

#### **CITY OF SAN ANTONIO** INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM FINANCE DEPARTMENT

TO:

Mayor and City Council

FROM:

Milo Nitschke, Director, Finance Department

THROUGH: Terry M. Brechtel, City Manager

COPIES:

Melissa Byrne Vossmer, Assistant City Manager; City Attorney's Office; City

Clerk; File

**SUBJECT:** 

Approving the Issuance, Sale and Delivery of City of San Antonio, Texas General

Improvement Refunding Bonds, Series 2003-A

DATE:

June 19, 2003

#### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Ordinance authorizes the issuance of approximately \$57,865,000 "City of San Antonio, Texas General Improvement Refunding Bonds, Series 2003-A"; levies a continuing direct annual ad valorem tax for the payment of the bonds; prescribes the form, terms, conditions, and resolves other matters incident and related to the issuance, sale and delivery of the bonds, including the approval and distribution of an official statement pertaining thereto; authorizes the execution of a paying agent/registrar agreement, escrow agreement and a purchase contract; complies with the requirements imposed by the letter of representations previously executed with the Depository Trust Company; and provides for an immediate effective date upon passage by eight affirmative votes.

Staff recommends approval of this Ordinance.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

On June 5, 2003, City Council approved the form, content and distribution of a Preliminary Official Statement pertaining to the issuance, sale and delivery of approximately \$57,865,000 City of San Antonio, Texas General Improvement Refunding Bonds, Series 2003-A (the "2003-A Refunding Bonds"). The 2003-A Refunding Bonds are being issued to refund approximately \$57,935,000 General Improvement Bonds and Certificates of Obligation issued in 1996. A recent analysis shows that this refunding generates \$4,331,030 in gross savings and \$2,834,287 or 4.89% in present value savings.

In connection with the issuance and sale of the bonds, offering documents were submitted to Moody's, Standard & Poor's and Fitch the week of June 2, 2003. The ratings are anticipated to be received on June 13, 2003.

It is anticipated that the 2003-A Refunding Bonds will be sold the week of June 16, 2003 by an underwriting syndicate including Ramirez & Co., Inc. as Senior Book Running Manager; UBS Painewebber, Inc. as Co-Senior Manager; and A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc., Southwestern Capital Markets, Inc. and Southwest Securities as Co-Managers.

The final results of the pricing and sale will be detailed in a memorandum which will be provided on Thursday, June 19, 2003.

#### **POLICY ANALYSIS**

The aforementioned transaction is consistent with the Debt Management Plan.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

Any costs pertaining to the proposed bond transaction will be paid from the proceeds derived from the issuance and sale of such obligations. Therefore, there is no impact on the City's Operating Budget.

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS**

The disclosures required by the City's Ethics Ordinance for each of the underwriting firms are attached.

#### **COORDINATION**

This action was coordinated with the City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office, the Departments of Finance, the Office of Management and Budget, the City's Underwriting Syndicate, Co-Financial Advisors and Co-Bond Counsel.

Milo D. Nitschke

Director, Finance Department

Approved:

Melissa Byrne Vossmer

Assistant City Manager

Terry M. Brechtel

City Manager

#### Discretionary Contracts Disclosure\*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2 Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient. State "Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

\* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

#### Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the city in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the code of ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the ide	ntity of any inc	lividual who would b	e a party to the c	discretionary co	ntract; ﴿ [[] [[] [[] [[] [[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [	A Market Street, 1997 A. S.
None						
(A) (I) SEE		•				
(2) the ide	ntity of any bu	siness entity? that w	ould be a party to	o the discretion	ary contract:	Tale Tale Control of St.
		Section 1995	<b>11.</b> 11. 11. 11.		**************************************	n to the state of
and the na	me of:					
	(A) any indivi	dual or business en	ity that would be	a subcontracto	or on the discretio	nary contract:
	Ninna					
	None					
						1957
	(B) any indivi	dual or business en	tity that is known	to be a partner	or a parent or s	ibsidiary business
		individual or busine				
						,
					•	
	l					.*
	None					
(3) the ide	ntity of any lob	obyist or public relati	ons firm employe	ed for purposes	relating to the dis	scretionary contract
		ividual or business e				

