund pays the Distributor for the provision of

certain services to the holders of Class B shares a fee at the annual rate of 0.25% of the value of the Fund's average daily net assets attributable to Class B. Under each Shareholder Services Plan, the services provided may include personal services relating to shareholder accounts, such as answering shareholder inquiries regarding the Fund and providing reports and other information, and services related to the maintenance of shareholder accounts. As to each Fund, under the Shareholders Services Plan for Class B, the Distributor may make payments to Service Agents in respect of their services.

A quarterly report of the amounts expended under each Shareholder Services Plan, and the purposes for which such expenditures were incurred, must be made to the Fund's Board for its review. In addition, each Shareholder Services Plan provides that material amendments to the Shareholder Services Plan must be approved by the Fund's Board, and by the Board members who are not "interested persons" (as defined in the 1940 Act) of the Fund and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operation of the Shareholder Services Plan, by vote cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of considering such amendments. Each Shareholder Services Plan is subject to annual approval by such vote of its Board members cast in person at a meeting called for the purpose of voting on the Shareholder Services Plan. Each Shareholder Services Plan is terminable at any time by vote of a majority of the Board members who are not "interested persons" and have no direct or indirect financial interest in the operation of the Shareholder Services Plan.

Set forth below are the total amounts payable by each Fund pursuant to its separate Shareholder Services Plans for Class A and Class B, the amounts reimbursed to the Fund by the Manager pursuant to undertakings in effect, if any, and the net amount paid by the Fund for the Fund's fiscal year ended November 30, 2007:

<u>Name of Fund and Class</u>	<u>Total Amount Payable Pursuant to Shareholder Services Plan</u>	<u>Amount Reimbursed Pursuant to Undertaking</u>	<u>Net Amount Paid by Fund</u>
Government Money Fund			
- Class A	\$44,954	\$0	\$44,954
- Class B	\$2,832,577	\$331,681	\$2,500,896
Money Fund			
- Class A	\$345,282	\$0	\$345,282
- Class B	\$22,808,237	\$1,395,763	\$21,412,474
Treasury Money Fund			
- Class A	\$840	\$840	\$0
- Class B	\$226,588	\$180,281	\$46,307
California Municipal Fund			
- Class A	\$123,909	\$0	\$123,909
- Class B	\$224,581	\$40,375	\$184,206
National Municipal			

<u>Name of Fund and Class</u>	<u>Total Amount Payable Pursuant to Shareholder Services Plan</u>	<u>Amount Reimbursed Pursuant to Undertaking</u>	<u>Net Amount Paid by Fund</u>
Fund			
- Class A	\$51,110	\$0	\$51,110
- Class B	\$1,776,692	\$318,681	\$1,458,011
New York Municipal Fund			
- Class A	\$154,023	\$0	\$154,023
- Class B	\$238,125	\$71,573	\$166,552

## HOW TO REDEEM SHARES

General. The Fund ordinarily will make payment for all shares redeemed within seven days after receipt by the Transfer Agent of a redemption request in proper form, except as provided by the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission. However, if you have purchased Fund shares by check, by Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege or through Dreyfus- Automatic Asset Builder® and subsequently submit a written redemption request to the Transfer Agent, the Fund may delay redemption of such shares, and the redemption proceeds may not be transmitted to you, for up to eight business days after the purchase of such shares. In addition, the Fund will not honor checks under the Checkwriting Privilege, and will reject requests to redeem shares by wire or telephone, online or pursuant to the Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege, for a period of up to eight business days after receipt by the Transfer Agent of the purchase check, the Dreyfus TeleTransfer purchase or the Dreyfus- Automatic Asset Builder® order against which such redemption is requested. These procedures will not apply if your shares were purchased by wire payment, or if you otherwise have sufficient collected balance in your account to cover the redemption request. Prior to the time any redemption is effective, dividends on such shares will accrue and be payable, and you will be entitled to exercise all other rights of beneficial ownership. Fund shares may not be redeemed until the Transfer Agent has received your Account Application.

Checkwriting Privilege. Each Fund provides Redemption Checks ("Checks") automatically upon opening an account, unless you specifically refuse the Checkwriting Privilege by checking the applicable "No" box on the Account Application. The Checkwriting Privilege may be established for an existing account by a separate signed Shareholder Services Form. Checks will be sent only to the registered owner(s) of the account and only to the address of record. The Account Application or Shareholder Services Form must be manually signed by the registered owner(s). Checks are drawn on your Fund account and may be made payable to the order of any person in an amount of \$500 or more. When a Check is presented to the Transfer Agent for payment, the Transfer Agent, as your agent, will cause the Fund to redeem a sufficient number of shares in your account to cover the amount of the Check. Dividends are earned until the Check clears. After clearance, a copy of the Check will be returned to you. You generally will be subject to the same rules and regulations that apply to checking accounts, although the election of this Privilege creates only a shareholder-transfer agent relationship with the Transfer Agent.

You should date your Checks with the current date when you write them. Please do not postdate your Checks. If you do, the Transfer Agent will honor, upon presentment, even if presented before the date of the check, all postdated Checks which are dated within six months of presentment for payment, if they are otherwise in good order. If you hold shares in a Dreyfus-sponsored IRA account, you may be permitted to make withdrawals from your IRA account using checks furnished to you by The Dreyfus Trust Company.

Checks are free, but the Transfer Agent will impose a fee for stopping payment of a Check upon your request or if the Transfer Agent cannot honor a Check due to insufficient funds or other valid reason. If the amount of the Check is greater than the value of the shares in your account, the Check will be returned marked insufficient funds. Checks should not be used to close an account.

Wire Redemption Privilege. By using this Privilege, you authorize the Transfer Agent to act on telephone, letter or, with respect to Class A shares of the Funds, online redemption instructions from any person representing himself or herself to be you or a representative of your Service Agent, and reasonably believed by the Transfer Agent to be genuine. Ordinarily, each Fund will initiate payment for shares redeemed pursuant to this Privilege on the same business day if the Transfer Agent receives a redemption request in proper form prior to 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, on such day; otherwise the Fund will initiate payment on the next business day. Redemption proceeds (\$1,000 minimum) will be transferred by Federal Reserve wire only to the commercial bank account specified by you on the Account Application or the Shareholder Services Form, or to a correspondent bank if your bank is not a member of the Federal Reserve System. Fees ordinarily are imposed by such bank and borne by the investor. Immediate notification by the correspondent bank to your bank is necessary to avoid a delay in crediting the funds to your bank account.

To change the commercial bank or account designated to receive redemption proceeds, a written request must be sent to the Transfer Agent. This request must be signed by each shareholder, with each signature guaranteed as described below under "Stock Certificates; Signatures."

Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege. You may request by telephone or, with respect to Class A shares of the Funds, online that redemption proceeds be transferred between your Fund account and your bank account. Only a bank account maintained in a domestic financial institution which is an ACH member may be designated. Redemption proceeds will be on deposit in your account at an ACH member bank ordinarily two days after receipt of the redemption request. You should be aware that if you have selected the Dreyfus TeleTransfer privilege, any request for a Dreyfus TeleTransfer transaction will be effected through the ACH system unless more prompt transmittal specifically is requested. Shares held in an IRA or Education Savings Account may not be redeemed through the Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege. See "How to Buy Shares--Dreyfus TeleTransfer Privilege."

Redemption Through a Selected Dealer. If you are a customer of a Selected Dealer, you may make redemption requests to your Selected Dealer. If the Selected Dealer transmits the redemption request so that it is received by the Transfer Agent or its designee by 3:00 p.m., Eastern time, with respect to the Municipal Funds, or 5:00 p.m., Eastern time, with respect to the Government Money Fund, Treasury Money Fund and Money Fund on a business day, the proceeds of the redemption ordinarily will be transmitted in Federal Funds on the same day and the shares will not receive the dividend declared on that day. If a redemption request is received after such time, but by 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, the redemption request will be effective on that day, the shares will receive the dividend declared on that day and the proceeds of redemption ordinarily will be transmitted in Federal Funds on



the next business day. If a redemption request is received after 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, the redemption request will be effective on the next business day. It is the responsibility of the Selected Dealer to transmit a request so that it is received in a timely manner. The proceeds of the redemption are credited to your account with the Selected Dealer.

Stock Certificates; Signatures. Any certificates representing Fund shares to be redeemed must be submitted with the redemption request. A fee may be charged to replace lost or stolen certificates, or certificates that were never received. Written redemption requests must be signed by each shareholder, including each holder of a joint account, and each signature must be guaranteed. Signatures on endorsed certificates submitted for redemption also must be guaranteed. The Transfer Agent has adopted standards and procedures pursuant to which signature-guarantees in proper form generally will be accepted from domestic banks, brokers, dealers, credit unions, national securities exchanges, registered securities associations, clearing agencies and savings associations, as well as from participants in the New York Stock Exchange Medallion Signature Program, the Securities Transfer Agents Medallion Program ("STAMP"), and the Stock Exchanges Medallion Program. Guarantees must be signed by an authorized signatory of the guarantor, and "Signature-Guaranteed" must appear with the signature. The Transfer Agent may request additional documentation from corporations, executors, administrators, trustees or guardians, and may accept other suitable verification arrangements from foreign investors, such as consular verification. For more information with respect to signature-guarantees, please call one of the telephone numbers listed on the cover.

Redemption Commitment. Each Fund has committed itself to pay in cash all redemption requests by any shareholder of record, limited in amount during any 90-day period to the lesser of \$250,000 or 1% of the value of the Fund's net assets at the beginning of such period. Such commitment is irrevocable without the prior approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission. In the case of requests for redemption in excess of such amount, each Fund's Board reserves the right to make payments in whole or in part in securities or other assets of the Fund in case of an emergency or any time a cash distribution would impair the liquidity of the Fund to the detriment of the existing shareholders. In such event, the securities would be valued in the same manner as the Fund's portfolio is valued. If the recipient sells such securities, brokerage charges might be incurred.

Suspension of Redemptions. The right of redemption may be suspended or the date of payment postponed (a) during any period when the New York Stock Exchange is closed (other than customary weekend and holiday closings), (b) when trading in the markets a Fund ordinarily utilizes is restricted, or when an emergency exists as determined by the SEC so that disposal of a Fund's investments or determination of its net asset value is not reasonably practicable, or (c) for such other periods as the SEC by order may permit to protect a Fund's shareholders.

## SHAREHOLDER SERVICES

Fund Exchanges. Clients of certain Service Agents may purchase, in exchange for shares of a Fund, shares of certain other funds managed or administered by the Manager or shares of certain funds advised by Founders Asset Management LLC ("Founders"), an indirect subsidiary of the Manager, to the extent such shares are offered for sale in such client's state of residence. Shares of other funds purchased by exchange will be purchased on the basis of relative net asset value per share as follows:

- A. Exchanges for shares of funds offered without a sales load will be made without a sales load.

- B. Shares of funds purchased without a sales load may be exchanged for shares of other funds sold with a sales load, and the applicable sales load will be deducted.
- C. Shares of funds purchased with a sales load may be exchanged without a sales load for shares of other funds sold without a sales load.
- D. Shares of funds purchased with a sales load, shares of funds acquired by a previous exchange from shares purchased with a sales load, and additional shares acquired through reinvestment of dividends or distributions of any such funds (collectively referred to herein as "Purchased Shares") may be exchanged for shares of other funds sold with a sales load (referred to herein as "Offered Shares"), but if the sales load applicable to the Offered Shares exceeds the maximum sales load that could have been imposed in connection with the Purchased Shares (at the time the Purchased Shares were acquired), without giving effect to any reduced loads, the difference may be deducted.

To accomplish an exchange under item D above, you or your Service Agent acting on your behalf must notify the Transfer Agent of your prior ownership of fund shares and your account number.

You may exchange Class B shares of any of the funds in the Dreyfus Premier Family of Funds and certain funds advised by Founders and certain eligible shares of Dreyfus Worldwide Dollar Money Market Fund, Inc. ("DWDMMF"), for Class B shares of the Money Fund. If you exchange Class B shares of a Dreyfus Premier fund or Dreyfus Founders fund which are subject to a contingent deferred sales charge ("CDSC"), or certain eligible shares of DWDMMF, for Class B shares of the Money Fund, the Money Fund's Class B shares obtained in the exchange will be held in a special account created solely for this purpose ("Exchange Account"). Exchanges of shares from an Exchange Account of the Money Fund only can be made into Class B shares of Dreyfus Premier funds or Dreyfus Founders funds. No CDSC is charged when an investor exchanges into or out of an Exchange Account of the Money Fund; however, the applicable CDSC will be imposed when shares are redeemed from an Exchange Account or other applicable fund account. Upon redemption, the applicable CDSC will be calculated taking into account the time such shares were held in the Exchange Account. The time Class B shares are held in an Exchange Account of the Money Fund also will be taken into account for purposes of calculating when such shares convert to Class A shares (or other designated class of shares of a Dreyfus Premier fund or Dreyfus Founders fund). If your Class B shares are held in an Exchange Account of the Money Fund at the time such shares are scheduled to convert, you will receive Class A shares of the Money Fund which may be exchanged for Class A shares (or other designated class of shares) of a Dreyfus Premier fund or Dreyfus Founders fund at net asset value.

You should review carefully the current prospectus of the fund from which Class B shares were exchanged and, if applicable, into which such shares are exchanged to determine the CDSC chargeable upon redemption of Class B shares and for information on conversion features.

Exchange Account shares are eligible for the Dreyfus Auto-Exchange Privilege and the Automatic Withdrawal Plan. The proceeds of any redemption of Class B shares held in an Exchange Account will be paid only by Federal wire or by check.

To request an exchange, you or your Service Agent acting on your behalf must give exchange instructions to the Transfer Agent in writing, by telephone or, with respect to Class A shares of the Funds, online. The ability to issue exchange instructions by telephone is given to shareholders of each Fund automatically, unless you check the applicable "No" box on the Account Application, indicating that you specifically refuse this privilege. By using the privilege, you authorize the Transfer Agent to act on telephonic and, with respect to Class A shares, online instructions (including over the Dreyfus Express<sup>®</sup> voice response telephone system) from any person representing himself or herself to be you or a representative of your Service Agent, and reasonably believed by the Transfer Agent to be genuine. Exchanges may be subject to limitations as to the amount involved or the number of exchanges permitted. Shares issued in certificate form are not eligible for online or telephone exchange. No fees currently are charged shareholders directly in connection with exchanges, although each Fund reserve the right, upon not less than 60 days' written notice, to charge shareholders a nominal administrative fee in accordance with rules promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

To establish a personal retirement plan by exchange, shares of the fund being exchanged must have a value of at least the minimum initial investment required for the fund into which the exchange is being made.

During times of drastic economic or market conditions, each Fund may suspend Fund Exchanges temporarily without notice and treat exchange requests based on their separate components -- redemption orders with a simultaneous request to purchase the other fund's shares. In such a case, the redemption request would be processed at the Fund's next determined net asset value but the purchase order would be effective only at the net asset value next determined after the fund being purchased receives the proceeds of the redemption, which may result in the purchase being delayed.

Dreyfus Auto-Exchange Privilege. Dreyfus Auto-Exchange Privilege permits you to purchase (on a semi-monthly, monthly, quarterly or annual basis), in exchange for shares of a Fund, shares of certain other funds in the Dreyfus Family of Funds or shares of certain funds advised by Founders of which you are a shareholder. This Privilege is available only for existing accounts. Shares will be exchanged on the basis of relative net asset value as described above under "Fund Exchanges." Enrollment in or modification or cancellation of this Privilege is effective three business days following notification by you. You will be notified if your account falls below the amount designated to be exchanged under this Privilege. In this case, your account will fall to zero unless additional investments are made in excess of the designated amount prior to the next Auto-Exchange transaction. Shares held under IRA and other retirement plans are eligible for this Privilege. Exchanges of IRA shares may be made between IRA accounts and from regular accounts to IRA accounts, but not from IRA accounts to regular accounts. With respect to all other retirement accounts, exchanges may be made only among those accounts.

Fund Exchanges and the Auto-Exchange Privilege are available to shareholders resident in any state in which shares of the fund being acquired legally may be sold. Shares may be exchanged only between accounts having certain identical identifying designations.

Shareholder Services Forms and prospectuses of the other funds may be obtained by calling 1-800-645-6561 or visiting [www.dreyfus.com](http://www.dreyfus.com). Each Fund reserves the right to reject any exchange

request in whole or in part. The Fund Exchanges service or the Auto-Exchange Privilege may be modified or terminated at any time upon notice to shareholders.

Dreyfus-Automatic Asset Builder®. Dreyfus-Automatic Asset Builder permits you to purchase Fund shares (minimum of \$100 and maximum of \$150,000 per transaction) at regular intervals selected by you. Fund shares are purchased by transferring funds from the bank account designated by you.

Dreyfus Government Direct Deposit Privilege. Dreyfus Government Direct Deposit Privilege enables you to purchase Fund shares (minimum of \$100 and maximum of \$50,000 per transaction) by having Federal salary, Social Security, or certain veterans', military or other payments from the Federal Government automatically deposited into your Fund account.

Dreyfus Payroll Savings Plan. The Payroll Savings Plan permits you to purchase Fund shares (minimum of \$100 per transaction) automatically on a regular basis. Depending upon your employer's direct deposit program, you may have part or all of your paycheck transferred to your existing Dreyfus account electronically through the ACH system at each pay period. To establish a Payroll Savings Plan account, you must file an authorization form with your employer's payroll department. It is the sole responsibility of your employer to arrange for transactions under the Dreyfus Payroll Savings Plan.

Dreyfus Dividend Options. Dreyfus Dividend Sweep allows you to invest automatically your dividends or dividends and capital gain distributions, if any, paid by a Fund in shares of another fund in the Dreyfus Family of Funds or shares of certain funds advised by Founders of which you are a shareholder. Shares of other funds purchased pursuant to this privilege will be purchased on the basis of relative net asset value per share as follows:

- A. Dividends and distributions paid by a fund may be invested without a sales load in shares of other funds offered without a sales load.
- B. Dividends and distributions paid by a fund that does not charge a sales load may be invested in shares of other funds sold with a sales load, and the applicable sales load will be deducted.
- C. Dividends and distributions paid by a fund that charges a sales load may be invested in shares of other funds sold with a sales load (referred to herein as "Offered Shares"), but if the sales load applicable to the Offered Shares exceeds the maximum sales load charged by the fund from which dividends or distributions are being swept (without giving effect to any reduced loads), the difference may be deducted.
- D. Dividends and distributions paid by a fund may be invested in shares of other funds that impose a CDSC and the applicable CDSC, if any, will be imposed upon redemption of such shares.

Dreyfus Dividend ACH permits you to transfer electronically dividends or dividends and capital gain distributions, if any, from each Fund to a designated bank account. Only an account

maintained at a domestic financial institution which is an ACH member may be so designated. Banks may charge a fee for this service.

Quarterly Distribution Plan. The Quarterly Distribution Plan permits you to receive quarterly payments from a Fund consisting of proceeds from the redemption of shares purchased for your account through the automatic reinvestment of dividends declared on your account during the preceding calendar quarter.

Automatic Withdrawal Plan. The Automatic Withdrawal Plan permits you to request withdrawal of a specified dollar amount (minimum of \$50) on either a monthly or quarterly basis if you have a \$5,000 minimum account. Withdrawal payments are the proceeds from sales of Fund shares, not the yield on the shares. If withdrawal payments exceed reinvested dividends and distributions, your shares will be reduced and eventually may be depleted. Automatic Withdrawal may be terminated at any time by you, the Fund or the Transfer Agent. Shares for which certificates have been issued may not be redeemed through the Automatic Withdrawal Plan.

Corporate Pension/Profit-Sharing and Personal Retirement Plans. (Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund) Each of the Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund makes available to corporations a variety of prototype pension and profit-sharing plans, including a 401(k) Salary Reduction Plan. In addition, these Funds make available Keogh Plans, IRAs (including regular IRAs, spousal IRAs for a non-working spouse, Roth IRAs, SEP-IRAs and rollover IRAs) and Education Savings Accounts and 403(b)(7) Plans. Plan support services also are available.

If you wish to purchase Fund shares in conjunction with a Keogh Plan, a 403(b)(7) Plan or an IRA, including a SEP-IRA, you may request from the Distributor forms for adoption of such plans.

The entity acting as custodian for Keogh Plans, 403(b)(7) Plans or IRAs may charge a fee, payment of which could require the liquidation of shares. All fees charged are described in the appropriate form.

Shares may be purchased in connection with these plans only by direct remittance to the entity which acts as custodian. Such purchases will be effective when payments received by the Transfer Agent are converted into Federal Funds. Purchases for these plans may not be made in advance of receipt of funds.

You should read the prototype retirement plans and the applicable form of custodial agreement for further details as to eligibility, service fees and tax implications, and should consult a tax adviser.

## DETERMINATION OF NET ASSET VALUE

Amortized Cost Pricing. The valuation of each Fund's portfolio securities is based upon their amortized cost, which does not take into account unrealized capital gains or losses. This involves valuing an instrument at its cost and thereafter assuming a constant amortization to maturity of any discount or premium, regardless of the impact of fluctuating interest rates on the market value of the instrument. While this method provides certainty in valuation, it may result in periods during which value, as determined by amortized cost, is higher or lower than the price the Fund would receive if it sold the instrument.

Each Fund's Board has established, as a particular responsibility within the overall duty of care owed to the Fund's shareholders, procedures reasonably designed to stabilize the Fund's price per share as computed for the purpose of purchases and redemptions at \$1.00. Such procedures include review of the Fund's portfolio holdings by the Board, at such intervals as it may deem appropriate, to determine whether the Fund's net asset value calculated by using available market quotations or market equivalents deviates from \$1.00 per share based on amortized cost. In such review, investments for which market quotations are readily available will be valued at the most recent bid price or yield equivalent for such securities or for securities of comparable maturity, quality and type, as obtained from one or more of the major market makers for the securities to be valued. Other investments and assets, to the extent a Fund is permitted to invest in such instruments, will be valued at fair value as determined in good faith by the Board. With respect to the Municipal Funds, market quotations and market equivalents used in the Board's review are obtained from an independent pricing service (the "Service") approved by the Board. The Service values these Funds' investments based on methods which include considerations of: yields or prices of municipal obligations of comparable quality, coupon, maturity and type; indications of values from dealers; and general market conditions. The Service also may employ electronic data processing techniques and/or a matrix system to determine valuations.

The extent of any deviation between a Fund's net asset value based upon available market quotations or market equivalents and \$1.00 per share based on amortized cost will be examined by the Fund's Board. If such deviation exceeds 1/2 of 1%, the Board promptly will consider what action, if any, will be initiated. In the event a Fund's Board determines that a deviation exists which may result in material dilution or other unfair results to investors or existing shareholders, it has agreed to take such corrective action as it regards as necessary and appropriate, including: selling portfolio instruments prior to maturity to realize capital gains or losses or to shorten average portfolio maturity; withholding dividends or paying distributions from capital or capital gains; redeeming shares in kind; or establishing a net asset value per share by using available market quotations or market equivalents.

New York Stock Exchange and Transfer Agent Closings. The holidays (as observed) on which both the New York Stock Exchange and the Transfer Agent are closed currently are: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

## DIVIDENDS, DISTRIBUTIONS AND TAXES

Management believes that each Fund has qualified for treatment as a "regulated investment company" under the Code for the fiscal year ended November 30, 2007. Each Fund intends to continue to so qualify if such qualification is in the best interests of its shareholders. As a regulated investment company, the Fund will pay no Federal income tax on net investment income and net realized securities gains to the extent that such income and gains are distributed to shareholders in accordance with applicable provisions of the Code. To qualify as a regulated investment company, the Fund must pay out at least 90% of its net income (consisting of net investment income and net short-term capital gain), and must meet certain asset diversification and other requirements. If the Fund does not qualify as a regulated investment company, it will be treated for tax purposes as an ordinary corporation subject to Federal income tax. The term "regulated investment company" does not imply the supervision of management or investment practices or policies by any government agency.