(2) A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust,

COSA Form 1050-33-2, Discretionary Contracts, 08/01/01

unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

None

Political Contributions  Any individual or pusinessiently seeking a proposal for a discretionary contractall political past wenty four (24) months made directional and any political candidate for City Council, or to any political facility for any political facility for any political facility for the contraction of t	iscreuouary contract from the city	dred dollars (\$100) or more within
Inerpast wenty-four (24) months made direct candidate for Gily Council, or to any political individual or business entity whose identity by an individual include soutaire mortimited or common law Undirect contributions by an officers, owners, attorneys, or registered of	o, contributions made by institutions made by its of the antility.	viduals spouse, whether statutory to contributions/made through the
To Whom Made: None	Amount:None	Date of Contribution: N/ A
Disclosures in Proposals Any individual or business entity seeking a which, reasonably understood, raise a ques Section Hof, Part B, Improper Economic Be contract.	tion <sup>(3)</sup> as to whether any city offic	ial or employee would violate
		7 <u>1</u>
None		
ixone		
Signature: FRAML SANCATURE PLANS	Title: Company: Sr. Vice President	Date:Setpember 6, 2002

<sup>(3)</sup> For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

City Attorney's Office

## LITIGATION DISCLOSURE

Failure to fully and truthfully disclose the information required by this Litigation Disclosure form may result in the disqualification of your proposal from consideration or termination of the contract, once awarded.

•	any member of your Firm to be assign felony or misdemeanor greater than a 0	ed to this engagement ever been indicted or Class C in the last five (5) years?
Circle One	YES	NO
	ed for the City of San Antonio or any oth	ated (for cause or otherwise) from any work ner Federal, State or Local Government, or
Circle One	YES	NO
	tonio or any other Federal, State or Loc	ed in any litigation with or filed a claim against the cal Government, or Private Entity during the last
Circle One	YES	NO A
If you have ar	swered "YES" to any of the above guest	tions, please indicate the name(s) of the

If you have answered "YES" to any of the above questions, please indicate the name(s) of the person(s), the nature, and the status and/or outcome of the indictment, conviction, termination, claim or litigation, as applicable. Any such information should be provided on a separate page, attached to this form and submitted with your proposal.

## City Attorney's Office

## LITIGATION DISCLOSURE

Failure to fully and truthfully disclose the information required by this Litigation Disclosure form may result in the disqualification of your proposal from consideration or termination of the contract, once awarded.

1.	Have you or any member of convicted of a felony or misder		to this engagement ever been indicted or C in the last five (5) years?
	Circle One	YES	NO
2.			or cause or otherwise) from any work being eral, State or Local Government, or Private
	Circle One	YES	NO
3.			y litigation with or filed a claim against the overnment, or Private Entity during the last
	Circle One	YES	NO -
	person(s), the nature, and the sta	atus and/or outcome of the such information should b	tions, please indicate the name(s) of the indictment, conviction, termination, claim e provided on a separate page, attached to

## CITY OF SAN ANTONIO Discretionary Contracts Disclosure\*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State "Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

\* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

#### Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the city in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the code of ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
N/A
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> that would be a party to the <u>discretionary</u> contract:  UBS PaineWebber Inc.  and the name of:
<ul> <li>(A) any individual or business entity that would be a subcontractor on the discretionary contract;</li> </ul>
N/A N/A
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a partner, or a parent or subsidiary
business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the
UBS Americas
(3) the identity of any lobbyist or public relations firm employed for purposes relating to the discretionary contract being sought by any individual or business entity who would be a
party to the discretionary contract.
As noted in our response to Question 9, Mr. Frank Madla is employed as a consultant by UBS PaineWebber Inc., although he is not specifically assigned to the City of San Antonio team.