Each Fund ordinarily declares dividends from its net investment income on each day the New York Stock Exchange or, for the Government Money Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund only, the Transfer Agent is open for regular business. The Fund's earnings for Saturdays, Sundays and holidays are declared as dividends on the preceding business day. Dividends usually are paid on the last calendar day of each month and automatically are reinvested in additional shares at net asset value or, at your option, paid in cash. If you redeem all shares in your account at any time during the month, all dividends to which you are entitled will be paid to you along with the proceeds of the redemption. If you are an omnibus accountholder and indicate in a partial redemption request that a portion of any accrued dividends to which such account is entitled belongs to an underlying accountholder who has redeemed all shares in his or her account, such portion of the accrued dividends will be paid to you along with the proceeds of the redemption.

If you elect to receive dividends and distributions in cash, and your dividend or distribution check is returned to the Fund as undeliverable or remains uncashed for six months, the Fund reserves the right to reinvest such dividend or distribution and all future dividends and distributions payable to you in additional Fund shares at net asset value. No interest will accrue on amounts represented by uncashed distribution or redemption checks.

Ordinarily, gains and losses realized from portfolio transactions will be treated as capital gain or loss. However, all or a portion of any gain realized from the sale or other disposition of certain market discount bonds will be treated as ordinary income.

With respect to the Municipal Funds, if, at the close of each quarter of its taxable year, at least 50% of the value of the Fund's total assets consists of Federal tax exempt obligations, then the Fund may designate and pay Federal exempt-interest dividends from interest earned on all such tax exempt obligations. Such exempt-interest dividends may be excluded by shareholders of the Fund from their gross income for Federal income tax purposes. Dividends derived from Taxable Investments, together with distributions from any net realized short-term securities gains, generally are taxable as ordinary income for Federal income tax purposes whether or not reinvested. Distributions from net realized long-term securities gains generally are taxable as long-term capital gains to a shareholder who is a citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not reinvested and regardless of the length of time the shareholder has held his shares.

With respect to the California Municipal Fund, if, at the close of each quarter of its taxable year, at least 50% of the value of the Fund's total assets consists of obligations which, when held by an individual, the interest therefrom is exempt from California personal income tax, and if the Fund qualifies as a management company under the California Revenue and Taxation Code, then the Fund will be qualified to pay dividends to its shareholders that are exempt from California personal income tax (but not from California franchise tax) ("California exempt-interest dividends"). However, the total amount of California exempt-interest dividends paid by the Fund to a non-corporate shareholder with respect to any taxable year cannot exceed such shareholder's pro rata share of interest received by the Fund during such year that is exempt from California taxation less any expenses and expenditures deemed to have been paid from such interest.

For shareholders subject to the California personal income tax, exempt-interest dividends derived from California Municipal Obligations will not be subject to the California personal income tax. Distributions from net realized short-term capital gains to California resident shareholders will be subject to the California personal income tax distributed by the Fund as ordinary income.

Distributions from net realized long-term capital gains may constitute long-term capital gains for individual California resident shareholders. Unlike under Federal tax law, the California Municipal Fund's shareholders will not be subject to California personal income tax, or receive a credit for California taxes paid by the Fund, on undistributed capital gains. In addition, California tax law does not consider any portion of the exempt-interest dividends paid an item of tax preference for the purpose of computing the California alternative minimum tax.

Federal regulations require that you provide a certified taxpayer identification number ("TIN") upon opening or reopening an account. See the Account Application for further information concerning this requirement. Failure to furnish certified TIN to a Fund could subject you to a \$50 penalty imposed by the Internal Revenue Service.

## PORTFOLIO TRANSACTIONS

General. The Manager assumes general supervision over the placement of securities purchase and sale orders on behalf of the funds it manages. In cases where the Manager or fund employs a sub-adviser, the sub-adviser, under the supervision of the Manager, places orders on behalf of the applicable fund(s) for the purchase and sale of portfolio securities.

Certain funds are managed by dual employees of the Manager and an affiliated entity in the Mellon organization. Funds managed by dual employees use the research and trading facilities, and are subject to the internal policies and procedures, of the affiliated entity. In this regard, the Manager places orders on behalf of those funds for the purchase and sale of securities through the trading desk of the affiliated entity, applying the written trade allocation procedures of such affiliate.

The Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) generally has the authority to select brokers (for equity securities) or dealers (for fixed income securities) and the commission rates or spreads to be paid. Allocation of brokerage transactions, including their frequency, is made in the best judgment of the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) and in a manner deemed fair and reasonable to shareholders. The primary consideration in placing portfolio transactions is prompt execution of orders at the most favorable net price. In choosing brokers or dealers, the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) evaluates the ability of the broker or dealer to execute the particular transaction (taking into account the market for the security and the size of the order) at the best combination of price and quality of execution.

In general, brokers or dealers involved in the execution of portfolio transactions on behalf of a fund are selected on the basis of their professional capability and the value and quality of their services. The Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) attempts to obtain best execution for the fund by choosing brokers or dealers to execute transactions based on a variety of factors, which may include, but are not limited to, the following: (i) price; (ii) liquidity; (iii) the nature and character of the relevant market for the security to be purchased or sold; (iv) the measured quality and efficiency of the broker's or dealer's execution; (v) the broker's or dealer's willingness to commit capital; (vi) the reliability of the broker or dealer in trade settlement and clearance; (vii) the level of counter-party risk (*i.e.*, the broker's or dealer's financial condition); (viii) the commission rate or the spread; (ix) the value of research provided; (x) the availability of electronic trade entry and reporting links; and (xi) the size and type of order (*e.g.*, foreign or domestic security, large block, illiquid security). In selecting brokers or dealers no factor is necessarily determinative; however, at various



times and for various reasons, certain factors will be more important than others in determining which broker or dealer to use. Seeking to obtain best execution for all trades takes precedence over all other considerations.

With respect to the receipt of research, the brokers or dealers selected may include those that supplement the Manager's (and where applicable, a sub-adviser's or Dreyfus affiliate's) research facilities with statistical data, investment information, economic facts and opinions. Such information may be useful to the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) in serving funds or accounts that it advises and, conversely, supplemental information obtained by the placement of business of other clients may be useful to the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) in carrying out its obligations to the fund. Information so received is in addition to, and not in lieu of, services required to be performed by the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate), and the Manager's (and where applicable, a sub-adviser's or Dreyfus affiliate's) fees are not reduced as a consequence of the receipt of such supplemental information. Although the receipt of such research services does not reduce the Manager's (and where applicable, a sub-adviser's or Dreyfus affiliate's) normal independent research activities, it enables it to avoid the additional expenses that might otherwise be incurred if it were to attempt to develop comparable information through its own staff.

Under the Manager's (and where applicable, a sub-adviser's or Dreyfus affiliate's) procedures, portfolio managers and their corresponding trading desks may seek to aggregate (or "bunch") orders that are placed or received concurrently for more than one fund or account. In some cases, this policy may adversely affect the price paid or received by a fund or an account, or the size of the position obtained or liquidated. As noted above, certain brokers or dealers may be selected because of their ability to handle special executions such as those involving large block trades or broad distributions, provided that the primary consideration of best execution is met. Generally, when trades are aggregated, the Fund or account within the block will receive the same price and commission. However, random allocations of aggregate transactions may be made to minimize custodial transaction costs. In addition, at the close of the trading day, when reasonable and practicable, the completed securities of partially filled orders will generally be allocated to each participating fund and account in the proportion that each order bears to the total of all orders (subject to rounding to "round lot" amounts).

Portfolio turnover may vary from year to year as well as within a year. In periods in which extraordinary market conditions prevail, the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) will not be deterred from changing a Fund's investment strategy as rapidly as needed, in which case higher turnover rates can be anticipated which would result in greater brokerage expenses. The overall reasonableness of brokerage commissions paid is evaluated by the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) based upon its knowledge of available information as to the general level of commissions paid by other institutional investors for comparable services. Higher portfolio turnover rates usually generate additional brokerage commissions and transaction costs and any short-term gains realized from these transactions are taxable to shareholders as ordinary income.

To the extent that a fund invests in foreign securities, certain of such fund's transactions in those securities may not benefit from the negotiated commission rates available to funds for transactions in securities of domestic issuers. For funds that permit foreign exchange transactions, such transactions are made with banks or institutions in the interbank market at prices reflecting a mark-up or mark-down and/or commission.

The Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) may deem it appropriate for one fund or account it manages to sell a security while another fund or account it manages is purchasing the same security. Under such circumstances, the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) may arrange to have the purchase and sale transactions effected directly between the fund and/or accounts ("cross transactions"). Cross transactions will be effected in accordance with procedures adopted pursuant to Rule 17a-7 under the 1940 Act.

All portfolio transactions of each money market fund are placed on behalf of the fund by the Manager. Debt securities purchased and sold by a fund generally are traded on a net basis (*i.e.*, without a commission) through dealers acting for their own account and not as brokers, or otherwise involve transactions directly with the issuer of the instrument. This means that a dealer makes a market for securities by offering to buy at one price and sell at a slightly higher price. The difference between the prices is known as a "spread." Other portfolio transactions may be executed through brokers acting as agent. A fund will pay a spread or commission in connection with such transactions. The Manager uses its best efforts to obtain execution of portfolio transactions at prices that are advantageous to a fund and at spreads and commission rates (if any) that are reasonable in relation to the benefits received. The Manager also places transactions for other accounts that it provides with investment advice.

When more than one fund or account is simultaneously engaged in the purchase or sale of the same investment instrument, the prices and amounts are allocated in accordance with a formula considered by the Manager (and where applicable, a sub-adviser or Dreyfus affiliate) to be equitable to the fund or account. In some cases this system could have a detrimental effect on the price or volume of the investment instrument as far as a fund or account is concerned. In other cases, however, the ability of a fund or account to participate in volume transactions will produce better executions for the fund or account.

When transactions are executed in the over-the-counter market (*i.e.*, with dealers), the Manager will typically deal with the primary market makers unless a more favorable price or execution otherwise is obtainable.

Regular Broker-Dealers. A Fund may acquire securities issued by one or more of its "regular brokers or dealers," as defined in Rule 10b-1 under the 1940 Act. Rule 10b-1 provides that a "regular broker or dealer" is one of the ten brokers or dealers that, during the Fund's most recent fiscal year (i) received the greatest dollar amount of brokerage commissions from participating, either directly or indirectly, in the Fund's portfolio transactions, (ii) engaged as principal in the largest dollar amount of the Fund's portfolio transactions or (iii) sold the largest dollar amount of the Fund's securities. The following is a list of each Fund that acquired securities of its regular brokers or dealers for the fiscal year ended November 30, 2007, the issuer of the securities and the aggregate value per issuer, as of November 30, 2007, of such securities:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Name of Regular Broker Dealer</u>	<u>Aggregate Value Per Issuer</u>
Government Money Fund	Barclays Capital Inc.	\$239,000,000
Money Fund	Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc.	\$60,000,000
	UBS Securities	\$495,000,000

Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.	\$138,947,000
Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc.	\$100,000,000
Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc.	\$225,000,000
Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.	\$130,000,000

Disclosure of Portfolio Holdings. It is the policy of Dreyfus to protect the confidentiality of fund portfolio holdings and prevent the selective disclosure of non-public information about such holdings. Each Fund, or its duly authorized service provider, may publicly disclose its portfolio holdings in accordance with regulatory requirements, such as periodic portfolio disclosure in filings with the SEC. Each non-money market fund, or its duly authorized service providers, may publicly disclose its complete schedule of portfolio holdings at month-end, with a one-month lag, at [www.dreyfus.com](http://www.dreyfus.com). In addition, each money market fund, or its duly authorized service providers, may publicly disclose daily on the website its complete schedule of portfolio holdings as of the end of the previous business day. Portfolio holdings will remain available on the website until the fund files a Form N-CSR or Form N-Q for the period that includes the date of the posted holdings.

If a Fund's portfolio holdings are released pursuant to an ongoing arrangement with any party, such Fund must have a legitimate business purpose for doing so, and neither the fund, nor Dreyfus or its affiliates, may receive any compensation in connection with an arrangement to make available information about the fund's portfolio holdings. Funds may distribute portfolio holdings to mutual fund evaluation services such as Standard & Poor's, Morningstar or Lipper Analytical Services; due diligence departments of broker-dealers and wirehouses that regularly analyze the portfolio holdings of mutual funds before their public disclosure; and broker-dealers that may be used by the fund, for the purpose of efficient trading and receipt of relevant research, provided that: (a) the recipient does not distribute the portfolio holdings to persons who are likely to use the information for purposes of purchasing or selling fund shares or fund portfolio holdings before the portfolio holdings become public information; and (b) the recipient signs a written confidentiality agreement.

Funds may also disclose any and all portfolio information to their service providers and others who generally need access to such information in the performance of their contractual duties and responsibilities and are subject to duties of confidentiality, including a duty not to trade on non-public information, imposed by law and/or contract. These service providers include the fund's custodian, auditors, investment adviser, administrator, and each of their respective affiliates and advisers.

Disclosure of portfolio holdings may be authorized only by the Fund's Chief Compliance Officer, and any exceptions to this policy are reported quarterly to the Fund's Board.

## INFORMATION ABOUT THE FUNDS

Each Fund share has one vote and, when issued and paid for in accordance with the terms of the offering, is fully paid and non-assessable. Fund shares have equal rights as to dividends and in liquidation. Shares have no preemptive or subscription rights and are freely transferable.

The Government Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund are separate series of the Government Company. Rule 18f-2 under the 1940 Act provides that any matter required to be submitted under the provisions of the 1940 Act or applicable state law or otherwise to the holders of the outstanding voting securities of an investment company, such as the Government Company will not be deemed to have been effectively acted upon unless approved by the holders of a majority of the outstanding shares of each series affected by such matter. Rule 18f-2 further provides that a series shall be deemed to be affected by a matter unless it is clear that the interests of each series in the matter are identical or that the matter does not affect any interest of such series. The Rule exempts the selection of independent accountants and the election of Board members from the separate voting requirements of the Rule.

Unless otherwise required by the 1940 Act, ordinarily it will not be necessary for each Fund to hold annual meetings of shareholders. As a result, Fund shareholders may not consider each year the election of Board members or the appointment of auditors. However, the holders of at least 10% of the shares outstanding and entitled to vote may require the Fund to hold a special meeting of shareholders for purposes of removing a Board member from office. Fund shareholders may remove a Board member by the affirmative vote of a majority, in the case of the Government Money Fund, National Municipal Fund, Money Fund and Treasury Money Fund, or two-thirds, in the case of the California Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund, of the Fund's outstanding voting shares. In addition, the Board will call a meeting of shareholders for the purpose of electing Board members if, at any time, less than a majority of the Board members then holding office have been elected by shareholders.

The California Municipal Fund and New York Municipal Fund are organized as unincorporated business trusts under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Under Massachusetts law, shareholders could, under certain circumstances, be held personally liable for the obligations of the Fund. However, the Agreement and Declaration of Trust (the "Trust Agreement") for each of these Funds disclaims shareholder liability for acts or obligations of the Fund and requires that notice of such disclaimer be given in each agreement, obligation or instrument entered into or executed by the Fund or a Trustee. The Trust Agreement provides for indemnification from the Fund's property for all losses and expenses of any shareholder held personally liable for the obligations of the Fund. Thus, the risk of a shareholder incurring financial loss on account of shareholder liability is limited to circumstances in which the Fund itself would be unable to meet its obligations, a possibility which management believes is remote. Upon payment of any liability incurred by the Fund, the shareholder paying such liability will be entitled to reimbursement from the general assets of the Fund. The Fund intends to conduct its operations in such a way so as to avoid, as far as possible, ultimate liability of the shareholder for liabilities of the Fund.

Each Fund sends annual and semi-annual financial statements to all its shareholders.

Set forth below, as to each share Class of each Fund, as applicable, are those shareholders known by the Fund to own of record 5% or more of a Class of shares of the Fund outstanding as of March 14, 2008.

### **Government Money Fund**

Class A: The Bank of New York, As Agent for American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, Attn. John Eilhardt, 260 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016-2401 – owned of

record – 9.54%;

The Bank of New York, As Agent for The Atlantic Foundation of New York, 125 Park Ave., 21<sup>st</sup> Floor, New York, NY 10017-8502 – owned of record – 7.83%.

Class B: SWS Securities, Inc., Attn. Money Market, 1201 Elm St., Dallas, TX 75270-2002 – owned of record – 7.30%;

Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record – 7.29%;

Janney Montgomery Scott LLC, 1801 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103-1628 – owned of record – 9.57%;

Stifel Nicolaus & Co. Inc., for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, 500 N. Broadway, St. Louis, MO 63102-2110 - owned of record - 26.29%;

Robert W. Baird & Co. Inc., Omnibus Account for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, P.O. Box 672, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0672 - owned of record - 10.85%;

Morgan Keegan & Co. Inc., 50 Front Street, Floor 4, Memphis, TN 38103-1175 - owned of record - 26.59%;

### **Treasury Money Fund**

Class A: Crowell Weedon & Co., For The Exclusive Benefit of Customers, Attn: James L. Cronk, 624 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2510, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3335 – owned of record – 83.89%.

Class B: Crowell Weedon & Co., For the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, Attn. James L. Cronk, 624 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2510, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3335 - owned of record – 13.46%;

Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6F, Jersey City, NJ 07399-0001 - owned of record – 19.01%.

Stifel Nicolaus & Co. Inc., One Financial Plaza, 501 N. Broadway, St. Louis, MO 63102-2131 – owned of record - 53.87%.

### **Money Fund**

Class A: Morgan Keegan & Co. Inc., 50 Front Street, Floor 4, Memphis, TN, 38103– owned of record - 48.04%;

Robert W. Baird & Co. (VIP), 777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53202-5300 – owned of record - 18.43%;

Class B: Janney Montgomery Scott, Mutual Funds Dept., 1801 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103-1628 – owned of record – 10.01%;

Pershing LLC, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record – 20.79%;

Robert W. Baird & Co., Omnibus Account for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, P.O. Box 672, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0672 - owned of record - 12.38%;

Stifel Nicolaus & Co. Inc., For The Exclusive Benefit of Customers, 500 N. Broadway, St. Louis, MO 63102-2110 - owned of record - 26.30%;

SWS Securities, Inc., Attn.: Money Market, 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 75270-2002 - owned of record - 9.03%.

Crowell Weeden & Co., for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, Attn. James L. Cronk, 624 South Grand Avenue, 2510, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3335 - owned of record – 5.75%.

Morgan Keegan & Co., Inc., 50 Front St., Fl 4, Memphis, TN 38103-1175 – owned of record – 10.13%

### **California Municipal Fund**

Class A: Pershing LLC, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record – 15.97%.

National Financial Services Corp. for Exclusive Benefit of our Customers, One World Financial Center, 200 Liberty St., New York, NY 10281-1003 – owned of record – 9.03%.

Wells Fargo Bank, NA, Attn. Cash Sweep Dept., 733 Marquette Ave., Minneapolis, MN 55479-0001 – owned of record - 5.20%.

Class B: Crowell Weedon & Co., for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, 624 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2510, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3335 – owned of record – 62.34%;

Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6F, Jersey City, NJ 07499-0002 – owned of record – 25.58%.

### **National Municipal Fund**

Class A: Pershing LLC, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record - 25.74%.

Morgan Keegan & Co., Inc., 50 North Front Street, Fl 4, Memphis, TN 38103-1175 – owned of record -37.62%.

Class B: Robert W. Baird & Co. Inc., Omnibus Account for the Exclusive Benefit of its Customers, P.O. Box 672, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0672 - owned of record - 14.32%;

Stifel Nicolaus & Co. Inc. for the Exclusive Benefit of Customers, 500 N. Broadway, St. Louis, MO 63102-2110 - owned of record - 32.79%;

Morgan Keegan & Co. Inc., 50 Front Street, Floor 4, Memphis, TN 38103-1175 – owned of record - 17.50%;

Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record – 13.07%;

Janney Montgomery Scott LLC, 1801 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103-1628 – owned of record – 11.11%;

SWS Securities, Inc., Attn.: Money Market, 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 75270-2102 - owned of record – 5.86%.

### **New York Municipal Fund**

Class A: Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399 – owned of record – 8.83%;

Hugo Neu Corporation, 120 5<sup>th</sup> Ave., 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, NY 10011-5603 – owned of record – 6.70%.

Class B: Janney Montgomery Scott LLC, 1801 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19103-1628 – owned of record – 40.20%;

Pershing, Cash Management Services, One Pershing Plaza, Harborside III, 6th Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07399-0002 – owned of record - 12.96%;

The York Group, Inc., Newport Office Center VII, 480 Washington Blvd., 24<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jersey City, NJ 07310-2053 – owned of record - 6.76%.

Stifel Nicolaus & Co., Inc. for The Exclusive Benefit of Customers, 500 N. Broadway, St. Louis, MO 63102-2110 – owned of record – 35.23%.

#### COUNSEL AND INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP, 180 Maiden Lane, New York, New York 10038-4982, as counsel for each Fund, has rendered its opinion as to certain legal matters regarding the due authorization and valid issuance of the shares being sold pursuant to the Funds' Prospectus.

Ernst & Young LLP, 5 Times Square, New York, New York 10036, an independent registered public accounting firm, has been selected to serve as the independent registered public accounting firm for each Fund.



## APPENDIX A (MONEY FUND ONLY)

Description of the two highest commercial paper, bond and other short- and long-term rating categories assigned by Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ("S&P"), Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's"), Fitch Ratings ("Fitch"), and Thomson BankWatch, Inc. ("BankWatch"):

### Commercial Paper and Short-Term Ratings

The designation A-1 by S&P indicates that the degree of safety regarding timely payment is either overwhelming or very strong. Those issues determined to possess overwhelming safety characteristics are denoted with a plus sign (+) designation. Capacity for timely payment on issues with an A-2 designation is strong. However, the relative degree of safety is not as high as for issues designated A-1.

The rating Prime-1 (P-1) is the highest commercial paper rating assigned by Moody's. Issuers of P-1 paper must have a superior capacity for repayment of short-term promissory obligations and ordinarily will be evidenced by leading market positions in well established industries, high rates of return of funds employed, conservative capitalization structures with moderate reliance on debt and ample asset protection, broad margins in earnings coverage of fixed financial charges and high internal cash generation, and well established access to a range of financial markets and assured sources of alternate liquidity. Issues rated Prime-2 (P-2) have a strong capacity for repayment of short-term promissory obligations. This ordinarily will be evidenced by many of the characteristics cited above but to a lesser degree. Earnings trends and coverage ratios, while sound, will be more subject to variation. Capitalization characteristics, while still appropriate, may be more affected by external conditions. Ample alternate liquidity is maintained.

The rating Fitch-1 (Highest Grade) is the highest commercial paper rating assigned by Fitch. Paper rated Fitch-1 is regarded as having the strongest degree of assurance for timely payment. The rating Fitch-2 (Very Good Grade) is the second highest commercial paper rating assigned by Fitch which reflects an assurance of timely payment only slightly less in degree than the strongest issues.

The rating TBW-1 is the highest short-term obligation rating assigned by BankWatch. Obligations rated TBW-1 are regarded as having the strongest capacity for timely repayment. Obligations rated TBW-2 are supported by a strong capacity for timely repayment, although the degree of safety is not as high as for issues rated TBW-1.

## Bond and Long-Term Ratings

Bonds rated AAA are considered by S&P to be the highest grade obligations and possess an extremely strong capacity to pay principal and interest. Bonds rated AA by S&P are judged by S&P to have a very strong capacity to pay principal and interest and, in the majority of instances, differ only in small degrees from issues rated AAA. The rating AA may be modified by the addition of a plus or minus sign to show relative standing within the rating category.

Bonds rated Aaa by Moody's are judged to be of the best quality. Bonds rated Aa by Moody's are judged by Moody's to be of high quality by all standards and, together with the Aaa group they comprise what are generally known as high-grade bonds. Bonds rated Aa are rated lower than Aaa bonds because margins of protection may not be as large or fluctuations of protective elements may be of greater amplitude or there may be other elements present which make the long-term risks appear somewhat larger. Moody's applies numerical modifiers 1, 2 and 3 in the Aa rating category. The modifier 1 indicates a ranking for the security in the higher end of this rating category, the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking, and the modifier 3 indicates a ranking in the lower end of the rating category.

Bonds rated AAA by Fitch are judged by Fitch to be strictly high grade, broadly marketable, suitable for investment by trustees and fiduciary institutions and liable to slight market fluctuation other than through changes in the money rate. The prime feature of an AAA bond is a showing of earnings several times or many times interest requirements, with such stability of applicable earnings that safety is beyond reasonable question whatever changes occur in conditions. Bonds rated AA by Fitch are judged by Fitch to be of safety virtually beyond question and are readily salable, whose merits are not unlike those of the AAA class, but whose margin of safety is less strikingly broad. The issue may be the obligation of a small company, strongly secured but influenced as to rating by the lesser financial power of the enterprise and more local type of market.

Fitch also assigns a rating to certain international and U.S. banks. A Fitch bank rating represents Fitch's current assessment of the strength of the bank and whether such bank would receive support should it experience difficulties. In its assessment of a bank, Fitch uses a dual rating system comprised of Legal Ratings and Individual Ratings. In addition, Fitch assigns banks Long- and Short-Term Ratings as used in the corporate ratings discussed above. Legal Ratings, which range in gradation from 1 through 5, address the question of whether the bank would receive support from central banks or shareholders if it experienced difficulties, and such ratings are considered by Fitch to be a prime factor in its assessment of credit risk. Individual Ratings, which range in gradations from A through E, represent Fitch's assessment of a bank's economic merits and address the question of how the bank would be viewed if it were entirely independent and could not rely on support from state authorities or its owners.

In addition to ratings of short-term obligations, BankWatch assigns a rating to each issuer it rates, in gradations of A through E. BankWatch examines all segments of the organization including, where applicable, the holding company, member banks or associations, and other subsidiaries. In those instances where financial disclosure is incomplete or untimely, a qualified

rating (QR) is assigned to the institution. BankWatch also assigns, in the case of foreign banks, a country rating which represents an assessment of the overall political and economic stability of the country in which the bank is domiciled.

## APPENDIX B (MUNICIPAL FUNDS)

Description of certain S&P, Moody's and Fitch ratings:

### **S&P**

#### Municipal Bond Ratings

An S&P municipal bond rating is a current assessment of the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to a specific obligation.

The ratings are based on current information furnished by the issuer or obtained by S&P from other sources it considers reliable, and will include: (1) likelihood of default-capacity and willingness of the obligor as to the timely payment of interest and repayment of principal in accordance with the terms of the obligation; (2) nature of and provisions of the obligation; and (3) protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization or other arrangement under the laws of bankruptcy and other laws affecting creditors' rights.

### **AAA**

Debt rated AAA has the highest rating assigned by S&P. Capacity to pay interest and repay principal is extremely strong.

### **AA**

Debt rated AA has a very strong capacity to pay interest and repay principal and differs from the highest rated issues only in a small degree.

### **A**

Debt rated A has a strong capacity to pay interest and repay principal although they are somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than debt in higher rated categories.

#### Municipal Note Ratings

### **SP-1**

The issuers of these municipal notes exhibit very strong or strong capacity to pay principal and interest. Those issues determined to possess overwhelming safety characteristics are given a plus (+) designation.

## Commercial Paper Ratings

The rating A is the highest rating and is assigned by S&P to issues that are regarded as having the greatest capacity for timely payment. Issues in this category are delineated with the numbers 1, 2 and 3 to indicate the relative degree of safety. Paper rated A-1 indicates that the degree of safety regarding timely payment is either overwhelming or very strong. Those issues determined to possess overwhelming safety characteristics are denoted with a plus sign (+) designation.

## **Moody's**

### Municipal Bond Ratings

#### **Aaa**

Bonds rated Aaa are judged to be of the best quality. They carry the smallest degree of investment risk and are generally referred to as "gilt edge." Interest payments are protected by a large or by an exceptionally stable margin and principal is secure. While the various protective elements are likely to change, such changes as can be visualized are most unlikely to impair the fundamentally strong position of such issues.

#### **Aa**

Bonds rated Aa are judged to be of high quality by all standards. Together with the Aaa group they comprise what generally are known as high grade bonds. They are rated lower than the best bonds because margins of protection may not be as large as in Aaa securities or fluctuation of protective elements may be of greater amplitude or there may be other elements present which make the long-term risks appear somewhat larger than in Aaa securities. Bonds in the Aa category which Moody's believes possess the strongest investment attributes are designated by the symbol Aa1.

#### **A**

Bonds rated A possess many favorable investment attributes and are to be considered as upper-medium-grade obligations. Factors giving security to principal and interest are considered adequate, but elements may be present which suggest a susceptibility to impairment sometime in the future.

## Commercial Paper Ratings

The rating Prime-1 (P-1) is the highest commercial paper rating assigned by Moody's. Issuers of P-1 paper must have a superior capacity for repayment of short-term promissory obligations, and ordinarily will be evidenced by leading market positions in well established industries, high rates of return on funds employed, conservative capitalization structures with

moderate reliance on debt and ample asset protection, broad margins in earnings coverage of fixed financial charges and high internal cash generation, and well established access to a range of financial markets and assured sources of alternate liquidity. Issuers rated Prime-2 (P-2) have a strong ability for repayment of senior short-term debt obligations. Capitalization characteristics, while still appropriate, may be more affected by external conditions. Ample alternate liquidity is maintained.

### Municipal Note Ratings

Moody's ratings for state and municipal notes and other short-term loans are designated Moody's Investment Grade (MIG). Such ratings recognize the difference between short-term credit risk and long-term risk. Factors affecting the liquidity of the borrower and short-term cyclical elements are critical in short-term ratings, while other factors of major importance in bond risk, long-term secular trends for example, may be less important over the short run.

A short-term rating may also be assigned on an issue having a demand feature. Such ratings will be designated as VMIG or, if the demand feature is not rated, as NR. Short-term ratings on issues with demand features are differentiated by the use of the VMIG symbol to reflect such characteristics as payment upon periodic demand rather than fixed maturity dates and payment relying on external liquidity. Additionally, you should be alert to the fact that the source of payment may be limited to the external liquidity with no or limited legal recourse to the issuer in the event the demand is not met.

Moody's short-term ratings are designated Moody's Investment Grade as MIG 1 or VMIG 1 through MIG 4 or VMIG 4. As the name implies, when Moody's assigns a MIG or VMIG rating, all categories define an investment grade situation.

#### **MIG 1/VMIG 1**

This designation denotes best quality. There is present strong protection by established cash flows, superior liquidity support or demonstrated broad-based access to the market for refinancing.

#### **MIG 2/VMIG 2**

This designation denotes high quality. Margins of protection are ample although not so large as in the preceding group.

### **Fitch**

### Municipal Bond Ratings

The ratings represent Fitch's assessment of the issuer's ability to meet the obligations of a specific debt issue or class of debt. The ratings take into consideration special features of the issue, its relationship to other obligations of the issuer, the current financial condition and operating performance of the issuer and of any guarantor, as well as the political and economic environment that might affect the issuer's future financial strength and credit quality.

### **AAA**

Bonds rated AAA are considered to be investment grade and of the highest credit quality. The obligor has an exceptionally strong ability to pay interest and repay principal, which is unlikely to be affected by reasonably foreseeable events.

### **AA**

Bonds rated AA are considered to be investment grade and of very high credit quality. The obligor's ability to pay interest and repay principal is very strong, although not quite as strong as bonds rated AAA. Because bonds rated in the AAA and AA categories are not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable future developments, short-term debt of these issuers is generally rated F-1+.

### **A**

Bonds rated A are considered to have a low expectation of credit risk. The capacity for timely payment of financial commitments is considered to be strong, but may be more vulnerable to changes in economic conditions and circumstances than bonds with higher ratings.

Plus (+) and minus (-) signs are used with a rating symbol to indicate the relative position of a credit within the rating category.

### **Short-Term Ratings**

Fitch's short-term ratings apply to debt obligations that are payable on demand or have original maturities of up to three years, including commercial paper, certificates of deposit, medium-term notes, and municipal and investment notes.

Although the credit analysis is similar to Fitch's bond ratings analysis, the short-term rating places greater emphasis than bond ratings on the existence of liquidity necessary to meet the issuer's obligations in a timely manner.

### **F-1+**

Exceptionally Strong Credit Quality. Issues assigned this rating are regarded as having the strongest degree of assurance for timely payment.

### **F-1**

Very Strong Credit Quality. Issues assigned this rating reflect an assurance of timely payment only slightly less in degree than issues rated F-1+.

**F-2**

Good Credit Quality. Issues carrying this rating have a satisfactory degree of assurance for timely payments, but the margin of safety is not as great as the F-1+ and F-1 categories.



## APPENDIX C

### RISK FACTORS—INVESTING IN CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL BONDS

The following information is a summary of special factors affecting investments in California Municipal bonds. It does not purport to be a complete description and is based on information drawn from official statements relating to securities offerings of the State of California (the "State") available as of the date of this Statement of Additional Information. While the Fund has not independently verified this information, it has no reason to believe that such information is not correct in all material respects.

#### General Information

Economy. California's economy, the nation's largest and one of the largest in the world, has major sectors in high technology, trade, entertainment, agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, construction and services. Much like the national picture, economic growth in the State slowed considerably in 2007, with much lower job growth than in the prior several years, and with the unemployment rate in the State rising to over 6 percent at the end of 2007. This has been caused in large part by a dramatic downturn in the housing industry, with a drop in new home starts and sales and decline in average home sales prices. At the start of 2008, it appears the housing market has still not reached the bottom, and economic growth in the State is expected to be slow in 2008, with some increase in 2009.

Because of the weakening economy, revenues in the main tax categories were projected by the State in January 2008 to be \$4.2 billion lower, for Fiscal Year 2007-08, than had been forecast in mid-2007 (this has been partially offset by certain one-time actions to issue bonds and utilize reserves). Further deterioration of the State economy could result in significant decreases in State revenues. Projected expenditures for Fiscal Year 2007-08 have increased by \$1.1 billion since the enactment of the 2007 Budget Act. The Governor's proposed 2008-09 budget showed that a deficit would re-emerge next year with spending exceeding revenues by \$6.1 billion. Since the adoption of the 2007 Budget Act, changes have occurred resulting in a projected shortfall of \$14.5 billion by the end of Fiscal Year 2008-09, in the absence of any changes in State law or policy reducing spending. In response, the Governor declared a "fiscal emergency," initiating the issuance of \$3.179 billion of deficit-financing bonds and proposing cutbacks of about 10% in expenditures for most State-funded programs, including aid to schools.

As of January 1, 2008, the State had outstanding more than \$50.7 billion principal amount of general obligation bonds, lease purchase obligations and other obligations payable solely from the General Fund. Over the last two years, the Legislature and State's voters, have approved the issuance of more than \$50 billion of additional obligations. After all three rating agencies raised the State's general obligation credit ratings in the last 3 years, Fitch placed the State's rating on negative watch in January 2008.

Population and Labor Force. The State's July 1, 2007 population of about 37.8 million represented over 12% of the total United States population. California's population is concentrated in metropolitan areas. As of the 2000 census, 97% resided in the 25 major metropolitan statistical areas in the State. As of July 1, 2006, the 5-county Los Angeles area accounted for 49% of the State's population, with over 18 million residents, and the 11-county San Francisco Bay Area represented 21%, with a population of nearly 8 million. The State's unemployment rate was at 6% at the end of 2007.

### Recent Developments

On January 10, 2008, the Governor declared a fiscal emergency and called a special session of the Legislature. On February 15, 2008, the Legislature approved an estimated \$1.45 billion in budget solutions for Fiscal Year 2007-08. On February 14, 2008, the State issued \$3.179 billion of Economic Recovery Bonds ("ERBs"), which provided \$3.313 billion of additional revenues to the General Fund. On February 19, 2008, the Governor signed an order directing State agencies and departments to reduce their Fiscal Year 2007-08 General Fund expenditures by 1.5% on an annualized basis, which is expected to save the State an estimated \$100 million.

Current reports indicate that General Fund agency cash for January was \$277 million below the 2008-09 Governor's Budget forecast of \$11.6 billion. January sales tax revenues were down \$193 million and down \$260 million on a year-to-date basis. Corporate tax revenues are \$58 million above the year-to-date estimate of \$4.9 billion. Reports indicate that residential housing permit issuance and existing single-family home sales increased slightly in December 2007, but not enough to slow the State's housing slide. Home Foreclosures in 2007 set a yearly record.

### State Indebtedness and Financing

The State Treasurer is responsible for the sale of debt obligations of the State and its various authorities and agencies. The State has always paid the principal of and interest on its general obligation bonds, general obligation commercial paper notes, lease-purchase debt and short-term obligations, including revenue anticipation notes ("RANs") and revenue anticipation warrants ("RAWs"), when due.

General Obligation Bonds. The State Constitution prohibits the creation of general obligation indebtedness of the State unless a bond law is approved by a majority of the electorate voting at a general election or a direct primary. General obligation bond acts provide that debt service on such bonds shall be appropriated annually from the General Fund and all debt service on general obligation bonds is paid from the General Fund. Under the State Constitution, debt service on general obligation bonds is the second charge to the General Fund after the application of monies in the General Fund to the support of the public school system and public institutions of higher education. Certain general obligation bond programs receive revenues from sources other than the sale of bonds or the investment of bond proceeds.

As of January 1, 2008, the State had outstanding over \$52.2 billion in long-term general obligation bonds, of which over \$43.1 billion was payable primarily from the General Fund and over \$9 billion was payable from other revenue sources. As of January 1, 2008, there were unused voter authorizations for the future issuance of approximately \$65.2 billion of long-term general obligation bonds, including \$42.7 billion of new general obligation bond authorizations approved by the voters in November 2006. Of this unissued amount, almost \$4.2 billion is for bonds payable from other revenue sources. A \$9.95 billion bond measure for high-speed rail projects has been placed on the November 2008 general election ballot.

The State is permitted to issue as variable rate indebtedness up to 20% of the aggregate amount of long-term general obligation bonds outstanding. As of February 15, 2008, the State had outstanding over \$7.1 billion in variable rate general obligation bonds (which includes the ERBs described below), representing about 13.1% of the State's total outstanding general obligation bonds as of that date. Of its variable rate portfolio, the State only has \$500 million of auction rate securities outstanding, which are uninsured, and the State plans to redeem \$400 million of these bonds in the near future. The one remaining series of \$100 million does not reset its interest rate until January, 2009. The State has \$474.565 million of insured variable rate ERBs.

Commercial Paper Program. Pursuant to legislation enacted in 1995, voter-approved general obligation indebtedness may be issued either as long-term bonds or, for some but not all bond issuances, as commercial paper notes. Commercial paper notes may be renewed or may be refunded by the issuance of long-term bonds. The State issues long-term general obligation bonds from time to time to retire its general obligation commercial paper notes. Commercial paper notes are deemed outstanding upon authorization by the respective finance committees, whether or not such notes are actually issued. Pursuant to the terms of the current bank credit agreement, the general obligation commercial paper program may have up to \$2.5 billion in aggregate principal amount at any time. As of January 1, 2008, \$545 million aggregate principal amount of general obligation commercial paper notes were outstanding.

Lease-Purchase Debt. In addition to general obligation bonds, the State builds and acquires capital facilities through the use of lease-purchase borrowing. Under these arrangements, the State Public Works Board, another State or local agency or a joint powers authority issues bonds to pay for the construction of facilities such as office buildings, university buildings or correctional institutions. These facilities are leased to a State agency or the University of California under a long-term lease that provides the source of payment of the debt service on the lease-purchase bonds. In some cases, there is not a separate bond issue, but a trustee directly creates certificates of participation in the State's lease obligation, which are then marketed to investors. Certain of the lease-purchase financings are supported by special funds rather than the General Fund. The State had over \$7.6 billion General Fund-supported lease-purchase obligations outstanding as of January 1, 2008. The State Public Works Board, which is authorized to sell lease revenue bonds, had over \$10.7 billion authorized and unissued as of January 1, 2008, which includes \$7.4 billion of new authorizations approved in 2007 for corrections facilities. In addition, as of that date, certain joint powers authorities were authorized to issue approximately \$81,000,000 of revenue bonds to be secured by State leases.

Non-Recourse Debt. Certain State agencies and authorities issue revenue obligations for which the General Fund has no liability. Revenue bonds represent obligations payable from State revenue-producing enterprises and projects, which are not payable from the General Fund, and conduit obligations payable only from revenues paid by private users of facilities financed by the revenue bonds. The enterprises and projects include transportation projects, various public works projects, public and private educational facilities, housing, health facilities and pollution control facilities. State agencies and authorities had approximately \$50.7 billion aggregate principal amount of revenue bonds and notes, which are non-recourse to the General Fund outstanding as of December 31, 2007.

Pension Obligation Bonds. Pursuant to the California Pension Restructuring Bond Act of 2004 (the "Restructuring Bond Act"), the State proposes to issue pension obligation bonds to make future contributions to the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS"). The payment of the debt service on the bonds would be payable from the General Fund.

Pursuant to the Restructuring Bond Act, the Pension Obligation Bond Committee (the "POBC") authorized the issuance of bonds to pay a portion of the State's pension obligation for Fiscal Year 2004-05 or a subsequent fiscal year. The POBC initiated a validation action seeking court determination that the bonds will not be in violation of the Constitutional debt limit. The validation action was challenged in court, which prevented the issuance of the pension obligation bonds in time to pay the pension contribution during Fiscal Years 2004-05 or 2005-06. The judge ruled on November 15, 2005 that the bonds were not valid. The POBC appealed and the matter was scheduled for oral argument on June 25, 2007. On July 3, 2007, the court ruled that the Legislature's authorization to issue bonds to pay a portion of the State's pension obligation was invalid. The State is not planning to appeal the decision. The 2007 Budget Act did not include the planned issuance of any pension obligation bonds.

Future Issuance Plans. Between November 2006 and August 2007, voters and the Legislature authorized more than \$50 billion of new general obligation bonds and lease revenue bonds, which are paid solely from the General Fund, thereby increasing the amount of such General Fund-supported debt authorized and unissued to about \$71.7 billion as of January 1, 2008. The State expects the volume of issuance of both categories of bonds to increase substantially, starting in Fiscal Year 2007-08, in order to address the program needs for these new authorizations, along with those, which existed before 2006. The Department of Finance has estimated that annual new money issuance for these obligations in Fiscal Years 2008-09 to 2011-12 will total approximately \$12 billion, \$15.5 billion, \$12.5 billion, and \$8.5 billion, respectively. The State estimates issuance of new general obligation and lease-revenue bonds in Fiscal Year 2007-08 will be approximately \$8.3 billion, of which approximately \$2.9 billion has been issued through January 1, 2008.

Based on the current projections of bond issuance, without taking any future authorizations into account, the aggregate amount of outstanding general obligation and lease revenue bonds would peak at about \$98 billion by the middle of the next decade, compared to the current total outstanding amount of about \$51 billion. The annual debt service costs on this amount of debt would peak at around \$8.5 billion, compared to about \$4.7 billion budgeted in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

Economic Recovery Bonds. The California Economic Recovery Bond Act ("Proposition 57") was approved by voters at the Statewide primary election in March 2004. Proposition 57 authorizes the issuance of up to \$15 billion of ERBs to finance the negative General Fund reserve balance as of June 30, 2004 and other General Fund obligations undertaken prior to June 30, 2004. Repayment of the ERBs is secured by a pledge of revenues from a 1/4¢ increase in the State's sales and use tax that started July 1, 2004, but also is secured by the State's full faith and credit because the ERBs were approved by voters as general obligation bonds.

The State issued \$10.896 billion of ERBs, resulting in the deposit of net proceeds to the General Fund of approximately \$11.254 billion during Fiscal Year 2003-04 (of which, approximately \$9.2 billion was applied to Fiscal Year 2002-03 expenditures, and approximately \$2 billion has been applied to offset Fiscal Year 2004-05 General Fund expenditures). In order to relieve current cash flow and budgetary shortfalls, the State issued \$3.179 billion of ERBs on February 14, 2008, generating net proceeds of \$3.313 billion, which were transferred to the General Fund.

All proceeds from the 1/4¢ sales tax in excess of the amounts needed, on a semi-annual basis, to pay debt service and other required costs of the ERBs are required to be applied to the early retirement of the ERBs. In addition, the following sources of funds are required to be used for early retirement of the ERBs: (i) fifty percent of each annual deposit, up to \$5 billion in the aggregate, of future deposits in the BSA, and (ii) all proceeds from the sale of surplus State property. During Fiscal Years 2005-06 and 2006-07, \$1.72 billion of ERBs were retired early, and on July 1, 2007, including use of \$472 million, which was transferred from the BSA in 2006-07. The 2007 Budget Act included \$1.02 billion, which was transferred pursuant to Proposition 58 (discussed below) to retire ERBs. In addition, there was approximately \$394 million of excess sales tax revenues from the period January 1-June 30, 2007, which will be used for early retirement of ERBs, together with excess sales tax revenues which may be generated for the period July 1-December 31, 2007, and any proceeds of excess property sales.

Cash Flow Borrowings. As part of its cash management program, the State has regularly issued short-term obligations to meet cash flow needs. The State has issued RANs in 19 of the last 20 fiscal years to partially fund timing differences between revenues and disbursements, as the majority of General Fund revenues are received in the last part of the fiscal year. RANs must mature prior to the end of the fiscal year of issuance. If additional external cash flow borrowings are required, the State has issued RAWs, which can mature in a subsequent fiscal year. RANs and RAWs are both payable from any unapplied revenues in the General Fund on their maturity date, subject to the prior application of such money in the General Fund to pay certain priority payments in the general areas of education, general obligation debt service, State employee wages and benefits and other specified General Fund reimbursements.

On June 18, 2003, the State issued \$10.97 billion of RAWs, which matured and were paid in full on June 16, 2004. The State also issued \$3 billion of RANs on October 28, 2003, which matured and were paid in full on June 23, 2004. The State issued \$6 billion of RANs on October 6, 2004, which matured on June 30, 2005. The State issued \$3 billion of RANs on November 10, 2005, which matured on June 30, 2006, \$1.5 billion of RANs on October 3, 2006, which matured on June 29, 2007, and \$7 billion of RANs on November 1, 2007, which is

scheduled to mature on June 30, 2008. The November 2007 issuance was authorized in order to maintain adequate reserves to manage the State's cash flow requirements during Fiscal Year 2007-08.

Ratings. After reaching their lowest point in 2003, the ratings of the State's general obligation bonds have been raised by all three rating agencies starting in 2004 and most recently in 2006. S&P has raised the State's general obligation credit rating from "BBB" to "A+." Moody's has raised the rating from "Baa1" to "A1." Fitch has raised the rating from "BBB" to "A+," but Fitch placed the State's rating on negative watch in January 2008.

### State Funds and Expenditures

The Budget and Appropriations Process. The State's fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30. The annual budget is proposed by the Governor by January 10 of each year for the next fiscal year. Under State law, the annual proposed budget cannot provide for projected expenditures in excess of projected revenues and balances available from prior fiscal years. Following the submission of the proposed budget, the Legislature takes up the proposal. The Balanced Budget Amendment ("Proposition 58"), which was approved by voters in March 2004, requires the State to adopt and maintain a balanced budget and establish an additional reserve, and restricts future long-term deficit-related borrowing.

The primary source of the annual expenditure authorizations is the Budget Act as approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor. The Budget Act must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote of each House of the Legislature. The Governor may reduce or eliminate specific line items in the Budget Act or any other appropriations bill without vetoing the entire bill. Such individual line-item vetoes are subject to override by a two-thirds majority vote of each House of the Legislature. Appropriations also may be included in legislation other than the Budget Act. Bills containing appropriations (except for K-12 and community college ("K-14") education) must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote in each House of the Legislature and be signed by the Governor. Bills containing K-14 education appropriations require a simple majority vote. Continuing appropriations, available without regard to fiscal year, also may be provided by statute or the State Constitution.