COSA Form 1050-33-2, Discretionary Contracts, 08/01/01

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

Any individual or business entity seeking a disconnection with a proposal for a discretional hundred dollars (\$100) or more within the indirectly to any current or former member of any political action committee that contribute business entity whose identity must be discontributions by an individual include, but individual's spouse, whether statutory or coinclude, but are not limited to contributions registered lobbyists of the entity	scretionary contract for ry contract all politic past twenty-four (24 City Council any cares to City Council elessionsed under (1), are not limited to made through the of	om the city must disclose in all contributions totaling one all contributions totaling one all contributions made directly or adidate for City Council, or to ections, by any individual or (2) or (3) above. Indirect contributions made by the treatment contributions by an entity ficers, owners, attorneys, or		
To Whom Made:	Amount:	Date of Contribution:		
To the best of our knowledge, we are not aware of any contributions that must be disclosed.  Disclosures in Proposals  Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract with the city shall disclose any known facts which, reasonably understood, raise a question as to whether any city official or employee would violate Section 1 of Part B, Improper Economic Benefit, by participating in official action relating to the discretionary contract.				
None.				

Signature:

A Fresh Farly

Title: Managing Director

**UBS** PaineWebber

Company:

Inc.

Date: 9/6/2002

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

## City Attorney's Office

#### LITIGATION DISCLOSURE

Failure to fully and truthfully disclose the information required by this Litigation Disclosure form may result in the disqualification of your proposal from consideration or termination of the contract, once awarded.

1.	Have you or any member of your Firm to be assigned to this engagement ever been indicted o convicted of a felony or misdemeanor greater than a Class C in the last five (5) years?			
	Circle One	YES	NO	
2.	Have you or any member of performed for the City of Entity?			
	C: 1.0	NOTE:	NO	
	Circle One	YES	NO	
3.	Have you or any member of City of San Antonio or any ten (10) years?			
	Circle One	YES	NO	en e
	If you have answered "Y	ES" to any of the abov	e questions, please indic	cate the name(s) of the

person(s), the nature, and the status and/or outcome of the indictment, conviction, termination, claim or litigation, as applicable. Any such information should be provided on a separate page, attached to

Please see following page for the detail regarding our response to Question 3.

this form and submitted with your proposal.

#### Question 3:

Like most securities firms, UBS PaineWebber Inc. is and has been a defendant in numerous legal actions relating to its securities and commodities business that allege various violations of federal and state securities laws. Prior to November 3, 2000, UBS PaineWebber Inc. was a wholly owned subsidiary of PaineWebber Group, Inc., a public company listed on the NYSE which regularly reports on Forms 10K and 10Q to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") and the NYSE regarding pending material litigation, including administrative proceedings. These reports are publicly available and include information about UBS PaineWebber matters.

Effective November 3, 2000, UBS PaineWebber Inc. became a wholly owned subsidiary of UBS AG. UBS AG, a Swiss banking corporation, is publicly owned, and its shares are listed on the Zurich, New York and Tokyo stock exchanges. UBS AG files annual reports on Form 20-F with the SEC, and also files quarterly reports and certain other material information with the SEC under cover of Form 6-K. These reports are publicly available. Starting with the Form 20-F for the year ended December 31, 2000, these reports include material information about UBS PaineWebber matters, including information about any material litigation or administrative proceedings. To the best of our knowledge, there are not any matters pending that are likely to adversely impact UBS PaineWebber's ability to provide the services that are contemplated by the Request for Proposal.

The following legal proceedings relating to the investment banking activities of PaineWebber's Municipal Securities Group and involving Federal, State or Local Government or private entity are pending or were closed within the past 10 years:

UBS PaineWebber Inc. was an underwriter of certain bonds issued by the City of Tehachapi, California whose purpose was to finance certain improvements to undeveloped property. The City of Tehachapi brought a foreclosure action against developer, Tiote Construction Development Company ("Tiote"), when it failed to pay its taxes on certain property covered by the bond issue. Tiote asserted cross-claims against UBS PaineWebber for negligent misrepresentation and fraud. On September 25, 1995, the Court granted UBS PaineWebber Inc.'s motion to dismiss the cross-claims of Tiote without leave to amend. Tiote appealed. On February 24, 1999, the appellate court found that Tiote's claims were properly dismissed, but also held that Tiote should have been given an opportunity to amend the cross-complaint to see if it could allege a valid cause of action. Since that time there have been several filings. On December 20, 2000, the Superior Court granted UBS PaineWebber's demurrer to Tiote's Fourth Amended Cross-Complaint, without leave to amend. Tiote filed another appeal on March 5, 2001.