The General Fund. The monies of the State are segregated into the General Fund and over 900 other funds, including special, bond and trust funds. The General Fund consists of revenues received by the State Treasury and not required by law to be credited to any other fund, as well as earnings from the investment of State monies not allocable to another fund. The General Fund is the principal operating fund for the majority of governmental activities and is the depository of most of the major revenue sources of the State. The General Fund may be expended as a consequence of appropriation measures enacted by the Legislature and approved by the Governor, as well as appropriations pursuant to various constitutional authorizations and initiative statutes.

The Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties. The Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties ("SFEU") is funded with General Fund revenues and was established to protect the State from unforeseen revenue reductions and/or unanticipated expenditure increases. Amounts

in the SFEU may be transferred by the State to the General Fund as necessary to meet cash needs of the General Fund. The State is required to return monies so transferred without payment of interest as soon as there are sufficient monies in the General Fund. At the end of each fiscal year, the State is required to transfer from the SFEU to the General Fund any amount necessary to eliminate any deficit in the General Fund. In certain circumstances, monies in the SFEU may be used in connection with disaster relief. For budgeting and general accounting purposes, any appropriation made from the SFEU is deemed an appropriation from the General Fund. For year-end reporting purposes, the State is required to add the balance in the SFEU to the balance in the General Fund so as to show the total monies then available for General Fund purposes.

The Budget Stabilization Account. Proposition 58, approved in March 2004, creates a second budgetary reserve called the Budget Stabilization Account ("BSA"). Beginning with Fiscal Year 2006-07, a specified portion of estimated annual General Fund revenues (reaching a ceiling of 3% by Fiscal Year 2008-09) will be transferred into the BSA no later than September 30 of each fiscal year. These transfers will continue until the balance in the BSA reaches \$8 billion or 5% of the estimated General Fund revenues for that fiscal year, whichever is greater. The annual transfer requirement will go back into effect whenever the balance falls below the \$8 billion or the 5% target. Proposition 58 also provides that one-half of the annual transfers shall be used to retire ERBs, until a total of \$5 billion has been used for that purpose. A total of \$1.495 billion of the \$5 billion amount has now been allocated for retirement of ERBs.

The 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes to suspend the Fiscal Year 2008-09 transfer of \$3.018 billion from the General Fund to the BSA, in light of the current condition of the General Fund. The 2007 Budget Act gave the State authority to transfer moneys from the BSA back into the General Fund, and, on January 10, 2008, the entire balance of \$1.494 billion was transferred from the BSA to the General Fund.

Inter-Fund Borrowings. Inter-fund borrowing is used to meet temporary imbalances of receipts and disbursements in the General Fund. If General Fund revenue is or will be exhausted, the State may direct the transfer of all or any part of the monies not needed in special funds to the General Fund. All money so transferred must be returned to the special fund from which it was transferred. As of August 31, 2007, there were \$1.5 billion of loans from the SFEU and other internal sources to the General Fund.

Pension Trusts. The three principal retirement systems in which the State participates are CalPERS, the California State Teachers' Retirement System ("CalSTRS") and the University of California Retirement System ("UCRS"). The State's contribution to CalPERS and UCRS are actuarially determined each year, while the State's contribution to CalSTRS is established by statute.

CalPERS administers the Public Employment Retirement Fund ("PERF"), which is a multiple-employer defined benefit plan. As of June 30, 2007, PERF had 1,086,900 active and inactive program members and 445,208 benefit recipients. The payroll for State employees covered by PERF for Fiscal Year 2005-06 was approximately \$13.3 billion. Due to investment losses and increased retirement benefits, the State contribution to CalPERS, through the PERF,

has increased from \$1.19 billion in Fiscal Year 2002-03 to an estimated \$2.747 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, with a projected estimated \$2.746 billion for Fiscal Year 2008-09.

CalSTRS administers the Teacher's Retirement Fund, which is an employee benefit trust fund created to administer the State Teachers' Retirement Plan ("STRP"). STRP is a cost-sharing, multi-employer, defined benefit pension plan that provides for retirement, disability and survivor benefits to teachers and certain other employees of the California public school system. As of June 30, 2006, the Defined Benefit Program ("DB Program") had approximately 1,400 contributing employers, approximately 586,966 active and inactive program members and 207,846 benefit recipients. State contribution to CalSTRS, through STRP, has increased from \$975.5 million in Fiscal Year 2002-03 to an estimated \$1.12 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget is proposing to reduce the State's contributions to the Supplemental Benefits Maintenance Account ("SBMA") from 2.5% to 2.2% of salary and to vest a right to supplemental payments at 80% of purchasing power. The latter proposal would provide the corresponding benefit to teachers necessary to reduce the State's General Fund contribution. The savings from the reduced contribution equates to \$80 million in 2008-09.

Welfare System. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 fundamentally reformed the nation's welfare system. This Act included provisions to: (1) convert Aid to Families with Dependent Children ("AFDC") from an entitlement program to a block grant titled Temporary Assistance for Needy Families ("TANF"), with lifetime time limits on TANF recipients, work requirements and other changes; (2) deny certain Federal welfare and public benefits to legal non-citizens (amended by subsequent Federal law), allow states to elect to deny additional benefits (including TANF) to legal non-citizens, and generally deny almost all benefits to illegal immigrants; and (3) make changes in the Food Stamp program, including to reduce maximum benefits and impose work requirements.

Federal authorization for the TANF program was recently approved and extended until September 30, 2010. The legislation modified countable work activities under TANF and applied new Federal work participation rates to the State's program. In addition, the legislation effectively eliminated the State's caseload reduction credit and the bulk of the State's caseload will be subject to the 50% work participation rate beginning in Federal fiscal year 2007. The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids ("CalWORKs") replaced the former AFDC and other similar programs effective January 1, 1998. Consistent with Federal law, CalWORKs contains time limits on receipt of welfare aid. The centerpiece of CalWORKs is the linkage of eligibility to work participation requirements. The revised CalWORKs caseload projections are 452,000 and 377,000 cases in Fiscal Years 2007-08 and 2008-09, respectively. Since CalWORKs' inception in January 1998, caseload has declined by over 36%.

California was expected to fail to meet the work participation rate in 2007 (at least 50% work participation among all families), and as a result, California's required Maintenance of Effort ("MOE") will be 80% of the FFY 1994 historic expenditures rather than the 75% MOE level California has been required to meet. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget increases MOE spending by \$179.5 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09, to \$2.9 billion, to reflect this penalty. Considerable improvement in work participation rates must be achieved to avoid additional Federal penalties, which could cost the State and counties more than \$1.5 billion over a five-year



period, beginning in Fiscal Year 2009-10. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes major programmatic changes that place greater emphasis on work participation and reduce reliance upon public assistance to significantly improve the ability of the State and counties to meet federal work requirements in the TANF program.

The Governor's proposed reform measures are estimated to provide net savings of \$73.7 million General Fund in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and \$476 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09. Along with these reforms, the 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes to maintain the \$230 million included in the Budget Acts of 2006 and 2007 to support CalWORKs program improvements, including \$90 million for counties to implement program improvements and \$140 million to support county administration. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget eliminates \$40 million in Pay for Performance incentive funds in Fiscal Year 2007-08, but makes available \$40 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09 for those counties that achieve improved program outcomes during 2007-08. Total CalWORKs program expenditures of \$7 billion are proposed for Fiscal Year 2008-09, including TANF and MOE countable expenditures, of which \$3.038 billion is budgeted to be paid from the General Fund. The amount budgeted includes \$4.7 billion for CalWORKs program expenditures, \$108 million in county expenditures, \$2.2 billion in other programs, and \$133 million for a CalWORKs program reserve. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$131 million to provide a statutory COLA for assistance payments. In the fiscal emergency special session, the Legislature approved a delay in providing the July 2008 CalWORKs COLA until October 2008, resulting in savings of \$40.5 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

Local Governments. The primary units of local government in the State are the 58 counties, ranging in population from 1,200 in Alpine County to approximately 10 million in Los Angeles County. Counties are responsible for the provision of many basic services, including indigent health care, welfare, jails and public safety in unincorporated areas. There also are 478 incorporated cities and thousands of special districts formed for education, utility and other services. The fiscal condition of local governments has been constrained since the enactment of "Proposition 13" in 1978, which reduced and limited the future growth of property taxes and limited the ability of local governments to impose "special taxes" (those devoted to a specific purpose) without two-thirds voter approval. Counties, in particular, have had fewer options to raise revenues than many other local government entities and have been required to maintain many services.

In the aftermath of Proposition 13, the State provided aid to local governments from the General Fund to make up some of the loss of property tax monies, including taking over the principal responsibility for funding K-12 schools and community colleges. During the recession of the early 1990s, the Legislature eliminated most of the remaining components of post-Proposition 13 aid to local government entities other than K-12 schools and community colleges by requiring cities and counties to transfer some of their property tax revenues to school districts. However, the Legislature also provided additional funding sources (such as sales taxes) and reduced certain mandates for local services.

The 2004 Budget Act, related legislation and the enactment of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 4 ("Amendment No. 4") dramatically changed the State-local fiscal relationship. These constitutional and statutory changes implemented an agreement negotiated between the

Governor and local government officials (the "State-local agreement") in connection with the 2004 Budget Act. One change relates to the reduction of the vehicle license fee ("VLF") rate from 2% to 0.65% of the market value of the vehicle. In order to protect local governments, which have previously received all VLF revenues, the reduction in VLF revenue to cities and counties from this rate change was replaced by an increase in the amount of property tax that they receive.

As part of the State-local agreement, Amendment No. 4 was enacted by the Legislature and subsequently approved by the voters at the November 2004 election (Proposition 1A). Amendment No. 4 amended the State Constitution to, among other things, reduce the Legislature's authority over local government revenue sources by placing restrictions on the State's access to local governments' property, sales, and VLF revenues as of November 3, 2004. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2008-09, the State will be able to borrow up to 8% of local property tax revenues, but only if the Governor proclaims such action is necessary due to a severe State fiscal hardship, two-thirds of both houses of the Legislature approve the borrowing and the amount borrowed is required to be paid back within three years. The State also will not be able to borrow from local property tax revenues for more than two fiscal years within a period of ten fiscal years, and only if previous borrowings have been repaid. In addition, the State cannot reduce the local sales tax rate or restrict the authority of the local governments to impose or change the distribution of the statewide local sales tax. Amendment No. 4 also prohibits the State from mandating activities on cities, counties or special districts without providing for the funding needed to comply with the mandates. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2005-06, if the State does not provide funding for the activity that has been determined to be mandated, the requirement on cities, counties or special districts to abide by the mandate would be suspended.

Trial Courts. Prior to legislation enacted in 1997, local governments provided the majority of funding for the State's trial court system. The legislation consolidated trial court funding at the State level in order to streamline the operation of the courts, provide a dedicated revenue source and relieve fiscal pressure on the counties. The State's trial court system will receive approximately \$2.7 billion and \$2.9 billion in State resources in Fiscal Years 2007-08 and 2008-09, and \$499 million in resources from the counties in each fiscal year.

State Appropriations Limit. The State is subject to an annual appropriations limit imposed by the State Constitution (the "Appropriations Limit"). The Appropriations Limit does not restrict appropriations to pay debt service on voter-authorized bonds or appropriations from funds that do not derive their proceeds from taxes. There are other various types of appropriations excluded from the Appropriations Limit, including appropriations required to comply with mandates of courts or the Federal government, appropriations for qualified capital outlay projects, appropriations for tax refunds, appropriations of revenues derived from any increase in gasoline taxes and motor vehicle weight fees above January 1, 1990 levels, and appropriation of certain special taxes imposed by initiative. The Appropriations Limit may be exceeded in cases of emergency.

The Appropriations Limit in each year is based on the limit for the prior year, adjusted annually for changes in State per capita personal income and changes in population, and adjusted, when applicable, for any transfer of financial responsibility of providing services to or from

another unit of government or any transfer of the financial source for the provisions of services from tax proceeds to non-tax proceeds. The Appropriations Limit is tested over consecutive two-year periods. Any excess of the aggregate "proceeds of taxes" received over such two-year period above the combined Appropriations Limits for those two years is divided equally between transfers to K-14 school districts and refunds to taxpayers.

As of the release of the 2008-09 Governor's Budget, the Department of Finance projects the Appropriations subject to limitation to be \$16.606 billion and \$10.667 billion under the Appropriations Limit in Fiscal Years 2007-08 and 2008-09, respectively.

Proposition 98. On November 8, 1988, voters approved Proposition 98, a combined initiative constitutional amendment and statute called the "Classroom Instructional Improvement and Accountability Act." Proposition 98 changed State funding of public education primarily by guaranteeing K-14 schools a minimum share of General Fund revenues. Any amount not funded by local property taxes is funded by the General Fund. Proposition 98 (as modified by Proposition 111, enacted on June 5, 1990), guarantees K-14 schools a certain variable percentage of General Fund revenues as test 1, based on certain factors including cost of living adjustments, enrollment and per capita income and revenue growth. Legislation adopted prior to the end of Fiscal Year 1988-89, implementing Proposition 98, determined the K-14 schools' funding guarantee to be 40.7% of the General Fund tax revenues, based on Fiscal Year 1986-87 appropriations. However, that percentage has been adjusted to approximately 41% to account for a subsequent redirection of local property taxes that directly affected the share of General Fund revenues to schools. Proposition 98 permits the Legislature by two-thirds vote of both Houses, with the Governor's concurrence, to suspend the minimum funding formula for a one-year period. Proposition 98 also contains provisions transferring certain excess State tax revenues to K-14 schools, but no such transfers are expected for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and 2008-09.

In the fiscal emergency special session, the Legislature reduced Fiscal Year 2007-08 Proposition 98 appropriations by \$506.8 million; however, \$295.4 million was offset by re-appropriating prior year Proposition 98 savings. The remaining \$211.4 million reduction eliminated appropriations from programs that encountered implementation delays. As part of the proposed budget-balancing reductions, Proposition 98 expenditures from the General Fund will be reduced by 9.2% to \$39.6 billion. The Administration proposes to suspend the Proposition 98 Guarantee by \$4 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09, resulting in a Proposition 98 Guarantee of \$55.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09, of which the General Fund share is \$39.6 billion.

In 2004, legislation suspended the Proposition 98 guarantee, which, at the time the 2004 Budget Act was enacted, was estimated to be \$2.004 billion. That estimate, however, has been increased by an additional \$1.6 billion due to subsequent revenue growth in the General Fund. This suspended amount is added to the existing maintenance factor. This funding, along with approximately \$1.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06 were the subject of a lawsuit, which has recently been settled. The terms agreed upon consist of retiring this approximately \$2.8 billion obligation beginning in Fiscal Year 2007-08 with a \$300 million payment, followed by annual payments of \$450 million beginning in Fiscal Year 2008-09 until it is paid in full. In addition, legislation was approved to refinance the State's Series 2003A Bonds (discussed below), which

became effective on January 1, 2007. The first \$900 million in additional funds expected to be raised from the refinancing will offset initial settlement costs.

Appropriations for Fiscal Years 1995-96, 1996-97, 2002-03 and 2003-04 are estimated cumulatively to be \$1.4 billion below the amounts required by Proposition 98 because of increases in State tax revenues above previous estimates. Legislation enacted in August 2004 annually appropriates \$150 million per year, beginning in Fiscal Year 2006-07, to repay prior year Proposition 98 obligations. The current estimate of the remaining obligation is \$1.292 billion. The 2005 Budget Act funded \$16.8 million toward these settle-up obligations, which reduced the first Fiscal Year 2006-07 settle-up appropriation, from \$150 million to \$133.2 million. The 2006 Budget Act included this appropriation along with a \$150 million prepayment of the Fiscal Year 2007-08 allocation. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$150 million for the Fiscal Year 2008-09 allocation. As a result, the outstanding settle-up balance as of the 2008-09 Governor's Budget is \$950.6 million.

Constraints on the Budget Process. Over the years, a number of laws and Constitutional amendments have been enacted that restrict the use of General Fund or special fund revenues, or otherwise limit the Legislature's and Governor's discretion in enacting budgets. A proposed initiative measure has qualified for the February 5, 2008 statewide election, which would, among other things, modify Proposition 98 to create a separate funding guarantee for community colleges, different from the funding guarantee for K-12 schools. More recently, a new series of Constitutional amendments have affected the budget process. These include Proposition 58, approved in 2004, which requires the adoption of a balanced budget and restricts future borrowing to cover budget deficits, Proposition 1A, approved in 2004, which limits the Legislature's power over local revenue sources, and Proposition 1A, approved at the November 7, 2006 election, which limits the Legislature's ability to use sales taxes on motor vehicle fuels for any purpose other than transportation. This, and other recent Constitutional amendments affecting the budget process, are described below.

*Proposed Budget Stabilization Act.* The 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes a Budget Stabilization Act (the "Act"), a Constitutional amendment to reform the State budget process. The Act will require excess revenues to be deposited in the Revenue Stabilization Fund. In years of below-average rates of revenue growth, monies will be transferred from a new Revenue Stabilization Fund back into the General Fund in an amount not to exceed the shortfall. The Act allows transfers from the Revenue Stabilization Fund back into the General Fund only in years when revenue grows at a rate less than the long-term average. Transfers would not be allowed simply to avoid deficits, not even in emergencies.

The Act will provide for automatic expenditure reductions triggered whenever the Governor projects that the State will be in deficit. When estimates show a likely General Fund deficit of 1% or less, the Governor will reduce appropriations, on an annualized basis by 2%; when estimates show a deficit of greater than 1%, appropriations will be reduced by 5%. The Act will require the Legislature and the Governor to enact statutory changes in all State entitlement programs that allow for reductions in service levels or rates of payment sufficient to achieve the targeted reductions of 2% and 5%.

*Proposition 58 (Balanced Budget Amendment).* Proposition 58, approved in 2004, requires the State to enact a balanced budget, establish a special reserve in the General Fund and restricts future borrowing to cover budget deficits. As a result, the State may have to take more immediate actions to correct budgetary shortfalls. Beginning with the budget for Fiscal Year 2004-05, Proposition 58 requires the Legislature to pass a balanced budget and provides for mid-year adjustments in the event that the budget falls out of balance. The balanced budget determination is made by subtracting expenditures from all available resources, including prior-year balances.

Proposition 58 requires that a special reserve (the BSA) be established in the General Fund. The BSA will be funded by annual transfers of specified amounts from the General Fund, unless suspended or reduced by the Governor or until a specified maximum amount has been deposited. Proposition 58 also prohibits certain future borrowing to cover budget deficits. This restriction applies to general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, and certain other forms of long-term borrowing. The restriction does not apply to certain other types of RANs or RAWs currently used by the State, or inter-fund borrowings.

*Local Government Finance (Proposition 1A of 2004).* Approved in 2004, Proposition 1A amended the State Constitution to reduce the Legislature's authority over local government revenue sources by placing restrictions on the State's access to local governments' property, sales, and vehicle license fee revenues as of November 3, 2004. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2008-09, the State will be able to borrow up to 8% of local property tax revenues, but only if the Governor proclaims such action is necessary due to a severe State fiscal hardship and two-thirds of both houses of the Legislature approves the borrowing. The amount borrowed is required to be paid back within three years. The State also will not be able to borrow from local property tax revenues for more than two fiscal years within a period of 10 fiscal years. In addition, the State cannot reduce the local sales tax rate or restrict the authority of local governments to impose or change the distribution of the statewide local sales tax.

Proposition 1A further requires the State to reimburse cities, counties, and special districts for mandated costs incurred prior to Fiscal Year 2004-05 over a term of years. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$75 million for the third payment of these claims. The remaining estimated cost of claims for mandated costs incurred prior to Fiscal Year 2004-05 is \$924 million.

*Proposition 49 (After School Education Funding).* An initiative statute, called the "After School Education and Safety Program of 2002," was approved by the voters in 2002, and requires the State to expand funding for before and after school programs in public elementary and middle schools. This increase was first triggered in Fiscal Year 2006-07, which increased funding for these programs to \$550 million. These funds are part of the Proposition 98 minimum-funding guarantee for K-14 education. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget reflects a reduction of \$59.6 million for Proposition 49 programs, consistent with other reductions proposed for Proposition 98 programs.

*Transportation Financing (Proposition 1A of 2006).* On November 7, 2006, voters approved Proposition 1A to protect Proposition 42 transportation funds from any further

suspensions. The new measure modified the constitutional provisions of Proposition 42 in a manner similar to Proposition 1A of 2004, so that if such suspension occurs, the amount owed by the General Fund must be repaid to the Transportation Investment Fund within three years, and only two such suspensions can be made within any ten-year period. The 2006 Budget Act fully funded the Proposition 42 transfer at \$1.415 billion for Fiscal Year 2006-07, and also included \$1.415 billion for advance repayment of a portion of prior year suspensions. The 2007 Budget Act fully funded the Proposition 42 transfer at \$1.439 billion and required repayment for remaining Proposition 42 debts at \$83 million for Fiscal Year 2007-08. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposed to fully fund the Proposition 42 transfer for 2008-09 at \$1.485 billion with another \$83 million to repay a portion of past suspensions.

Tobacco Settlement Revenue Bonds. In 1998, the State signed the Master Settlement Agreement (the "MSA") with the four major cigarette manufacturers for payment of approximately \$25 billion (subject to adjustment) over 25 years. Under the MSA, half of the money will be paid to the State and half to local governments. Payments continue in perpetuity, but the specific amount to be received by the State and local governments is subject to adjustment. Details in the MSA allow reduction of payments for decreases in cigarette shipment volumes by the settling manufacturers, payments owed to certain previously settled states and certain types of offsets for disputed payments, among other things. However, settlement payments are adjusted upward each year by at least 3% for inflation, compounded annually.

State statutory law allows the issuance of revenue bonds secured by MSA revenues beginning in Fiscal Year 2003-04. An initial sale of 56.57% of the State's tobacco settlement revenues producing \$2.5 billion in proceeds was completed in January 2003 ("Series 2003A Bonds"). A second sale of the remaining 43.43% of the State's tobacco settlement revenues, which produced \$2.264 billion in proceeds, was completed in September 2003 ("Series 2003B Bonds"). In August 2005, the Series 2003B Bonds were refinanced, retaining all of the covenants of the original issue, including the covenant regarding the request for a General Fund appropriation in the event tobacco revenues fall short. In return for providing this covenant, the State was paid a credit enhancement fee of \$525 million as part of the refinancing. In March 2007, the State completed a refunding of the 2003A Bonds. This refunding generated additional proceeds of approximately \$1.258 billion, which will then be used to offset the General Fund cost for the initial years of the litigation settlement related to the suspension of the Proposition 98 guarantee.

In 2005, MSA participants asserted that they had lost market shares in 2003 to manufacturers who did not participate in the MSA, which assertion was confirmed. As such, the MSA participating manufacturers ("PMs") are permitted to withhold up to three times the amount of lost market shares until such time as it is proven that the participating states are properly enforcing their statutory authority over the non-participants. As a result of withholding by some but not all of the PMs, the amount of tobacco revenues received by the State was reduced by \$50.9 million in Fiscal Year 2005-06; however, such revenues still exceeded the required debt service payments.

In April 2006, a similar filing was made by the PMs for calendar year 2004 payments. As a result, some of the PMs withheld funds from their scheduled payments, and tobacco settlement

revenues due in April 2007 were reduced by \$44 million. A similar filing made by the PMs for calendar year 2005 payments is pending with a determination expected in early 2008. It is anticipated that there will be no impact to the General Fund for Fiscal Year 2007-08 as a result of this issue.

### Sources of Tax Revenue

The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes the following revenue proposals: (i) reinstate the use tax on vessels, vehicles, and aircraft brought into the State within one year of purchase, with an estimated revenue gain of \$21 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09; (ii) legislation to bring personal income tax and corporate tax revenue accruals into conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principals, which would result in a one-time increase of revenues in Fiscal Year 2008-09 of \$2 billion; and (iii) increasing efforts to improve compliance, address growth in audit workload, reduce the "tax gap," and improve cash management are estimated to result in revenue gains of \$116 million in additional personal income tax and corporation tax revenues, \$7 million in interest income, \$62 million in sales and use tax, and \$4 million in tobacco taxes in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

Personal Income Tax. The California personal income tax, which accounts for a significant portion of General Fund tax revenues, is closely modeled after Federal income tax law. It is imposed on net taxable income (gross income less exclusions and deductions), with rates ranging from 1% to 9.3%. Personal, dependent and other credits are allowed against the gross tax liability. In addition, taxpayers may be subject to an alternative minimum tax ("AMT"). The personal income tax structure is highly progressive. For instance, it is estimated that the top 1% of taxpayers paid 47.5% of the total personal income tax in the 2005 tax year.

A proposal to add a 1% surcharge on taxable income over \$1 million in addition to the 9.3% rate, became effective January 1, 2005. The proceeds of the tax surcharge are required to be used to expand county mental health programs.

Taxes on capital gains and stock options, which are largely linked to stock market performance, add a significant dimension of volatility to personal income tax receipts. Capital gains and stock option tax receipts have accounted for as much as 24.8% and as little as 7.8% of General Fund revenues over the last ten years. It was estimated that capital gains and stock option tax receipts would account for 14.9% of General Fund revenue and transfers in Fiscal Year 2006-07 and expected 14.4% of General Fund revenue in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

On November 5, 2007, the United States Supreme Court heard the appeal of a case titled *Department of Revenue of the State of Kentucky v. Davis* (the "Davis case"). A state court in Kentucky had ruled that the Kentucky state income tax law, which, like California income tax law, exempts only interest on bonds from in-state government entities, violates the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution, by discriminating against other states' municipal bonds. If the Supreme Court upholds the lower court decision, and if the state is required to exempt the interest on all other states' municipal bonds from state income tax, the state may face a refund liability for the tax collected in prior years from taxpayers who reported interest income from out-of-state bonds. The Franchise Tax Board has made preliminary estimates that such a change

in tax rules would result in a prior year adjustment to Fiscal Year 2006-07 of \$70 million in refunds. Losses would rise to \$410 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and then fall to a level of about \$290 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09. For Fiscal Year 2009-10 and beyond losses would be in the neighborhood of \$250 million per year.

Sales Tax. The sales tax is imposed upon retailers for the privilege of selling tangible personal property in California. Most retail sales and leases are subject to the tax. However, exemptions have been provided for certain essentials such as food for home consumption, prescription drugs, gas delivered through mains and electricity. Other exemptions provide relief for a variety of sales ranging from custom computer software to aircraft.

As of January 1, 2008, the breakdown of the base State and local sales tax rate of 7.25% is as follows: 5% is imposed as a General Fund tax; 0.5% is dedicated to local governments for health and welfare program realignment; 0.5% is dedicated to local governments for public safety services; 1.0% local tax imposed under the Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law, with 0.25% dedicated to county transportation purposes and 0.75% for the city and county general-purpose use; and 0.25% deposited into the Fiscal Recovery Fund which will be available for annual appropriation by the Legislature to repay the ERBs.

Existing law provides that 0.25% of the basic 5% State tax rate may be suspended in any calendar year upon State certification by November 1 in any year in which the both following occur: (1) the General Fund reserve (excluding the revenues derived from the 0.25% sales and use tax rate) is expected to exceed 3% of revenues in that fiscal year (excluding the revenues derived from the 0.25% sales and use tax rate) and (2) actual revenues for the period May 1 through September 30 equal or exceed the May Revision forecast. The 0.25% rate will be reinstated the following year if the State subsequently determines conditions (1) or (2) above are not met for that fiscal year. The Department of Finance estimates that the reserve level will be insufficient to trigger a reduction for calendar year 2008.

Corporation Tax. Corporation tax revenues are derived from the following taxes and/or sources: (1) the franchise tax and the corporate income tax, which are levied at an 8.84% rate on profits; (2) banks and other financial corporations that are subject to the franchise tax plus an additional tax at the rate of 2% on their net income; (3) the AMT, which is imposed at a rate of 6.65%, is similar to the Federal AMT and is based on a higher level of net income computed by adding back certain tax preferences; (4) a minimum franchise tax of up to \$800, which is imposed on corporations subject to the franchise tax but not on those subject to the corporate income tax (new corporations are exempted from the minimum franchise tax for the first two years of incorporation); (5) Sub-Chapter S corporations, which are taxed at 1.5% of profits; and (6) fees paid by limited liability companies, which account for 2.8% of revenues (the constitutionality of these fees is currently being challenged in three separate State courts – potential refunds are estimated at up to \$1.3 billion. Should the courts decide against the State, the current estimate of refunds is \$155 million to be accrued back to Fiscal Year 2007-08).

Insurance Tax. The majority of insurance written in California is subject to a 2.35% gross premium tax. For insurers, this premium tax takes the place of all other State and local taxes except those on real property and motor vehicles. Exceptions to the 2.35% rate are certain



pension and profit sharing plans that are taxed at the lesser rate of 0.5%, surplus lines and non-admitted insurance at 3% and ocean marine insurers at 5% of underwriting profits.

The State Board of Equalization ruled in December 2006 that the premium tax insurers pay should be calculated on a cash basis rather than the accrual method required by the Department of Insurance. This ruling is expected to result in a total loss of \$406 million spread over several years; the impact is estimated to be \$175 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and \$100 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

Other Taxes. Other General Fund major taxes and licenses include: estate, inheritance and gift taxes; cigarette taxes; alcoholic beverage taxes; horse racing license fees and trailer coach license fees.

The California estate tax is based on the State death tax credit allowed against the Federal estate tax, and is designed to pick up the maximum credit allowed against the Federal estate tax return. The Federal Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001 phases out the Federal estate tax by 2010. It also reduced the State pick-up tax by 25% in 2002, 50% in 2003, and 75% in 2004 and eliminated it beginning in 2005. These provisions sunset after 2010; at that time, the Federal estate tax will be re-instated along with the State's estate tax, unless future Federal legislation is enacted to make the provisions permanent.

Special Fund Revenues. The State Constitution and statutes specify the uses of certain revenue. Such receipts are accounted for in various special funds. In general, special fund revenues comprise three categories of income: (i) receipts from tax levies, which are allocated to specified functions such as motor vehicle taxes and fees and certain taxes on tobacco products; (ii) charges for special services to specific functions, including such items as business and professional license fees; and (iii) rental royalties and other receipts designated for particular purposes (e.g., oil and gas royalties). Motor vehicle related taxes and fees accounted for approximately 35% of all special fund revenues in Fiscal Year 2006-07. Principal sources of this income are motor vehicle fuel taxes, registration and weight fees and VLFs. During Fiscal Year 2006-07, \$8.6 billion was derived from the ownership or operation of motor vehicles. About \$3.4 billion of this revenue was returned to local governments. The remainder was available for various State programs related to transportation and services to vehicle owners.

Taxes on Tobacco Products. Proposition 10, approved in 1998, increased the excise tax imposed on distributors selling cigarettes in California to 87¢ per pack effective January 1, 1999. At the same time, this proposition imposed a new excise tax on cigars, chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco and snuff at a rate equivalent to the tax increase on cigarettes. In addition, the higher excise tax on cigarettes automatically triggered an additional increase in the tax on other tobacco products effective July 1, 1999, with the proceeds going to the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund. The State's excise tax proceeds are earmarked for childhood development, education, health, research and other programs.

## State Economy and Finances

The State economy grew strongly between 1994 and 2000 and, as a result, for the five fiscal years from 1995-96 to 1999-2000, General Fund tax revenues exceeded budget estimates. These additional funds were largely directed to school spending and to fund new program initiatives, including education spending above Proposition 98 minimums, tax reductions, aid to local governments and infrastructure expenditures. The State ended Fiscal Year 2000-01 with a budget reserve of \$5.39 billion. During Fiscal Year 2001-02, however, the State experienced an unprecedented drop in revenues compared to the prior year. During Fiscal Years 2001-02 through 2003-04, the State encountered severe budgetary difficulties because of reduced revenues and failure to make equivalent reductions in expenditures, resulting in successive budget deficits. The budgets for these years included substantial reliance on one-time measures, internal borrowing, and external borrowing. The State also faced a cash flow crisis during this period, which was relieved by the issuance of RAWs in June 2002 and June 2003 and ERBs in early 2004.

While the 2004 Budget Act was aided by a recovering State economy and increased revenues, balancing of the budget still required a number of one-time actions. These included application of the proceeds from the sale of the ERBs and tobacco securitization bonds and suspension of Proposition 42 transfer of certain sales taxes to transportation purposes. The 2004 Budget Act also used the second year of borrowing from local governments. The 2004 Budget Act addressed a projected \$13.9 billion budget shortfall through expenditure cuts (\$4 billion or 28.7%), cost avoidance (\$4.4 billion or 31.7%), fund shifts (\$1.6 billion or 11.2%), loans or borrowing (\$2.1 billion or 15.4%) and transfers and other reserves (\$1.8 billion or 13%).

State Budget—Fiscal Year 2005-06. The 2005 Budget Act was adopted by the Legislature on July 7, 2005, and signed by the Governor on July 11, 2005. Under the 2005 Budget Act, General Fund revenues and transfers were projected to increase 5.7%, from \$79.9 billion in Fiscal Year 2004-05 to \$84.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06. The revenue projections assumed continued but moderating growth in California's economy. The 2005 Budget Act contained General Fund appropriations of \$90 billion, compared to \$81.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2004-05. The difference between revenues and expenditures in Fiscal Year 2005-06 was funded by using a part of the \$7.5 billion fund balance at June 30, 2005. The June 30, 2006 reserve was projected to be \$1.302 billion, compared to an estimated June 30, 2005 reserve of \$6.857 billion. About \$900 million of this reserve was to be set aside for payment in Fiscal Year 2006-07 of tax refunds and other adjustments related to the tax amnesty program. The 2005 Budget Act also included special fund expenditures of \$23.3 billion and bond fund expenditures of \$4 billion.

The 2005 Budget Act contained the following major components:

Proposition 98—General Fund expenditures increased by \$2.582 billion (7.6%), to \$36.6 billion, due to increases in the Proposition 98 guaranteed funding level. The 2005 Budget Act also reflected savings of \$3.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2004-05, which would be restored to the Proposition 98 budget in future years as General Fund revenue growth exceeds personal income growth.

Higher Education—The 2005 Budget Act marked the first year of funding for the Higher Education Compact, which was signed in 2004 to provide funding stability and preserve educational quality at the State's colleges and universities over the next six fiscal years. The 2005 Budget Act provided for total Higher Education funding of \$17.8 billion from all revenue sources, including \$10.2 billion from the General Fund.

Health and Human Services—Expenditures for these programs increased by \$2.1 billion (8.5%), to \$27.1 billion. This increase included higher Medi-Cal expenditures of \$1.3 billion, Department of Developmental Services expenditures of \$152 million, Department of Mental Health expenditures of \$306 million and Department of Social Services expenditures of \$55 million. The 2005 Budget Act reflected the suspension of the July 2005 and 2006 CalWORKs grant cost-of-living-adjustments, yielding General Fund savings of \$136 million and \$139 million in Fiscal Years 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively. The 2005 Budget Act further assumed that certain cost-of-living adjustments for recipients would be suspended for estimated General Fund savings of \$132 million, \$407.5 million and \$281 million in Fiscal Years 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively.

Retirement and Employee Compensation—The 2005 Budget Act fully funded the State's statutory obligations, and also reflected an augmentation of \$355 million for salary increases and dental and vision premium increases.

Financial Instruments—The 2005 Budget Act reflected the State's issuance of pension obligation bonds to fund approximately \$525 million of the State's Fiscal Year 2005-06 retirement obligation to CalPERS. An adverse court ruling prevented issuance of these bonds.

Three related lawsuits were settled by the State, and the largest of these settlements, in the amount of \$428 million, provided for the State to make annual payments of \$42.8 million per year for ten years. The first year's payment, plus \$36 million to completely dismiss the other two stipulated judgments, was included in the 2005 Budget Act.

*Fiscal Year 2005-06 Revised Estimates.* The 2007-08 Proposed Budget estimated more favorable results for the State than were projected at the time the 2005 Budget Act was signed. The State estimated that total prior year resources, plus revenues and transfers for Fiscal Year 2005-06, were about \$93.4 billion, nearly \$9 billion more than originally estimated. Also, expenditures increased by about \$1.6 billion. As a result, the fund balance at June 30, 2006 was estimated at about \$10.8 billion.

State Budget—Fiscal Year 2006-07. The 2006 Budget Act was adopted by the Legislature on June 27, 2006, and signed by the Governor on June 30, 2006. Under the 2006 Budget Act, General Fund revenues and transfers were projected to increase 1.2%, from \$92.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06 to \$93.9 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07. The 2006 Budget Act contained General Fund appropriations of \$101.3 billion, compared to \$92.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06. The June 30, 2007 reserve was projected to be \$2.1 billion, compared to an estimated June 30, 2006 reserve of \$9.5 billion.

The 2006 Budget Act also contained Special Fund expenditures of \$26.6 billion and Bond Fund expenditures of \$3.6 billion. Special Fund revenues were estimated at \$27.8 billion. Pursuant to the cash flow projections for the 2006 Budget Act, the State issued \$1.5 billion of RANs to assist in its cash management program for the fiscal year.

The 2006 Budget Act was substantially similar to the 2006-07 May Revision, however, it also assumed \$299 million greater revenues for Fiscal Year 2005-06 based on higher than expected revenues in May, and \$19 million greater revenues in Fiscal Year 2006-07 due to expanded sales tax licensing and collection programs. The 2006 Budget Act contains the following major General Fund components:

1. Repayments or Prepayments of Prior Obligations – \$2.812 billion of repayments or prepayments of prior obligations as follows: (1) \$1.415 billion for advance payment of a portion of the 2003-04 and 2004-05 Proposition 42 suspensions; (2) \$472 million for early retirement of ERBs; (3) \$296 million to repay/prepay non-Proposition 98 mandates; (4) \$347 million to repay/prepay loans from special funds; (5) \$150 million to prepay "settle-ups" under Proposition 98; (6) \$100 million to prepay flood control subventions; and (7) \$32 million to pay debt service on general obligation bonds in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

2. Proposition 98 – Proposition 98 General Fund expenditures were \$41.3 billion, an increase of \$2.9 billion (7.5%) compared to the revised Fiscal Year 2005-06 estimate. Including property taxes, the total Proposition 98 guarantee was \$55.1 billion, an increase of \$3.1 billion (5.9%).

3. K-12 Education – \$67.1 billion in spending on K-12 education, an increase of \$2.9 billion from the revised Fiscal Year 2005-06 estimate. General Fund expenditures were \$40.5 billion, an increase of \$2.7 billion (7.0%).

4. Higher Education – General Fund expenditures were \$11.4 billion, an increase of \$973 million (9.4%) over Fiscal Year 2005-06.

5. Health and Human Services – \$29.3 billion General Fund to be spent on Health and Human Services programs, an increase of \$2.5 billion (8.7%) from revised Fiscal Year 2005-06 estimates, which was due primarily to increases in caseload, population, and other workloads.

6. Transportation Funding – \$1.42 billion to fully fund Proposition 42 in Fiscal Year 2006-07 and \$1.415 billion for advance payment of a portion of the Proposition 42 suspensions. The 2005 Budget Act assumed repayment of a portion of outstanding transportation loans with \$1 billion in bond proceeds derived from certain Indian gaming revenues to specified transportation programs. There have been several lawsuits that prevented the bonds from being sold to date, and an Executive Order was issued in June 2006 to use the \$151 million in tribal gaming compact revenues that had been received to repay a portion of these loans. Bond proceeds in the amount of \$849 million were anticipated in the 2006 Budget Act. Due to the delays caused by ongoing litigation, the 2007-08 Proposed Budget anticipates expenditures of \$100 million per year as revenues are received in Fiscal Years 2006-07 and 2007-08, until the litigation is resolved.

7. Budget Stabilization Account – The transfer of an estimated \$944 million pursuant to Proposition 58. Half of this amount (\$472 million) remained in the BSA as a reserve. The other half was transferred for the purpose of early retirement of ERBs.

Fiscal Year 2006-07 Revised Estimates. The State estimates that total prior year resources, plus revenues and transfers for Fiscal Year 2006-2007, were about \$105.3 billion, nearly \$1.9 billion more than originally estimated, including 1.058 billion higher personal income tax revenues and 650.9 million higher corporate tax revenues. Expenditures increased by about \$152 million. As a result, the General Fund balance at June 30, 2007 was estimated at about \$3.9 billion, of which \$3.0 billion was in the SFEU, compared to the original 2006 Budget Act estimate of \$1.6 billion.

State Budget—Fiscal Year 2007-08. The 2007 Budget Act was adopted by the Legislature on August 21, 2007 and signed by the Governor on August 24, 2007. In approving the budget, the Governor vetoed \$943 million in appropriations (including \$703 million in General Fund appropriations). The 2007 Budget Act includes the largest reserve of any budget act in the State's history. Due to the shortfall in revenue collections exposed in June 2007, and in recognition of the State's continuing structural deficit and other potential threats, the Legislature took actions to reduce spending and increase funds available, thereby increasing the total reserve to an unprecedented \$3.4 billion.

General Fund revenues and transfers are projected to increase 6%, from \$95.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07 to \$101.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. The 2007 Budget Act contains General Fund appropriations of \$102.3 billion, compared to \$101.7 billion in 2006-07. The June 30, 2008 total reserve was projected to be \$4.1 billion, similar to the estimated June 30, 2007 reserve.

The 2007 Budget Act is substantially similar to the Governor's proposals and contains the following major General Fund components:

1. Maximizing the Value of the State's Student Loan Guarantee Function – The 2007 Budget Act assumes the sale of California's student loan guarantee function, generating \$1 billion in one-time revenue. The State's student loan guarantee function is operated through a contract between the California Student Aid Commission ("CSAC") and EdFund, California's student loan guarantee agency established by CSAC. This proposal will not adversely affect students' access to loans or the interest rates students' pay for loans.

2. Repayments or Prepayments of Prior Obligations – \$1 billion in prepayments of the ERBs and \$5 million of other budgetary debt repayments, bringing the total set aside to repay the ERBs to \$6.8 billion in four years since the bonds were issued. The Department of Finance projects that the ERBs will be fully retired in February of 2010, which is 14 years ahead of schedule.

3. Proposition 98 – The 2007 Budget Act includes Proposition 98 General Fund expenditures of \$41.5 billion, an increase of \$712 million (1.7%) compared to revised Fiscal Year 2006-07 estimates. When property taxes are taken into account, the total Proposition 98

guarantee is \$57.1 billion, which is an increase of \$2.2 billion (3.9%). The 2007 Budget Act also continues to include \$426 million above the 2006-07 Proposition 98 guarantee level to implement Proposition 49.

4. K-12 Education – \$66.8 billion in spending on K-12 education, an increase of \$3.5 billion from the revised Fiscal Year 2006-07 estimates.

5. Higher Education – Reflects total funding of \$19.7 billion, including \$14 billion General Fund and Proposition 98 sources for all major segments of higher education, which reflects an increase of \$1.1 billion above the revised Fiscal Year 2006-07 level.

6. Health and Human Services – \$29.7 billion General Fund to be spent on Health and Human Services programs, which is an increase of \$301 million from the revised Fiscal Year 2006-07 estimate. Total funding from all State funds is \$38 billion, which is an increase of \$1.6 billion from the revised estimates.

7. Transportation Funding – Includes \$1.48 billion to fully fund Proposition 42 in Fiscal Year 2007-08. Pursuant to Proposition 1A, the 2007 Budget Act repays \$83 million from the Fiscal Year 2003-04 and 2004-05 Proposition 42 suspensions. The 2007 Budget Act also provides for the use of \$100 million in tribal gaming compact revenues that will be received in Fiscal Years 2006-07, 2007-08, and any future years until the bonds are sold, in order to repay past loans.

8. Budget Stabilization Account – The fully funded transfer of \$2.05 billion to the BSA, pursuant to Proposition 58. Half of this amount (\$1.02 billion) will remain in the BSA as a reserve. The other half will be transferred for the purpose of early retirement of ERBs.

9. Lease of State Lottery – The Governor proposed an examination of the potential benefits, which could be derived from a lease of the State Lottery to private operators. The Governor indicated the State may be able to realize substantial new income while still providing a guaranteed payment to schools. The Governor did not include any specific proposal in the 2007-08 May Revision, and the 2007 Budget Act does not include any increased revenue estimate based on such a transaction.

10. Revenue Actions – The 2007 Budget Act includes several revenue proposals that were in the Governor's proposed budget. The most significant changes included the repeal of the teacher tax credit, resulting in an estimated revenue gain of \$170 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08, and additional efforts to reduce the "tax gap," which is estimated to result in \$77.5 million in additional personal income tax and corporation tax revenues in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

Budget Risks and Structural Deficit. For Fiscal Year 2007-08, the State faces a number of issues and risks that may impact the General Fund, and reduce the budget reserves included in the 2007 Budget Act. Some of the larger risks include: (i) deterioration of revenues primarily as a result of weaker economic conditions; (ii) delay in sale of the State's student loan guarantee function past the current fiscal year; (iii) reserves has already been reduced by \$500 million as a result of an adverse court ruling in August, 2007 in a case involving delayed payments to the

State Teachers' Retirement Fund, ultimately resulting in a payment of an additional \$210 million in interest; (iv) additional Proposition 98 spending; (v) additional costs for employee contracts of approximately \$300 million; (vi) a variety of individual budget decisions in the area of health, welfare and social services, including litigation, each having an impact of \$100 million or more; and (vii) potential impact on the General Fund reserve if the lawsuit challenging use of funds in the Public Transportation Account is successful. At this time, the State believes subsequent legislative action in the fiscal emergency special session has address the court's objections to the original 2007 Budget Act actions.

Approximately \$3.5 billion of the budget solutions included in the 2007 Budget Act are one-time actions, which cannot be repeated in Fiscal Year 2008-09. In part because of these one-time actions, and estimates of program growth based on existing statutory and constitutional requirements, the State projects that, absent additional corrective measures, the Fiscal Year 2008-09 budget will be about \$6.1 billion out of balance. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget projected the budget cap for Fiscal Year 2008-09 was almost \$14.5 billion.

*Fiscal Year 2007-08 Revised Estimates.* The 2008-09 Governor's Budget projects that the State will end Fiscal Year 2007-08 with a total reserve of \$871.9 million, compared with the original estimate of \$4.1 billion. Major changes include: (i) a net loss of \$439 million for Fiscal Year 2007-08 since the 2007 Budget Act, including (a) \$125 million lower revenues; (b) \$243 million decrease in expenditures; (c) \$ 557 million decrease in resources; (ii) the General Fund revenues and transfers for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected at \$101.2 billion, a net decrease of \$9 million compared with 2007 Budget Act estimates, consist of (a) \$4.164 billion decrease in major tax revenues including \$2.6 billion personal income tax and \$1.1 billion sales tax; (b) \$3.313 billion increase in revenues from the sale of ERBs; (c) \$1.494 billion increase due to the transfer of the balance of the BSA to the General Fund; (d) \$652 million decrease due to changes in other minor revenues and transfers; and (iii) the General Fund expenditures for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected at \$103.4 billion, an increase of \$1.1 billion compared with 2007 Budget Act estimates, comprising of significant adjustments since the 2007 Budget Act including (a) a total of \$1 billion of increased non-Proposition 98 expenditures, costs related to newly bargained labor contracts, and fire suppression costs relating to the Southern California wildfires; and (b) \$215 million of increased expenditures in Proposition 98. Legislation was adopted at the fiscal emergency special session to reduce expenditures in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and lower certain base expenditures for Fiscal Year 2008-09, which has resulted in \$4.8 billion of budget solutions for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and \$2.7 billion of budget solutions in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

*Proposed State Budget – Fiscal Year 2008-09.* The 2008-09 Governor's Budget, released on January 10, 2008, proposes to permanently control the State's persistent structural deficit by: (1) imposing budget-balancing reductions in the current and budget years while protecting and preserving essential State services, and (2) proposing a constitutional amendment, the Budget Stabilization Act, to reform the budget process so that State government has the tools needed to avoid spending more than it has in the future. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget projects to end Fiscal Year 2008-09 with at \$2.8 billion total reserve. General Fund revenues and transfers are projected at \$ 102.9 billion, an increase of \$1.7 billion compared with Fiscal Year 2007-08 revised estimates. General Fund expenditures for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected at \$101.0

billion, a decrease of \$2.4 billion, or 2% compared with the revised estimates for Fiscal Year 2007-08.