In December 1996, Orange County, California filed an adversary proceeding against a number of Wall Street firms, including UBS PaineWebber Inc. and Paine Webber Real Estate Securities Inc. in the United States Bankruptcy Court in California asserting claims relating to the sale of certain securities to the County. The matter was settled as to UBS PaineWebber on August 4, 2000.

In a related matter, UBS PaineWebber Inc., along with other firms, had been a defendant in a putative class action filed on behalf of purchasers of bonds issued by Orange County and municipal authorities that invested monies in the Orange County Investment Pool. On May 17, 1996, UBS PaineWebber and certain other defendants entered into a Stipulation of Partial Settlement dismissing all claims as to the settling defendants, subject to approval by the California State court. In December 1996, the California State Court entered a final judgment dismissing the Orange County bondholder securities litigation against certain defendants, including UBS PaineWebber, having found the settlement reached by those parties to be fair.

The Clerk of Collier County (FL), purportedly acting on behalf of thousands of municipal issuers, filed a class action suit in 1998 against a number of firms who sold government securities at allegedly inflated prices in connection with advance refunding transactions. Without admitting any liability, the defendant firms, including UBS PaineWebber, settled this matter in May 2001 by agreeing to pay, as a group, a total of approximately \$4.5 million. By Final Judgment Order and Final Judgment dated September 26, 2001, the Court approved the settlement, finding the settlement "fair, just and reasonable as to the Settling Class."

Although not asserted against UBS PaineWebber, the following matter is identified in the interest of full disclosure. On June 6, 2000, UBS PaineWebber Inc. acquired JC Bradford & Co. On November 19, 1996, a case was filed in Los Angeles Superior Court by the Indenture Trustee (purporting to act on behalf of the bondholders) against Bradford and a host of others involved in a December 1992 offering of \$14 million for a project to acquire and renovate a downtown Los Angeles hotel. Bradford served as underwriter in the offering and sold \$10.15 million of the bonds to three Farmers Insurance entities. The project encountered problems and the last interest payments were made in July 1995. The case brought by the Indenture Trustee was dismissed. The three Farmers Insurance entities and a Committee of Bondholders as plaintiffs then filed an action against Bradford and others based primarily on four alleged misrepresentations in the Official Statement. Without admitting liability, Bradford settled this case in December 2001.

A qui tam claim against UBS PaineWebber and others was filed under the state's Whistleblower statute in 1999 under seal. That action was recently unsealed by the court after the State of Illinois declined to participate in the action. The claim alleges that the firm engaged in yield-burning in a 1992 refunding transaction with the State of Illinois. The complaint was served on the firm on April 25, 2002. On June 12, 2002, the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, issued a Memorandum and Order dismissing plaintiffs' claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

On June 6, 2000, UBS PaineWebber Inc. acquired JC Bradford & Co. On January 4, 2001 a case was filed in the Thirteenth Judicial District Court of Sandoval County, New Mexico by the Board of County Commissioners of Sandoval County, New Mexico and the Sandoval County Treasurer against broker Royce Simpson and UBS PaineWebber Inc. as successor to J.C. Bradford and Co. The broker Simpson was served on January 17, 2001; but UBS PaineWebber Inc has not yet been served. The case alleges violations of Section 10(b) of the 1934 Act, of state securities law and unfair trade practices act, and common law negligent supervision and breach of fiduciary duty in connection with the sale of Treasury "strips" to the County by the broker resulting in unspecified damages. The case was removed to federal court (United States District Court for the District of New Mexico) on February 12, 2001. On September 24, 2001, the parties reached a settlement agreement by which UBS PaineWebber, while denying any and all liability, agreed to make payment to Sandoval County for full release of all claims.