The 2008-09 Governor's Budget has the following major General Fund components:

1. Budget Balancing Reductions – Budget-balancing reductions of \$216.6 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and \$9.1 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09 to close the \$14.5 billion budget gap. The 10% across-the-board reductions applies to all General Fund departments and programs, Boards, Commissions, and elected offices, many of which require implementation as early as March 1, 2008.

2. Cash Flow Management – A projected cash shortage in July and August 2008 has lead to a number of solutions including: (i) selling \$3.313 billion of ERBs by the end of February 2008 to help current year cash flow; (ii) and delaying disbursement of deferred apportionments for K-12 schools and community colleges to achieve \$1.3 billion of savings.

3. Proposition 98 – The Proposition 98 Guarantee for Fiscal Year 2008-09 is projected to grow to \$59.7 billion. The General Fund portion would be \$43.6 billion of total Proposition 98 funding. However, as part of the budget-balancing reductions, Proposition 98 General Fund will be reduced by 9.2% to \$39.6 billion. Thus, the State proposes to suspend the Proposition 98 Guarantee by \$ 4 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09.

4. K-12 Education - The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$65.1 billion after budget-balancing reductions.

5. Higher Education - The 2008-09 Governor's Budget reflects a total funding of \$20.5 billion, including \$13.9 billion General Fund and Proposition 98 sources for all major segments of Higher Education.

6. Health and Human Services – The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$29.3 billion General Fund for Health and Human Services Programs.

7. Transportation Funding - The 2008-09 Governor's Budget includes \$1.485 billion to fully fund Proposition 42 in Fiscal Year 2008-09. The 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes to use the \$100 million in tribal gaming compact revenues that will be received in Fiscal Years 2007-08 and 2008-09 until the bonds are sold, to repay past loans.

8. Budget Stabilization Account – Under normal circumstances, the State would set aside \$1.509 billion for Fiscal Year 2008-09 in the BSA for rainy day purposes. Given the \$14.5 billion budget deficit, the 2008-09 Governor's Budget proposes to suspend this transfer to the BSA for Fiscal Year 2008-09.

### Litigation

The State is a party to numerous legal proceedings. The following are the most significant pending proceedings, as reported by the Office of the Attorney General.



Action Seeking Modification of Retirement Formula for State Employees. In *Joseph Myers et al. v. CalPERS et al.* plead as a class action on behalf of State employees over age 55 who will retire after January 1, 2001, plaintiffs assert that current regulations violate State anti-discrimination law by changing the retirement formulas to give older workers a smaller percentage increase in benefits than is provided to younger workers. The complaint seeks injunctive relief and retroactive retirement benefits. At this time it is impossible to quantify the magnitude of the fiscal impact; however, it may be in excess of \$250 million. The trial court dismissed the complaint; plaintiffs have appealed.

Challenge Seeking Payment to Teacher's Retirement Board. In May 2003, the Legislature statutorily reduced a continuing appropriation to CalSTRS's Supplemental Benefit Maintenance Account ("SBMA") and provided that in future years, the appropriation may be returned if needed to make the SBMA actuarially sound. In October 2003, CalSTRS petitioned the California Supreme Court (*Teacher's Retirement Board, as Manager of the California State Teachers, Retirement System, et al. v. Donna Arduin, Director of California Department of Finance, and Steve Westly, California State Controller*) to compel the State Controller to transfer funds from the General Fund to the SBMA in an amount equal to the continuing appropriation as it existed prior to the enactment of the legislation. Plaintiffs also sought injunctive and declaratory relief to the same effect. On May 4, 2005, the trial court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. The court declared that the statutory reduction unconstitutionally impairs CalSTRS members' vested contractual rights. The court further ordered the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate commanding the Controller to transfer \$500 million from the General Fund to SBMA. On August 30, 2007, the Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court's holding. Payment of \$500 million has been made; the State may seek further review of the decision with respect to the amount of interest that is required.

Action Seeking Modification of Retirement Formula for State Employees. In a recent class action, *Joseph Myers et al v. CalPERS et al.*, the plaintiff alleges that a California statute violates the age discrimination provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act. The complaint seeks injunctive and monetary relief and alleges that, in changing the retirement formulas it previously executed, the statute "discriminates" against older workers by giving them a smaller percentage increase in benefits than it provides the younger workers. It is uncertain from the complaint what retroactive retirement benefits are being sought, and therefore, it is not possible to measure the enormity of the fiscal impact at this time; however, it may be over \$250 million. The trial court dismissed the complaint; plaintiffs have appealed.

Action Challenging Use of Vehicle Fuel Tax Revenue. In *Shaw et al. v. Chiang et al.*, the plaintiffs are challenging certain provisions of the 2007 Budget Act and related legislation. Plaintiffs assert that approximately \$1.2 billion in sales and use taxes collected on vehicle fuel were improperly appropriated to: (1) reimburse past debt service payments and to make current debt service payments on various transportation bonds; and (2) to fund various other transportation programs. The trial court concluded: (1) the \$409 million reimbursement to the General Fund from the Public Transportation Account for past debt service payments was illegal; and (2) the remaining \$779 million in challenged appropriations are lawful.

Tax Refund Cases. Six cases have been filed challenging the Franchise Tax Board's ("FTB") treatment of receipts from investment of cash in short-term financial instruments, and the resulting impact on the apportionment of corporate income allegedly earned outside of California to the corporation's California tax obligation. These cases are: *General Motors Corp. v. Franchise Tax Board*, *Microsoft Corporation v. Franchise Tax Board*, *The Limited Stores, Inc. and Affiliates v. Franchise Tax Board*, *Toys "R" Us, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board*, *Montgomery Ward LLC v. Franchise Tax Board* and *Colgate Palmolive v. Franchise Tax Board*. The State Supreme Court granted review in *General Motors*, *Microsoft*, *The Limited* and *Toys "R" Us*. On August 17, 2006, the California Supreme Court filed its decisions in *Microsoft* and *General Motors*. In the former case, the Court affirmed the judgment in favor of the FTB, upholding the Board's use of an alternative apportionment method that excluded returned principal from the calculation. In the latter case, the Court affirmed the appellate court's decision in favor of the FTB on the research credit issue and affirmed in substantial part the lower courts' decisions on the apportionment issue. The Court remanded the case for a determination whether the inclusion of returned principal in the income apportionment calculation was distortive of the taxpayer's business activities in California, as the Court had held in *Microsoft*. The *General Motors* case is currently pending in the trial court.

In *The Limited* case, on June 8, 2007, the appellate court affirmed the judgment in favor of the FTB. The *Toys "R" Us* case is pending in appellate court and the *Montgomery Ward* and *Colgate-Palmolive* are pending in trial courts. Until further guidance is provided by the courts, it is not possible to determine the extent of any fiscal impact on State revenues.

Three pending cases challenge the imposition of limited liability company fees by the FTB. In *Northwest Energetic Services, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board*, the trial court has ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, the FTB has appealed, and the appellate court determined that the fee unconstitutionally discriminates against interstate commerce as applied to plaintiff; in *Ventas Finance I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board*, the trial court has ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and the FTB has appealed; and *Bakersfield Mall LLC v. Franchise Tax Board*, was filed as a class action on behalf of all limited liability companies operating in California and is pending in the trial court. If it proceeds as a class action, the claimed refunds would be significant.

Three pending cases challenge the constitutionality of the State's tax amnesty program: *River Garden Retirement Home v. California v. Franchise Tax Board*, *Garcia v. Franchise Tax Board*, and *Duffield v. Franchise Tax Board*. The plaintiffs allege that the penalty under the State's tax amnesty program's amnesty penalty is unconstitutional. The statute imposed a new penalty equal to 50% of accrued interest from February 1, 2005, to March 31, 2005 on unpaid tax liabilities for taxable years for which amnesty could have been requested. In *Garcia*, the trial court eliminated plaintiff's claim challenging the constitutionality of the tax amnesty penalty, and issued a ruling on the remaining claims that plaintiff is entitled to a refund. An appeal is possible after a final decision is issued and judgment is entered. The fiscal impact of these cases is currently unknown and depends on court decisions, but is estimated to be over \$300 million.

In *Bratton v. Franchise Tax Board*, the plaintiff is challenging a penalty assessed for promotion of an abusive tax shelter. The amount in dispute is \$4 million, but an adverse ruling in

this matter, applied to other similarly situated plaintiffs, could have a more significant fiscal impact.

*Nortel v. State Board of Equalization*, a tax refund case, involves the interpretation of certain statutory sales and use tax exemptions for "custom-written" computer software and licenses to use computer software. A ruling adverse to the State Board of Equalization in this matter if applied to other similarly situated taxpayers could have a significant negative impact, in the range of approximately \$500 million annually, on tax revenues.

In two cases, *Abbott Laboratories v. Franchise Tax Board* and *River Garden Retirement Home v. California Franchise Tax Board*, the plaintiffs are challenging the denial of a deduction for dividends under the State's Revenue and Taxation Code. After the Tax Code was held to be unconstitutional, the FTB allowed a deduction for all dividends for years in which the normal 4-year statute of limitations prevented additional assessments and denied a deduction for all dividends for all taxpayers for all years in which the 4-year statute was still open. In *Abbott Laboratories*, plaintiff asserts that the proper remedy is to allow a deduction for all dividends based upon a judicial reformation of the statute on constitutional grounds. The trial court dismissed the complaint; plaintiff appealed. In *river Garden*, the trial court sustained the demur of the FTB on this issue; plaintiff also challenges the tax amnesty penalty. An adverse ruling in this matter, applied in the context of other statutes, could have a significant revenue impact.

Environmental Cleanup and Energy-Related Matters. In the matter of *Leviathan Mine, Alpine County, California, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, State of California*, the State, as owner of the Leviathan Mine, is a party through the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (the "Board"), which is the State entity potentially responsible for performing certain environmental remediation at the Leviathan Mine site. Also a party is ARCO, the successor in interest to the mining company that caused certain pollution of the mine site. The Leviathan Mine site is listed on the Environmental Protection Agency (the "EPA") Superfund List, and both remediation costs and costs for natural resource damages may be imposed on the State. The Board has undertaken certain remedial action at the mine site, but the EPA's decision on the interim and final remedies are pending. ARCO filed a complaint on November 9, 2007, against the State, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. State of California*. ARCO seeks to recover past and future costs, based on the settlement agreement, the State's ownership of the property, and the State's allegedly negligent past clean up efforts. It is possible these matters could result in a potential loss to the State in excess of \$400 million.

In *Carla Clark, et. Al. v. City of Santa Rosa, et. al*, 32 plaintiffs who own property or live in Santa Rosa brought a toxic tort case alleging that water wells supplying water to their homes were contaminated by carcinogenic chemicals. The State is sued under a mandatory duty theory premised on an alleged violation of The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986. Plaintiffs claim damages in excess of \$400 million. After the trial court granted the State's motion for summary judgment, plaintiffs appealed.

Escheated Property Claims. In five pending cases, plaintiffs claim that the State Controller has an obligation to pay interest on private property that has escheated to the State,

and that failure to do so constitutes an unconstitutional taking of private property: *Morris v. Westly*; *Trust Realty Partners v. Westly*, *Coppoletta v. Westley*, *Suever v. Connell*, and *Taylor v. Chiang*. The *Morris* lawsuit seeks a class action determination, a declaration that failure to pay interest is an unconstitutional taking, and injunctive relief. The trial court in *Morris* ordered judgment for the State; plaintiff appealed. The *Coppoletta* case raises issues analogous to those in *Morris* and also asks that the unclaimed property law be construed as creating a trust for the benefit of the true owner. The trial court dismissed the complaint, and plaintiffs appealed. The *Trust Realty Partners* lawsuit focuses on the State's elimination of interest payments on unclaimed property claims. The case seeks a common fund recovery and injunctive relief. After the trial court's initial interim order that the State pay interest on certain claims was reversed on appeal, the matter is again pending in the trial court, which has ruled for plaintiff on certain issues, but has not yet ruled regarding damages. *Suever* and *Taylor* plaintiffs argue that the State's failure to pay interest on claims paid violated their constitutional rights. In *Suever*, the district court concluded that the State is obligated to pay interest to persons who reclaim property that has escheated to the State, but its ruling did not specify the rate of interest. The State has filed a motion to stay of the court's order and to certify the issue for appeal. Plaintiffs in *Suever* and *Taylor* also assert that for the escheated property that has been disposed of by the State, plaintiffs are entitled to recover, in addition to the proceeds of such sale, any difference between the sale price and the property's highest market value during the time the State held it; the State asserts that such claims for damages are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. The State has filed a motion for summary judgment on these claims in *Suever*, and plaintiffs have filed motions for a permanent injunction and class certification on the interest issue. If plaintiffs prevail on the claims asserted in these actions, cost to the State could be in excess of \$500 million.

In *Suever* and *Taylor*, plaintiffs also challenge the constitutional adequacy of the notice provided to owners of unclaimed property before the State takes possession of and sells such property. The trial court in *Taylor* issued a preliminary injunction prohibiting the State Controller from taking possession of, selling or destroying property pursuant to the State's unclaimed property law until the State enacted new notice provisions. Following legislative amendment of the State's notice procedures, the district court dissolved the injunction; plaintiffs appealed.

Action Seeking Damages for Alleged Violations of Privacy Rights. In *Gail Marie Harrington-Wisely, et al. v. State of California, et al.*, a proposed class action, plaintiffs seek damages for alleged violations of prison visitors' rights resulting from the Department of Corrections' use of a body imaging machine to search visitors entering State prisons for contraband. This matter has been certified as a class action. The trial court granted judgment in favor of the State. Plaintiffs' appeal has been dismissed. Plaintiffs may attempt to re-file the appeal and other issues including attorneys' fees must still be resolved. If plaintiffs were successful in obtaining an award of damages for every use of the body-imaging machine, damages could be as high as \$3 billion.

*Gomez v. Saenz, et al.* involves due process constitutional challenges to an individual being placed on the State's child abuse central index prior to the conclusion of a noticed hearing. Another case stated that prior to being placed on the index, a person is entitled to a hearing. However, the court did not decide what sort of hearing would suffice. This is the subject at issue

with the current trial court in *Gomez*. Depending on the type and scope of the hearing that the trial court might order, and the number of individuals currently on the index that might be entitled to a hearing prior to remaining in the index, the costs to the State related to conducting these hearings could be in excess of \$500 million.

The plaintiff in *Gilbert P. Hyatt v. Franchise Tax Board* was subject to an audit by the FTB involving a claimed change of residence from California to Nevada. Plaintiff alleges a number of separate torts involving privacy rights and interference with his business relationships arising from the audit. The trial court ruled that plaintiff had not established a causal relation between the audit and the loss of his licensing business with Japanese companies; the Nevada Supreme Court denied review of this ruling. The economic damages claim exceeds \$500 million. This matter is pending in the trial court. The State is vigorously contesting this matter.

Actions Seeking Program Modifications. In the following case, plaintiffs seek a court order or judgment that would require the State to modify existing programs and, except as specified, do not seek monetary damages. Nevertheless, a judgment against the State in this case could require changes in the challenged program that could result in increased programmatic costs to the State in a future fiscal year in excess of \$250 million. Alternatively, in some circumstances, it may be possible that a judgment against the State could be addressed by legislative changes to the program that would cost less.

In *Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services*, a consortium of State and national law firms and public-interest groups, are alleging violations of Federal and State statutes on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities who are currently treated in large facilities. The case seeks modifications to existing State programs for the treatment of institutionalized disabled persons, including requiring the State to offer community-based services. Some rough estimates suggest the financial impact of a judgment against the State could be as high as \$1 billion per year in programming costs going forward. The State is vigorously defending this action.

Actions to Increase Amount of State Aid for Dependent Children. Ten pending class action lawsuits challenge the amount of aid provided by the State for the care of dependent children (either in foster care or adopted) who have also been determined to be developmentally disabled have been coordinated in *Butler v. Department of Social Services*. Specifically, plaintiffs assert that they were entitled to, but did not receive, the Alternative Residential Model (ARM) rate but have instead been receiving the standard AFDC-FC (foster care) rate and/or the AAP (adoption assistance program) rate. A final decision in favor of these plaintiffs could exceed \$450 million. The trial court dismissed the complaint; plaintiffs appealed. The State is vigorously litigating this issue.

In *Katie A., et al. v. Bonta, et al.*, a class action against DHS, Department of Social Services and the City of Los Angeles, plaintiffs seek to expand Medicaid-covered services for mentally disordered children in foster care. The district court issued a preliminary injunction ordering the State defendants to provide additional services to class members. Further, the court ordered the State defendants and plaintiffs to meet and confer both to develop a plan to implement the preliminary injunction and to come to consensus on whether the court should

appoint a special master. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit reversed the decision of the district court and remanded the matter for further proceedings. At this time, it is unknown what financial impact this unprecedented litigation would have on the General Fund.

Local Government Mandate Claims and Actions. In pending litigation, Orange County and San Diego County allege that the State has not provided full reimbursement for mandated programs. These lawsuits were consolidated in San Diego Superior Court (*County of San Diego v. State of California, et al.*; and *County of Orange v. State of California, et al.*). Plaintiffs are seeking relief that would divert current budget appropriations away from various State agencies, and to the counties, as payment for the un-reimbursed costs of implementing a variety of programs over the last ten years. The County of San Diego has alleged un-reimbursed costs in excess of \$40 million, and Orange County has alleged in excess of \$116 million for un-reimbursed State-mandated costs. The effects of a final determination by an appellate court that the contested appropriation practices are unconstitutional or that the State is required to appropriate an amount equal to the amount of the mandated costs, if applied to each of California's 58 counties, could result in costs in excess of \$1.5 billion. The trial court entered judgment in favor of the counties. The State defendants appealed, and plaintiff counties cross-appealed.

In litigation filed in November 2007, *California School Boards Association et al. v. State of California et al.*, plaintiffs, including the San Diego County Office of Education and four school districts, allege the State has failed to appropriate approximately \$900 million for new State-required programs or services in violation of the State Constitution. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief, including an order compelling reimbursement. At this time it is unknown what fiscal impact this matter would have upon the General Fund.

Actions Seeking to Enjoin Implementation of Certain Tribal Gaming Compacts. In June 2004, the State entered into amendments to tribal gaming compacts between the State and five Indian Tribes (the "Amended Compacts"). Those Amended Compacts are being challenged in three pending cases. A decision unfavorable to the State in the cases described below could eliminate future receipts of gaming revenues anticipated to result from the Amended Compacts, and could delay or impair the State's ability to sell a portion of the revenue stream anticipated to be generated by these Amended Compacts.

In *Rincon Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Rincon Reservation v. Schwarzenegger, et al.* the plaintiff (the "Rincon Band"), sought an injunction against implementation of the Amended Compacts on grounds that their execution and ratification by the State constituted an unconstitutional impairment of the State's compact with the Rincon Band. The Rincon Band asserts that its compact contains an implied promise that the State would not execute compacts or compact amendments with other tribes that would have an adverse impact on the Rincon Band's market share by allowing a major expansion in the number of permissible gaming devices in California. The complaint also asserts that the State breached Rincon's compact, principally by incorrectly calculating the total number of gaming device licenses, and a claim for damages sought for a separate alleged breach of compact but did not dismiss Rincon's other breach of compact claims, including a claim that the State failed to negotiate a compact amendment with the Rincon Band in good faith. The district court entered a separate judgment

with respect to the dismissed claims, and plaintiff appealed. On appeal, the Rincon Band does not challenge the validity of the Amended Compacts. The appeal involves the total number of gaming device licenses authorized and Rincon's claim for damages. The Five Tribes filed an amicus brief asserting that they were necessary and indispensable parties to the litigation.

*Hollywood Park Land Co., et al. v. Golden State Transportation, et. al.* is an action brought by various horse racetrack interests, challenging validity of the proposed issuance of tribal gaming bonds. Plaintiffs claim that the bonds violate provisions of the California Constitution and seek injunctive relief. The Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe and a tribal councilman filed a notice of appearance and contest the validity of the bonds and the bond contracts. Additionally, they seek a declaration that provisions of the Amended Compacts are invalid and void and a declaration that the State regulations that address remedies for alleged violation of tribal gaming compacts, violate the due process rights of the tribe and its members. The trial court granted judgment in favor of the defendants; plaintiffs appealed.

*San Pasqual Bank of Mission Indians v. State of California, et al.* plaintiff seeks a declaration that more aggregate slot machines licenses are available for issuance to all tribes that signed compacts with the State than the number of such licenses determined by the State in 2002. Should relief be granted and more licenses available, the Five Tribes' obligations to continue to fund State transportation bonds under the Amended Compacts would be rendered uncertain because the Amended Compacts contemplated the license pool created by the 1999 Compact would remain fixed at the number determined by the State. An expanded license pool would thus present questions about the Five Tribes' monetary obligations that would presumably be required to be addressed by amendment of the Amended Compacts. The district court dismissed the complaint, and plaintiff appealed.

Prison Healthcare Reform. The adult prison health care delivery system includes medical health care, mental health care and dental health care. The annual budget for this system is approximately \$2 billion. The system is operated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and affects approximately 33 prisons throughout the State. There are three significant cases pending in federal district courts challenging the constitutionality of prison health care. *Plata v. Schwarzenegger* is a class action regarding the adequacy of medical health care; *Coleman v. Schwarzenegger* is a class action regarding mental health care; and *Perez v. Tilton* is a class action regarding dental health care. A fourth case, *Armstrong v/ Schwarzenegger* is a class action on behalf of inmates with disabilities alleging violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. In *Plata* the district court appointed a Receiver, who took office in April 2006, to run and operate the medical health care portion of the health care delivery system. The *Plata* Receiver and the Special Master appointed by the *Coleman* court, joined by the Court representatives appointed by the *Perez* and *Armstrong* courts, meet routinely to coordinate efforts in these cases. To date, ongoing costs of remedial activities have been incorporated into the State's budget process. However, at this time, it is unknown what financial impact this litigation would have on the State's General Fund, particularly in light of the unprecedented step of appointing a Receiver of medical health care.

Action Seeking to Enjoin Lease Revenue Bond financing for Correctional Facilities. In *Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety, et al. v. Arnold Schwarzenegger et al.*, plaintiffs

challenge certain provisions of the Public Safety and Offender Rehabilitation Services Act of 2007 that authorize the issuance of over \$7 billion of lease revenue bonds to finance construction and renovation of State prison and county jail facilities. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief, alleging that the lease revenue bonds violate the debt limit in the California Constitution because the bonds were not approved by the voters. The trial court denied plaintiffs' request for a preliminary injunction and dismissed the case; plaintiffs appealed. At this time it is unknown what fiscal impact this matter would have on the State's General Fund.

Actions Seeking Medi-Cal Reimbursements. Two cases, each entitled *California Association of Health Facilities ("CAHF") v. Department of Health Services ("DHS")*, have been consolidated at the appellate level. CAHF, which represents various nursing and care facilities, filed the two separate cases alleging that Medi-Cal reimbursement rates paid by DHS to providers in Fiscal Years 2001-02 and 2002-03 were too low. The trial court sustained DHS' demurrers in both cases. On December 26, 2006, the Court of Appeal reversed and remanded the case to the trial court for further proceedings. The consolidated cases are pending in the trial court. A final decision adverse to DHS in both of the consolidated cases could result in reimbursement costs exceeding \$250 million.

In *Orinda Convalescent Hospital, et al. v. Department of Health Services*, plaintiffs challenge a quality assurance fee charged to certain nursing facilities and a Medi-Cal reimbursement methodology applicable to such facilities that were enacted in 2004, alleging violations of Federal Medicaid law, the Federal and State constitutions and State law. Plaintiffs seek a refund of fees paid and to enjoin future collection of the fee. If an injunction against collection of the fee is issued, it could negatively affect the State's receipt of Federal funds. At this time it is unknown what fiscal impact this matter would have upon the General Fund.



## APPENDIX D

### RISK FACTORS—INVESTING IN NEW YORK MUNICIPAL BONDS

The following information constitutes only a brief summary, does not purport to be a complete description, and is based primarily on information drawn from the Annual Information Statement of the State of New York (the "State") and any updates available as of the date of this Statement of Additional Information. While the Fund has not independently verified this information, it has no reason to believe that such information is not correct in all material respects.

#### Economic and Demographic Trends

U.S. Economy. The U.S. economy continued to lose momentum in the last half of 2007. Large declines in residential construction and reduced demand for automobiles and housing-related durable goods, combined with past energy price increases and credit market tightening, continued to generate a significant drag on economic growth. The uncertainty associated with the still unfolding subprime mortgage problem has substantially increased financial market volatility, reduced financial sector profits, and diminished the accessibility of credit to the nation's households and businesses. In addition, labor market growth continued to decelerate since the early part of 2007.

Continued global growth and a weaker dollar, however, have produced strong demand for U.S. exports. Additionally, some states and private lenders are offering initiatives to forestall a rising foreclosure rate. In combination with recent Federal Reserve actions, these interventions are expected to allow the economy to gradually rebound to its long-term trend growth rate over the course of 2008, after bottoming out below 2% in the fourth quarter of 2007 and first quarter of 2008. Both the Federal government and the Federal Reserve are playing active roles in trying to keep the economy out of recession. Following two quarters of very low growth in the fourth quarter of 2007 (2%) and the first quarter of 2008 (2.2%), the State's Department of the Budget (the "DOB") projects that the national economy will improve with each subsequent quarter, until reaching growth of 3% by the fourth quarter of 2008.

There are a number of risks to the DOB's forecast, including larger financial sector write-downs associated with the subprime mortgage problem and related credit crunches, deeper housing market contractions and falling housing prices or a resurgence in energy and food prices that could result in higher-than-expected inflation rates. All of these risks could be compounded by lower productivity growth or a weaker dollar and could impair the Federal Reserve's current efforts to stimulate domestic economic growth.

State Economy. New York is the third most populous state in the nation and has a relatively high level of personal wealth. The State's economy is diverse, with a comparatively

large share of the nation's financial activities, information, education and health services employment, and a very small share of the nation's farming and mining activity. The State's location and its air transport facilities and natural harbors have made it an important link in international commerce. Travel and tourism constitute an important part of the economy. Like the rest of the nation, New York has a declining proportion of its workforce engaged in manufacturing and an increasing proportion engaged in service industries.

The national economic slowdown is having a significant impact on the State's economy. The impact of the current credit market crisis on wages is projected to be greatest in the first quarter of 2008, during the height of the financial sector bonus season. The credit crisis could have a more deleterious effect on the State economy than on the nation as a whole given New York City's status as an international financial center. Though State economic growth is expected to slow in 2008, conditions currently are not expected to approach those of a recession. The State's large education and health sectors are expected to continue exhibiting strong growth. In addition, tourism and trade are expected to continue to be bolstered by the weaker dollar.

The credit crunch and expected decline in finance and insurance sector bonuses, combined with slowing job growth, is expected to result in significantly lower wage growth in 2008. DOB projects total wage growth of 3.3% for 2008, following an estimated increase of 7.6% for 2007. Slower growth in both the wage and non-wage components of income is expected to result in total personal income growth of 4.3% for 2008, following 7.4% growth for 2007.

Though there are parallels between State and national labor market trends, there are differences as well. As at the national level, State private sector job growth is expected to be greatest in education and health care and social assistance services. Similarly, both the State and the nation are projected to see large declines in the manufacturing and mining sector. However, DOB projects national construction employment to decline for 2008, consistent with the national housing market contraction. In contrast, State construction employment is projected to grow in 2008, albeit at a slower rate than in 2007. The continued strength of the New York City real estate market and the absence of a significant housing boom in much of upstate New York explain most of this difference. As for the nation, the State's average annual unemployment rate is expected to rise in 2008, from 4.4% for 2007 to 4.9% this year.

All of the risks to the U.S. economic forecast apply to the State's economic forecast as well, although as the nation's financial center, the current credit tightening poses a larger degree of uncertainty for the State as the full extent of losses associated with the subprime mortgage problem remains to be seen.

The City of New York. The fiscal demands on the State may be affected by the fiscal health of New York City (the "City"), which relies in part on State aid to balance its budget and meet its cash requirements. The State's finances also may be affected by the ability of the City, and certain entities issuing debt for the benefit of the City, to market their securities successfully in the public credit markets. For its normal operations, the City depends on aid from 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.

Other Localities. Certain localities outside the City have experienced financial problems and have requested and received additional State assistance during the last several State fiscal years. The potential impact on the State of any future requests by localities for additional oversight or financial assistance was not included in the projections of the State's receipts and disbursements for Fiscal Year 2007-08 or thereafter.

Like the State, local governments must respond to changing political, economic and financial influences over which they have little or no control. Such changes may adversely affect the financial condition of certain local governments. It is also possible that the City, other localities or any of their respective public authorities may suffer serious financial difficulties that could jeopardize local access to the public credit markets, which may adversely affect the marketability of notes and bonds issued by localities within the State. Localities may also face unanticipated problems resulting from pending litigation, judicial decisions and long-range economic trends. Other large-scale potential problems, such as declining urban populations, increasing expenditures, and the loss of skilled manufacturing jobs, may also adversely affect localities and necessitate State assistance.

#### Special Considerations

Many complex political, social, and economic forces influence the State's economy and finances, which may in turn affect the State's annual financial plan. These forces may affect the State unpredictably from fiscal year to fiscal year and are influenced by governments, institutions, and events that are not subject to the State's control and there can be no assurance that actual results will not differ materially and adversely from the current forecast.

*Taxation of Interest on Municipal Bonds.* On May 21, 2007, the United States Supreme Court agreed to review the decision of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky in *Davis v. Kentucky Dep't of Revenue of the Finance and Admin. Cabinet*, which held that the disparate state tax treatment of interest income on obligations issued by the State of Kentucky or its political subdivisions and obligations issued by other states or their political subdivisions violated the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. Currently, the vast majority of states employ a tax system that provides a preferential treatment that exempts the interest income earned on in-state municipal bonds from state taxation while subjecting the interest income earned on extraterritorially-issued bonds to state taxation.

On Monday, November 5, 2007, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the *Davis* case. If the Kentucky decision is affirmed by the Supreme Court, the State could be required to eliminate any disparity between the tax treatment of obligations issued by such state and its political subdivisions or instrumentalities and the tax treatment of obligations issued by other states and their respective political subdivisions or instrumentalities. The Supreme Court decision could result in an estimated potential impact of up to \$200 million in claims for tax refunds arising out of income tax payments made in prior years. The preliminary estimate of the financial impact on the State of New York of discontinuing the practice of subjecting

extraterritorially-issued municipal bonds to state income taxation is approximately \$70 million of lost tax revenues annually.

*Status of Auction Markets for Municipal Bonds.* Recently, a significant number of auction rate municipal bonds have failed to attract buyers, including certain bonds backed by the State, resulting in "failed auctions" and a resetting of the periodic rates to rates in excess of that which would otherwise prevail in the short-term market. The auction failures have affected municipal issuers throughout the nation. Failed auctions generally do not reflect the credit strength of individual issuers, but reflect concerns relating to bond insurers that have insured these auction rate bonds as well as changes in the operation of the auction rate market itself. As an outcome of these failed auctions, governmental issuers are experiencing significantly higher service costs on auction rate bonds and bondholders are experience significantly less liquidity than has been anticipated. The likely duration of the disruption in the auction rate securities market cannot be predicted at this time.

The State is evaluating the financial impact of the recent failed auctions and related increased debt service costs on its financial plan projections. The State currently does not believe that the higher interest rate costs will have a material adverse effect on its current financial plan, and is initiating steps to limit its exposure to auction rate bonds.

#### State Finances

The State accounts for all budgeted receipts and disbursements that support programs and other administrative costs of running State government within the All Governmental Funds type. The All Governmental Funds, comprised of funding supported by State Funds and Federal Funds, provides the most comprehensive view of the financial operations of the State. State Funds includes the General Fund and other State-supported funds including State Special Reserve Funds, Capital Projects Funds and Debt Service Funds. The General Fund is the principal operating fund of the State and is used to account for all financial transactions except those required to be accounted for in another fund. It is the State's largest fund and receives almost all State taxes and other resources not dedicated to particular purposes.

#### Recent Trends

Since DOB finalized its budget forecast in January 2008, the national economic situation has continued to deteriorate and the risk of a recession has increased. A weaker national economy and more severe financial sector woes are projected to negatively affect the economy as well. As a result, DOB has lowered its U.S. forecasts for corporate profits, equity market prices, employment growth, and wages in 2008. DOB also has modified its forecast for the State economy, based on events that are likely to affect the State's financial services industry. In particular, DOB now projects finance and insurance sector bonuses will remain essentially flat in Fiscal Year 2008-09 and that the volume of taxable capital gains realized by State taxpayers in 2008 will decline by 9.4% from 2007 levels.

DOB does not expect the impact of the revisions to the economic outlook to materially affect the overall General Fund revenue forecast in the current fiscal year, based on tax

collections to-date and the relatively strong economic performance over much of 2007. In Fiscal Year 2008-09, however, DOB has reduced its General Fund revenue forecast by \$358 million, with the most significant reductions taken in the projections for the personal income tax and business taxes. The revenue forecasts for subsequent years through Fiscal Year 2012 also have been lowered by roughly \$500 million annually.

#### Fiscal 2005-06 Year-End Results

DOB reported a Fiscal Year 2005-06 General Fund surplus of \$2 billion. Total receipts, including transfers from other funds, were \$47.2 billion, an increase of \$3.3 billion over the prior fiscal year. Disbursements, including transfers to other funds, totaled \$46.5 billion, an increase of \$2.9 billion from Fiscal Year 2004-05. The General Fund ended Fiscal Year 2005-06 with a balance of \$3.3 billion, which included dedicated balances of \$944 million in the State's "rainy day" fund, \$21 million in the Contingency Reserve Fund and \$251 million in the Community Projects Fund. The closing balance also included \$2 billion in a spending stabilization reserve. Tax receipts increased by \$3.8 billion and transfers increased by \$743 million, while miscellaneous receipts decreased by \$197 million, due primarily to the loss of various one-time receipts. The main sources of annual spending increases were Medicaid, school aid and fringe benefits.

The State ended Fiscal Year 2005-06 with a State Funds cash balance of \$6.8 billion. In addition to the \$3.3 billion General Fund balance, the State's special revenue funds had a closing balance of \$3.7 billion and the debt service funds had a closing balance of \$221 million. State Funds receipts totaled \$71.7 billion for Fiscal Year 2005-06, an increase of \$7.4 billion from the prior fiscal year. The annual growth in General Fund receipts combined with growth in other State taxes and miscellaneous receipts accounted for the change. State Funds disbursements totaled \$69.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06, an increase of \$5.8 billion from Fiscal Year 2004-05.

The State ended Fiscal Year 2005-06 with an All Funds cash balance of \$7.1 billion. In addition to the \$6.8 billion State Funds balance described above, the Federal Funds had a closing balance of \$249 million. All Funds receipts totaled \$107 billion, an increase of \$6.3 billion over Fiscal Year 2004-05. Strong growth in tax collections and moderate growth in miscellaneous receipts were partially offset by a decline in Federal grants. All Funds disbursements for Fiscal Year 2005-06 totaled \$104.3 billion, an increase of \$3.7 billion over the prior fiscal year.

#### 2006-07 Enacted Budget Financial Plan

2006-07 Budget. The 2006-07 Budget was finalized on April 26, 2006. The 2006-07 Budget was balanced in Fiscal Year 2006-07, but projected an estimated gap of \$1.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and \$3.0 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09. Since the time the 2006-07 Budget was enacted, annual spending was projected to grow by over 9% as a result of increases in school aid, health care, and higher education. All Governmental Funds spending was estimated at \$112.5 billion, an increase of 7.8% from 2005-06. State tax receipts were expected to grow 5% over Fiscal Year 2005-06 levels, down from the 10% growth rate of the preceding two consecutive years. State debt outstanding was initially projected to total \$50.7 billion, but the

estimate rose to \$51.0 billion for Fiscal Year 2006-07, with debt service equal to approximately 4.2% of All Funds receipts.

The 2006-07 Budget included the following material provisions: (i) \$1.3 billion increase in school aid; (ii) \$1.1 billion All Funds spending increase in Medicaid; (iii) new statewide school construction grant program totaling \$2.6 billion and authorization for the City to issue \$9.4 billion in bonds for such construction; (iv) elimination of the sales tax on clothing purchases under \$110; (v) limitation on duplicative drug coverage for those who qualify for certain Medicaid programs, avoiding approximately \$220 million in costs; (vi) new Medicaid Inspector's General Office to investigate and prevent Medicaid fraud; (vii) \$1.8 billion spending stabilization reserve in order to lower the Fiscal Year 2007-08 and Fiscal Year 2008-09 budget gaps; and (viii) \$250 million deposit to the State's Debt Reduction Reserve.

DOB projected the State would end Fiscal Year 2006-07 with a General Fund balance of \$2.3 billion with long-term reserves consisting of \$944 million in the State's Rainy Day Reserve and \$21 million in the Contingency Reserve for litigation risks. The reserves previously set aside for planned commitments included \$276 million in the Community Projects Fund, \$1.8 billion in a spending stabilization reserve, to be used to lower the expected Fiscal Year 2007-08 and Fiscal Year 2008-09 budget gaps, and \$250 million for debt reduction.

Receipts Outlook. All Funds receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to total \$111.2 billion, an increase of \$4.2 billion (3.9%) over Fiscal Year 2005-06. Underlying revenue growth of \$3.1 billion (6.1%) in Fiscal Year 2006-07 was offset by the loss of several one-time revenues (\$531 million), the phase-out of the personal income tax surcharge and a one-quarter percent increase in sales tax (\$1 billion), lower transfers from other funds due to increasing debt servicing costs (\$180 million), and higher transfers to finance certain educational programs (\$188 million).

*Personal Income Tax.* Personal income tax General Fund receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to reach \$23.1 billion, an increase of 11.8% from Fiscal Year 2005-06. General Fund receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 were projected to reach \$23.9 billion. All Funds personal income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were expected to total \$34.2 billion, an increase of approximately \$3.4 billion (11.1%) over the prior year. All Funds personal income tax projected Fiscal Year 2007-08 receipts of \$35.3 billion reflected an increase of \$1.1 billion (3.3%) above Fiscal Year 2006-07 estimates, continued economic growth, the full-year effect of the termination of the temporary surcharge and tax reductions authorized in the 2006-07 Budget. The All Funds receipts projections continued this trend, and were projected at \$37.9 billion, an increase of \$2.5 billion (7.2%) above Fiscal Year 2007-07 estimates.

*User Taxes and Fees.* All Funds user taxes and fees net receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to reach \$13.7 billion, a decrease of 1.7% from Fiscal Year 2005-06. All Funds user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 were projected to be \$14.2 billion. General Fund user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to reach \$8.3 billion, a decrease of 3.7% from the prior fiscal year, and the sales and use tax was projected at \$7.7 billion, a decrease of \$292 million (3.7%). General Fund user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 were projected at \$8.7 billion, an increase of \$343 million (4.1%) from Fiscal Year

2006-07. Sales tax receipts were estimated to increase \$327 million (4.3%), while General Fund other user taxes and fees were projected to remain the same as Fiscal Year 2006-07.

*Business Taxes.* All Funds business tax receipts in Fiscal Year 2006-07 were expected to be \$7.3 billion, or \$221 million (3.1%) above Fiscal Year 2005-06. All Funds receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 were projected to increase by \$132.5 million (1.8%) over the prior year. General Fund business taxes were projected to be \$5.3 billion, or 4.3% over Fiscal Year 2005-06. General Fund business tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 were expected to increase by 1.5% over Fiscal Year 2006-07.

*Other Taxes.* All Funds other taxes in Fiscal Year 2006-07 were expected to be \$1.7 billion, which was \$124 million (6.8%) below Fiscal Year 2005-06. The decrease was a result of an anticipated "cooling" of the downstate real estate market, but partially offset by an expected \$19 million increase in estate tax receipts. The All Funds receipts projection for other taxes was \$1.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, up \$71 million (4.2%) from Fiscal Year 2006-07 receipts. The estimate for General Fund other taxes was \$896 million, which was \$15 million (1.6%) above the prior fiscal year.

*Miscellaneous Receipts.* General Fund miscellaneous receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to total over \$2.8 billion, an increase of \$817 million from Fiscal Year 2005-06. Miscellaneous receipts in All Funds were projected to increase by \$412 million from the current year.

*Federal Grants.* General Fund Federal grants for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were projected to total \$9 million, an increase of \$9 million from Fiscal Year 2005-06.

Disbursements Outlook. General Fund spending was projected to total \$50.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$4.3 billion (9.4%) over Fiscal Year 2005-06. State Funds spending was projected to increase by \$7.4 billion (10.6%) to \$77.1 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07. All Funds spending, the broadest measure of State spending, was projected to total \$112.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$8.1 billion (7.8%).

Medicaid growth of \$2.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07 was primarily attributable to the increasing cost of providing health care services, as well as the rising number of recipients. In addition, the growth related to the State takeover of local healthcare provider costs were estimated to rise by \$235 million, and the loss of certain proceeds after the fiscal year, were no longer available in Fiscal Year 2006-07. School aid spending was projected to grow by \$461 million in Fiscal Year 2006-07. State operations spending was projected to increase by \$592 million with general State charges expected to increase by an additional \$375 million, primarily due to higher pension and health insurance costs for State employees.

2006-07 Financial Plan Update. DOB reported a General Fund surplus of \$1.5 billion for Fiscal Year 2006-07. Results for Fiscal Year 2006-07 were \$1.5 billion higher than the 2006-07 Budget as a result of revenue revisions over initial projections (\$1.4 billion) and changes to reserve fund balances (\$767 million), partly offset by higher than initially projected spending (\$607 million). Total receipts, including transfers from other funds, were \$51.4 billion, and

disbursements, including transfers to other funds, totaled \$51.6 billion. The General Fund ended Fiscal Year 2006-07 with a balance of \$3 billion. General Fund receipts, including transfers from other funds and the impact of the tax refund reserve transaction, totaled \$51.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$4.2 billion from Fiscal Year 2005-06. Tax receipts increased by \$3.4 billion, transfers increased by \$419 million, and miscellaneous receipts increased by \$390 million. General Fund spending, including transfers to other funds, totaled \$51.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$5.1 billion from Fiscal Year 2005-06. The main sources of annual growth were school aid, Medicaid, and higher education programs.

The State ended Fiscal Year 2006-07 with a State Funds cash balance of \$6.7 billion. In addition to the \$3 billion General Fund balance, the State's special revenue funds had a closing balance of \$3.7 billion and the debt service funds had a closing balance of \$233 million, partially offset by a negative balance in the capital projects funds of \$228 million. State Funds receipts totaled \$76.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$5.0 billion from Fiscal Year 2005-06. Actual State Funds disbursements totaled \$77.3 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07, an increase of \$7.6 billion from Fiscal Year 2005-06.

The State ended Fiscal Year 2006-07 with an All Funds cash balance of \$6.8 billion. In addition to the \$6.7 billion State Funds balance, the Federal Funds had a closing balance of \$85 million, including \$288 million in Federal special revenue funds, partially offset by a negative balance in the Federal capital projects funds of \$203 million. All Funds receipts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 totaled \$112.4 billion, an increase of \$5.4 billion over Fiscal Year 2005-06. All Funds disbursements for 2006-07 totaled \$112.8 billion, an increase of \$8.4 billion over Fiscal Year 2005-06.

#### 2007-08 Enacted Budget Financial Plan

2007-08 Budget. The Governor submitted the proposed 2007-08 budget to the Legislature on January 31, 2007, which was enacted on April 1, 2007. Annual spending in the General Fund is projected to grow by \$2.1 billion (4.1%) from Fiscal Year 2006-07 levels. All Governmental Funds spending is estimated at \$120.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, an increase of \$7.9 billion (7%) from Fiscal Year 2006-07. In order to help balance future budgets, the 2007-08 Budget establishes \$1.2 billion in flexible reserves.

The 2007-08 Budget includes the following material provisions: (i) a new Foundation Aid formula that bases the amount of School Aid on a district's educational needs and its ability to provide local support for education; (ii) expansion of the STAR program, providing a new benefit targeted to middle class taxpayers; (iii) expanded access to healthcare for the 400,000 children without healthcare coverage in the state; (iv) investment in providing initial funding for stem cell research; and (v) a \$250 million deposit to the State's Debt Reduction Reserve and \$175 million to the new Rainy Day Reserve.

General Fund spending, including transfers to other funds, is projected to total \$53.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-2008, an increase of \$2.1 billion over the Fiscal Year 2006-2007 forecast (4.1%). State Funds spending, which includes both the General Fund and spending from other funds supported by State revenues, is projected to increase by \$6.5 billion (8.4%) and total



\$83.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-2008. All Funds spending is projected to total \$120.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-2008, an increase of \$7.9 billion (7.0%) over Fiscal Year 2006-07.

Receipts Outlook. All Funds receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to reach \$119.5 billion, an increase of \$7.1 billion (6.3%) over Fiscal Year 2006-07. All Funds tax receipts are projected to grow by more than \$3.2 billion. All Funds Federal grants are expected to increase by more than \$1.5 billion (4.4%). All Funds miscellaneous receipts are projected to increase by approximately \$2.3 billion (12.9%). After controlling for the impact of all policy changes, base tax revenue growth is estimated to be 7.8% for Fiscal Year 2007-2008. Total State Funds receipts are projected at \$82.3 billion, an increase of \$5.5 billion (7.2%) from Fiscal Year 2006-2007 receipts. Total General Funds receipts are projected at \$53.7 billion, an increase of \$2.3 billion (4.5%) from Fiscal Year 2006-2007. General Fund tax receipt growth is projected to be 1.5% over Fiscal Year 2006-2007 and General Fund miscellaneous receipts are projected to increase by \$217 million.

*Personal Income Tax.* All Funds income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to increase \$2 billion over the prior fiscal year to total \$36.6 billion. General Fund income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are estimated to remain almost flat at \$22.7 billion.

*User Taxes and Fees.* All Funds user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to be \$13.9 billion, an increase of \$447 million (3.3%) from 2006-07. General Fund user taxes and fees receipts are projected to total \$8.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, an increase of \$317 million (3.9%) from Fiscal Year 2006-07. This increase largely reflects the projected growth in the sales tax base.

*Business Taxes.* All Funds business tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 of more than \$8.4 billion are estimated to decrease by \$169 million (2%) over the prior year. The 2007-08 Budget also reduced taxes by \$154 million, as a result of reductions in the net income tax rate imposed on corporations, banks, and insurance companies from 7.5% to 7.1% and the alternative minimum tax imposed under the corporate franchise tax from 2.5% to 1.5% (effective January 1, 2007). In addition, effective January 31, 2007, the entire net income tax rate imposed on certain manufacturers and qualified emerging technology companies was reduced from 7.5% to 6.5%. General Fund business tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 of \$6.3 billion are estimated to decrease by \$168 million (2.6%) over the prior year.

*Other Taxes.* All Funds other tax receipts in Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to be roughly \$2 billion, down \$61 million (2.9%) from Fiscal Year 2006-07. General Fund receipts for Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to total \$1 billion, a \$45 million decrease over the prior fiscal year.

*Miscellaneous Receipts.* General Fund miscellaneous receipts collections in Fiscal Year 2007-08 are projected to reach approximately \$2.4 billion, up \$176 million from Fiscal Year 2006-07.

Disbursements Outlook. In Fiscal Year 2007-08, General Fund spending, including transfers to other funds, is projected to total \$53.7 billion. State Funds spending, which includes

both the General Fund and spending from other funds supported by assessments, tuition, HCRA resources and other non-Federal revenues, is projected to total \$83.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. All Funds spending is projected to total \$120.7 billion in 2007-08, with spending for local assistance totaling \$83.9 billion.

All Funds State Operations spending, is projected at \$18.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08 and All Funds spending on General State Charges is expected to total \$5.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. All Funds debt service is projected at \$4.3 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. All Funds capital spending of \$6.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2006-07 is projected to increase to \$7.9 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08. All Funds transfers from other funds are expected to total \$21.3 billion and comprise of \$11.9 billion in the General Fund, \$3.7 billion in the Special Revenue Funds, \$5.5 billion in the Debt Service Funds and \$293 million in the Capital Projects Funds. All Funds transfers to other funds are also expected to total \$21.3 billion and comprise \$2.4 billion in the General Fund, \$3.6 billion in the Special Revenue Funds, \$14.4 billion in the Debt Service Funds and \$947 million in the Capital Projects Funds.

The State created a new Rainy Day Reserve in January 2007 that has an authorized balance of 3% of General Fund spending. The 2007-08 Budget authorizes the first deposit of \$175 million. When combined with the existing Tax Stabilization Reserve, the State's Rainy Day Reserve authorization totals 5% of General Fund spending.

2007-08 Financial Plan Update. DOB has revised its revenue and spending estimates based on operating results through the end of Fiscal Year 2007-08, and a review of factors affecting the long-term current services forecast. In addition, DOB has added costs for collective bargaining agreements reached with several of the State's major employee unions that have fiscal implications for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and beyond. These revisions result in net General Fund costs in Fiscal Year 2007-08 of \$137 million, which will be funded by current reserves.

General Fund disbursements, including transfers to other funds, are now expected to total \$53.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, \$81 million lower than prior estimates and \$244 million higher than projected in the 2007-08 Budget. Through December 2007, General Fund receipts, including transfers from other funds, totaled \$35.5 billion, \$103 million lower than prior estimates and \$528 million lower than forecasted in the 2007-08 Budget. Through December 2007, State Operating Funds receipts totaled \$53.1 billion or \$348 million less than projected in the 2007-08 budget. State Operating Funds disbursements totaled \$55.2 billion or \$566 million below than forecasted in the 2007-08 Budget. Through December 2007, All Funds receipts totaled \$80.77 billion or \$2.61 billion less than forecasted in the 2007-08 Budget. All Funds disbursements totaled \$83.05 billion or \$2.75 billion more than forecasted in the 2007-08 Budget.

DOB projects the State will end Fiscal Year 2007-08 with a General Fund balance of \$2.6 billion, consisting of \$1.2 billion in undesignated reserves and \$1.4 billion in designated reserves. The State is projected to move from a balanced General Fund budget in Fiscal Year 2007-08 to an imbalance of \$4.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09. Current services spending is projected to grow by \$5.3 billion over Fiscal Year 2007-08 compared to net revenue growth of

\$1.3 billion. The State currently plans to use \$370 million less in reserves in Fiscal Year 2008-09 than in Fiscal Year 2007-08 to help balance the budget.

#### 2008-09 Executive Budget Financial Plan

The 2008-09 Executive Budget eliminates the entire potential budget imbalance for that fiscal year, responding to the current fiscal uncertainties with a plan that focuses on recurring savings, valued at \$4.8 billion. This plan is sufficient to cut the current services gap of \$4.4 billion and finance new initiatives of just over \$400 million. The 2008-09 Executive Budget does not contain any tax increases. If enacted as proposed, the 2008-09 Executive Budget would cut the budget gap that must be addressed in Fiscal Year 2009-10 by nearly 50% and reduce the combined structural imbalance by nearly \$12 billion through Fiscal Year 2011-12. DOB currently projects that the State will end Fiscal Year 2008-09 with a General Fund balance of \$2.2 billion if the Legislature enacts the 2008-09 Executive Budget as proposed.

The 2008-09 Executive Budget proposes State Operating Funds spending of \$18.8 billion, an increase of \$3.9 billion over Fiscal Year 2007-08. This growth is for local aid to public schools, Medicaid costs, support for transportation, local government programs and debt service. All Funds spending, which comprises the General Fund, Special Revenue Funds, Capital Project Funds and Debt Service Funds, is estimated at \$124.3 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09, an increase of \$6 billion (5.1%) from Fiscal Year 2007-08.

Receipts Outlook. All Funds receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to total \$123.1 billion, an increase of \$6.3 billion over Fiscal Year 2007-08 projection. Of that amount, General Fund receipts are projected to total \$80.4 billion, an increase of \$4.35 billion (5.7%) over Fiscal Year 2007-08 projections. All Funds income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to total \$38.8 billion, an increase of \$2.3 billion from Fiscal Year 2007-08. General Fund income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to increase by \$1.7 billion, to \$24.4 billion, from Fiscal Year 2007-08. All Funds user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are expected to be \$14.2 billion, an increase of \$314 million from Fiscal Year 2008-09. General Fund user taxes and fees receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to total \$8.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09, an increase of \$329 million from the current fiscal year. All Funds business tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to total \$9.7 billion, an increase of \$1.3 billion (15.2%) over the current fiscal year. General Funds business tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2008-09 are projected to total nearly \$7.3 billion, an increase of \$954 million (15%) over Fiscal Year 2007-08.

Disbursements Outlook. All Funds pending, which includes capital spending and Federal aid in addition to State Operating Funds, is projected to total \$124.3 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09. All Funds spending for local assistance is expected to total \$87.4 billion, an increase of \$3.5 billion (4.1%) over the current fiscal year. This amounts includes spending for State aid to medical providers and public health programs, State aid to public schools and universities, temporary and disability assistance, transportation, family services and local governments. All Funds State Operations for Fiscal Year 2008-09 is projected at \$19.4 billion, which finances the costs of government agencies and the legislative and judicial branches of the State government.

All Funds State Operations spending, is projected at \$19.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09. All Funds spending on General State Charges is expected to total \$5.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08, and includes health insurance spending for employees (\$1.7 billion) and retirees (\$1.0 billion), pensions (\$1.2 billion) and social security (\$889 million). All Funds debt service for Fiscal Year 2008-09 is projected at \$4.6 billion, of which \$1.7 billion is paid from the General Fund through transfers and \$2.9 billion from other State funds.

#### General Fund Outyear Projections

The 2007-08 Budget, as revised, projects current service gaps, which formed the starting point for the 2008-09 Executive Budget, of \$6.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, \$7.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and \$9.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2011-12. The recommendations in the 2008-09 Executive Budget would result in a balanced budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09 and reduce projected out-year budget gaps to \$3.3 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, \$5.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and \$6.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2011-12.

Total All Funds receipts in Fiscal Year 2009-10 are projected to reach \$128 billion, an increase of \$5 billion (4.1%) from Fiscal Year 2008-09 estimates. All Funds receipts in Fiscal Year 2010-11 are expected to increase by nearly \$5 billion (4%) over the prior year. In Fiscal Year 2011-12, receipts are expected to increase by more than \$5 billion over Fiscal Year 2010-11. All Funds tax receipts are expected to increase by 6% in Fiscal Year 2009-10, 4.8% in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and 5% in Fiscal Year 2011-12. This growth pattern is consistent with the economic forecasts discussed herein.

General Fund personal income tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2009-10 are projected to increase over Fiscal Year 2008-09 by \$1.5 billion to \$25.9 billion. For Fiscal Year 2010-11, General Fund personal income tax receipts are projected to increase by another \$1.5 billion, to \$27.4 billion and may reach over \$29 billion in Fiscal Year 2011-12. Overall, tax receipts growth in the three fiscal years after Fiscal Year 2008-09 is expected to remain in the range of 4.8% to 6%. Total General Fund receipts are projected to reach nearly \$59 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, over \$61 billion in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and nearly \$65 billion in Fiscal Year 2011-12. Total State Funds receipts are expected to be approximately \$85 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, over \$88 billion in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and nearly \$92 billion in Fiscal Year 2011-12.

DOB forecasts General Fund spending of \$62.1 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, an increase of \$5.3 billion (9.4%) from Fiscal Year 2008-09. Growth in Fiscal Years 2010-11 and 2011-12 is projected at \$5.1 billion and \$4.2 billion, respectively. These levels are based on current service projection, as modified by the 2008-09 Executive Budget. General Fund spending for Medicaid is expected to grow by \$1.5 billion, \$1.1 billion and \$1.3 billion in Fiscal Years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively. State Operating spending is projected to total \$9.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2009-10, an increase of \$373 million (4.2%) over Fiscal Year 2008-09. In Fiscal Years 2010-11 and 2011-12, spending is projected to total \$9.8 billion and \$10 billion, respectively.

#### State Indebtedness

General. Financing activities of the State include general obligation debt and State-guaranteed debt, to which the full faith and credit of the State has been pledged, as well as lease-purchase and contractual-obligation financing, moral obligation and other financing through public authorities and municipalities, where the State's legal obligation to make payments to those public authorities and municipalities for their debt service is subject to annual appropriation by the Legislature. The State has never defaulted on any of its general obligation indebtedness or its obligations under lease-purchase or contractual-obligation financing arrangements and has never been called upon to make any direct payments pursuant to its guarantees.

#### Limitations on State-Supported Debt.

*Debt Reform Act of 2000.* The Debt Reform Act of 2000 (the "Act") is intended to improve the State's borrowing practices, and it applies to all new State-supported debt issued on and after April 1, 2000. It also imposes phased-in caps on new debt outstanding and new debt service costs. The Act also limited the use of debt to capital projects and established a maximum term of 30 years on such debt. The cap on new State-supported debt outstanding began at 0.75% of personal income in Fiscal Year 2000-01, and will gradually increase until it is fully phased-in at 4.0% in Fiscal Year 2010-11. Similarly, the cap on covered debt service costs began at 0.75% of total State funds receipts in Fiscal Year 2000-01, and will gradually increase to 5.0% in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

As of the most recent calculations, the State reported that it was in compliance with both debt caps, with debt issued after March 31, 2000 and then outstanding at 1.73% of personal income and debt service on such debt at 1.07% of total State receipts, compared to the caps of 2.32% each. DOB expects that debt outstanding and debt service costs for Fiscal Year 2006-07 and the entire five-year forecast period through 2010-11 will also be within the statutory caps.

*Variable Rate Obligations and Related Agreements.* State statutory law authorizes issuers of State-supported debt to issue a limited amount of variable rate obligations and, subject to various statutory restrictions, enter into a limited amount of interest rate exchange agreements. State law limits the use of debt instruments which result in a variable rate exposure to no more than 15% of total outstanding State-supported debt, and limits the use of interest rate exchange agreements to a total notional amount of no more than 15% of total State-supported outstanding debt. As of March 31, 2007, State-supported debt in the amount of \$42.7 billion was outstanding, resulting in a variable rate exposure cap and interest rate exchange agreement cap of approximately \$8.5 billion each. As of March 31, 2007, both amounts are less than the statutorily cap of 20%, and are projected to be below the caps for the entire forecast period through Fiscal Year 2011-12.

As of March 31, 2007, the State had approximately \$2.0 billion of outstanding variable rate instruments, or 4.6% of total debt outstanding, that are subject to the net variable rate exposure cap. That amount includes \$1.7 billion of unhedged variable rate obligations and \$224 million of synthetic variable rate obligations. In addition to these variable rate obligations, as of March 31, 2007, about \$2.4 billion in State-supported convertible rate bonds are currently outstanding.

State-Supported Debt. The State's debt affordability measures compare favorably to the forecasts contained in the State's Capital Program and Financing Plan. Issuances of State-supported debt obligations have been generally consistent with the expected sale schedule for the current year, with marginal revisions reflecting certain economic development bonding that occurred earlier in the year than originally anticipated. During the prior ten years, State-supported long-term debt service increased on an average annual basis by 3% to \$3.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2005-06, growing at a slower rate than total receipts (6.1% increase on an annual basis).

*General Obligation Bond Programs.* General obligation debt is currently authorized by the State for transportation, environment and housing purposes. The amount of general obligation bonds issued in Fiscal Year 2005-06 (excluding refunding bonds) was \$159 million, and as of March 31, 2006, the total amount of general obligation debt outstanding was \$3.5 billion. The amount of general obligation bonds issued in Fiscal Year 2006-07 (excluding refunding bonds) was \$180 million, and as of March 31, 2007, the total amount of general obligation debt outstanding was \$3.3 billion. Transportation-related bonds are issued for State highway and bridge improvements, aviation, highway and mass transportation projects and purposes, and rapid transport, rail, canal, port and waterway programs and projects. Environmental bonds are issued to fund environmentally sensitive land acquisitions, air and water quality improvements, municipal non-hazardous waste landfill closures and hazardous waste site cleanup projects. The 2006-07 Budget projected that approximately \$236 million in general obligation bonds will be issued in Fiscal Year 2006-07.

*Lease-Purchase and Contractual-Obligation Financing Programs.* Lease-purchase and contractual-obligation financing arrangements with public authorities and municipalities has been used primarily by the State to finance the State's bridge and highway programs, SUNY and CUNY buildings, health and mental hygiene facilities, prison construction and rehabilitation and various other State capital projects. As of March 31, 2007, approximately \$8.4 billion of State Personal Income Tax Revenue Bonds were outstanding. It is currently estimated that \$4.9 billion of State Personal Income Tax Revenue Bonds, \$102 million of SUNY Dormitory Facilities Revenue Bonds, \$373 million of Mental Health Facilities Improvement Revenue Bonds will be issued in Fiscal Year 2007-08. The 2007-08 Budget also reflects the planned issuance of \$703 million of Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund Bonds.

*Debt Servicing.* The Debt Reduction Reserve Fund (the "DRRF") was created in 1998 to set aside resources that could be used to reduce State-supported indebtedness either through the use of the DRRF as a pay-as-you-go financing source, reduce debt service costs or defease outstanding debt. Since Fiscal Year 1998-99, over \$1.1 billion has been deposited in the DRRF. All Funds debt service is projected at \$4.6 billion in 2008-09, of which \$1.7 billion is paid from the General Fund through transfers and \$2.9 billion from other State funds. Debt service is paid on revenue credits supported by dedicated taxes and fees and patient income, including Personal Income Tax Revenue bonds, Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund bonds and Mental Health facilities bonds, as well as service contract bonds that are secured mainly by the General Fund.

2006-07 State Supported Borrowing Plan. On January 17, 2006, the proposed Fiscal Year 2006-07 through 2010-11 Capital Program and Financing Plan was released . The final Plan was released on May 26, 2006, reflecting final action on the 2006-07 Budget, and projected new issuance of \$236 million in general obligation bonds in Fiscal Year 2006-07. In Fiscal Year 2007-08, the State's borrowing plan projects new issuance of \$358 million in general obligation bonds.

### Litigation

General. The legal proceedings listed below involve State finances and programs and miscellaneous civil rights, real property, contract and other tort claims in which the State is a defendant and the potential monetary claims against the State are deemed to be material, generally in excess of \$100 million. These proceedings could adversely affect the State's finances in the current fiscal year or thereafter.

Adverse developments in the proceedings could affect the ability of the State to maintain a balanced budget. The State believes that any budget will include sufficient reserves to offset the costs associated with the payment of judgments that may be required during the current fiscal year. There can be no assurance, however, that adverse decisions in legal proceedings against the State would not exceed the amount of all potential budget resources available for the payment of judgments.

Real Property Claims. In *Oneida Indian Nation of New York, et al. v. State of New York*, the alleged successors-in-interest to the historic Oneida Indian Nation seek a declaration that they hold a current possessory interest in approximately 250,000 acres of land that the tribe sold to the State in a series of transactions between 1795 and 1846, and ejectment of the State and surrounding counties from all publicly-held lands in the claim area. This case was dormant while the plaintiffs pursuant an earlier action which ended in an unsuccessful effort at a settlement. In 1998, the U.S. intervened in the case, and in December 1998 both the U.S. and the tribal plaintiffs moved for leave to amend their complaints to assert claims for 250,000 acres, including both monetary damages and ejectment, to add the State as a defendant and to seek class certification for all individuals who currently purport to hold title within the disputed land area. On September 25, 2000, the court granted the motions to amend the complaints to add the State as a defendant and to assert monetary damages, but denied the motions to seek class certification and the remedy of ejectment. On March 29, 2002, the court granted, in part, plaintiffs' motion to strike the State's defenses and counterclaims as to liability, but such defenses may still be asserted with respect to monetary damages. The court also denied the State's motion to dismiss for failure to join indispensable parties.

Further efforts at settlement of this action failed to reach a successful outcome. While such discussions were underway, two significant decisions were rendered by the Supreme Court and the Second Circuit Court of Appeals which changed the legal landscape pertaining to ancient land claims: *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York* and *Cayuga Indian Nation of New York v. Pataki*. Taken together, these cases have made clear that the equitable doctrines of laches, acquiescence, and impossibility can bar ancient land claims. These decisions prompted the District Court to reassess its 2002 decision, which in part had struck such defenses, and to

permit the filing of a motion for summary judgment predicated on the *Sherrill and Cayuga* holdings. On August 11, 2006, the defendants moved for summary judgment dismissing the action, based on the defenses of laches, acquiescence, and impossibility. By order dated May 21, 2007, the District Court dismissed plaintiffs' claims to the extent that they asserted a possessory interest, but permitted plaintiffs to pursue a claim seeking the difference between the amount paid and the fair market value of the lands at the time of the transaction. The District Court certified the May 21, 2007 order for interlocutory appeal and, on July 13, 2007, the Second Circuit granted motions by both sides seeking leave to pursue interlocutory appeals of that order.

Other Indian land claims include *Cayuga Indian Nation of New York v. Cuomo, et al.* and *Canadian St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians, et al., v. State of New York, et al.*, both in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, and *The Onondaga Nation v. State of New York, et al.*

In the *Canadian St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians* case, plaintiffs seek ejectment and monetary damages with respect to their claim that approximately 15,000 acres in Franklin and St. Lawrence counties were illegally transferred from their predecessors-in-interest. On July 28, 2003, the court granted, in most respects, the plaintiffs' motion to strike defenses and dismiss counterclaims. On October 20, 2003, the court denied the State's motion for a reconsideration of the July 28<sup>th</sup> decision regarding the State's counterclaims for contribution. On November 29, 2004, the plaintiff tribes, with one exception, approved a settlement with the State. On February 10, 2006, the district court stayed all proceedings and legislation until 45 days after the U.S. Supreme Court issued a final decision in the *Cayuga Indian Nation of New York* case. On November 6, 2006, after certiorari was denied in *Cayuga*, the defendants moved for judgment on the pleadings.

In the *Cayuga Indian Nation of New York* case, plaintiffs seek monetary damages for their claim that approximately 64,000 acres in Seneca and Cayuga Counties were illegally purchased by the State in 1795. Prior to trial, the court held that plaintiffs were not entitled to seek the remedy of ejectment. In October 1999, the District Court granted the federal government's motion to have the State held liable for any damages owed to the plaintiffs. In February 2000, at the conclusion of the damages phase of the trial of this case, a jury verdict of \$35 million in damages plus \$1.9 million representing the fair rental value of the tract at issue was rendered against the defendants. By decision and judgment dated October 2, 2001, the District Court also granted plaintiffs \$211 million in prejudgment interest. The State has appealed from the judgment to the United States Court of Appeals. On October 1, 2004, the State filed an action in Federal district court seeking contribution from the Federal government towards the \$248 million in judgment and post-judgment interest. On June 28, 2005, the Second Circuit held that plaintiffs' possessory land claim was barred, reversed the judgment of the District Court and entered judgment for the State. On September 8, 2005 the Second Circuit denied plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and *en banc* review. On February 3, 2006, the United States and the tribal plaintiffs filed petitions for a writ of certiorari. On May 15, 2006, the Supreme Court denied plaintiffs' petitions for certiorari. This case is now concluded.



Settlements were signed by the Governor with the Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma on November 12, 2004, and with the Cayuga Tribe of New York on November 17, 2004, which in part require enactment of certain State and Federal legislation by September 1, 2005, unless the parties agree to an extension of time. No legislation was enacted by September 1, 2005 and no extension of time was agreed upon.

In *The Onondaga Nation v. State of New York, et al.*, plaintiff seeks a judgment declaring that certain lands within the State are the property of the Onodaga Nation and the Haudenosaunee, and that conveyances of that land pursuant to treaties during the period from 1788-1822 are null and void. The District Court has granted defendants permission to move to dismiss the complaints or for summary judgment on the issue of laches. On August 15, 2006, the defendants moved for an order dismissing this action, based on the issue of laches.

Medicaid. Numerous cases challenge provisions of State law which alter the nursing home Medicaid reimbursement methodology on and after April 1, 1995. Included are *New York State Health Facilities Association, et al., v. DeBuono, et al.*, *St. Luke's Nursing Center, et al. v. DeBuono, et al.*, *New York Association of Homes and Services for the Aging v. DeBuono, et al.* (six cases), and *Matter of Nazareth Home of the Franciscan Sisters, et al. v. Novello*. Plaintiffs allege that the changes in methodology have been adopted in violation of procedural and substantive requirements of State and Federal law.

In *New York Association of Homes and Services for the Aging v. DeBuono, et al.*, the U.S. District Court dismissed plaintiff's complaint on May 19, 2004. On April 6, 2006, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the order of the District Court. Several related cases involving the same parties and issues have been held in abeyance pending the result of the litigation in Federal court.

In *Matter of Nazareth Home of the Franciscan Sisters, et al. v. Novello*, the trial court dismissed the plaintiffs' petition on December 22, 2004. On September 30, 2005, the trial court's decision was upheld, and on December 22, 2005, petitioners' motion for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals was granted. On October 24, 2006, the Court of Appeals affirmed the order of the Appellate Division dismissing the petition.

Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement. In *Freedom Holdings Inc. et al. v. Spitzer et ano.*, two cigarette importers brought an action in 2002 challenging portions of laws enacted by the State under the MSA that New York and many other states entered into with major tobacco manufacturers. The action alleged violations of the Commerce Clause, anti-trust violations and equal protection violations relating to the selective enforcement of State law on Native American reservations. The trial court granted the State's motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. Plaintiffs appealed, and on January 6, 2004 the appellate court affirmed the dismissal of the Commerce Clause claim, reversed the dismissal of the anti-trust claim, and remanded the selective enforcement claim to the trial court for further proceedings. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint challenging the validity of the MSA itself and seeking preliminary injunctive relief. On September 14, 2004, the district court denied the plaintiffs' motion, except the portion that prevented the tobacco manufacturers from obtaining certain funds from escrow. Plaintiffs have appealed the court's order. In May 2005, the Second Circuit affirmed the denial of the

preliminary injunction. In December 2006, the motions and cross-motions of the parties for summary judgment were fully submitted to the district court.

West Valley Litigation. In *State of New York et al v. The United States of America et al.*, the State and the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority have filed suit seeking declarations that (i) defendants are liable under CERCLA for the State's response costs and for damages to the State's natural resources resulting from pollution releases from the West Valley site and a judgment reimbursing the State for these costs and damages, (ii) defendants' are responsible to decontaminate and decommission the site and for future site monitoring and maintenance, and (3) defendants are responsible for paying the fees for disposal of solidified high level radioactive waste at the site. The parties have agreed to stay the litigation and submit the issues to non-binding arbitration and early neutral evaluation. The parties are currently engaged in mediation.