## CITY OF SAN ANTONIO Discretionary Contracts Disclosure\*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State "Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

\* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

#### Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the city in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the code of ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
N/A
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> that would be a party to the discretionary contract:  A.G Edwards & Sons, Inc.  and the name of:
(A) any individual or business entity that would be a subcontractor on the discretionary contract;
A.G. Edwards has no subcontracting relationships with respect to the proposed contract with the exception of ordinary relationships involving other registered securities firms which may act or seek to act, from time to time, as underwriter or financial advisor to the State, which relationships are always known to the issuer on a transaction-by-transaction basis.
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a <i>partner</i> , or a <i>parent</i> or <i>subsidiary</i> business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of A.G. Edwards, Inc.
(3) the identity of any <i>lobbyist</i> or <i>public relations firm</i> employed for purposes relating to the discretionary contract being sought by any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract.
N/A

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city must disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract all political contributions totaling one hundred dollars (\$100) or more within the past twenty-four (24) months made directly or indirectly to any current or former member of City Council, any candidate for City Council, or to any political action committee that contributes to City Council elections, by any individual or business entity whose identity must be disclosed under (1), (2) or (3) above Indirect contributions by an individual include, but are not limited to, contributions made by the individual's spouse whether statutory or common-law. Indirect contributions by an entity include, but are not limited to, contributions made through the officers, owners, attorneys, or registered lobbyists of the entity.

o Whom Made:	Amount:	Date of Contribution:
A.G. Edwards has implemented firmwide		
policies and procedures to ensure compliance		
with Rule G-37 of the Municipal Securities		
Rulemaking Board, as well as other		
applicable laws and rules governing political		
contributions. These procedures include, in		!
part, the requirement that certain restricted		
employees obtain approval before making		
political contributions to any state or local		
candidate or official. In addition, such		
restricted employees must sign quarterly		
certifications which identify specific		
contributions that were given during the		
reporting quarter.		
Based on the information available to the		
firm which was obtained through the		
procedures described above, to the best of		
our knowledge and belief, no direct or		
indirect political contributions have been		<b>.</b>
made by the firm's restricted employees to		÷ .
any member of the City Council. It should		
be noted that the employees who are subject		
to the policy include, among others, all		
registered financial consultants, as well as		2.0
employees of the Firm's Public Finance		
department and persons whose activities		
relate to the firm's municipal securities business. However, the policy does not		m per
business. However, the policy does not apply to all persons who may be officers of		
the firm, nor to all of the firm's owners (A.G.		1 mar.
Edwards is a publicly traded company and it		
undo to a pasticky traded company and it	1	

is neither practicable nor possible to require public shareholders - who are "owners" of the firm - to comply with the firm's internal procedures). To the best of our knowledge and belief, A.G. Edwards has not engaged

the services of any lobbyist with respect to	
the Firm's business in Texas; and none of the	
Firm's employees are registered as lobbyists	
with the State of Texas.	

Disclosures in Proposals

Any Individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract with the city shall disclose any known facts which, reasonably understood, raise a question as to whether any city official or employee would violate Section 1 of Part B, Improper Economic Benefit, by participating in official action relating to the discretionary contract.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, we are aware of no relationship which would result in any improper economic benefit as described in Section 1 of Part B of the San Antonio Ethics Code in connection with the activity contemplated by this proposal. As a major securities firm with over 17,000 employees and over 670 offices in 49 states, it is not feasible for A.G. Edwards to perform a firm-wide sweep that would enable us to make a categorical representation that there are no relationships in which there might be a potential conflict of interest involving the persons and entities involved with this proposed transaction. However, it should be noted that A.G. Edwards is currently engaged in, and has in the past engaged in, routine brokerage and other securities transactions with the City of San Antonio and related entities.

Signature:	Title: Managing Director	Date:
Mulí	Company: A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc.	September 6, 2002

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

## CITY OF SAN ANTONIO City Attorney's Office

## LITIGATION DISCLOSURE

Failure to fully and truthfully disclose the information required by this Litigation Disclosure form may result in the disqualification of your proposal from consideration or termination of the contract, once awarded.

			signed to this engagement a Class C in the last five (5)	
Circle One		YES	NO*	
			ated (for cause or otherwise er Federal, State or Local C	
Circle One		YES**	NO	
3. Have you c City of San ten (10) year	Antonio or any o	your Firm been involve ther Federal, State or I	ed in any litigation with or for a control of the c	iled a claim against the e Entity during the last
Circle One		YES***	NO	
person(s), the or litigation	ne nature, and the	status and/or outcome ny such information s	ve questions, please indica e of the indictment, convict hould be provided on a sep	ion, termination, claim
* To the best financing have last five (5) yes	been indicted or	ge and belief, no A.C convicted of a felony	G. Edwards employees assort or misdemeanor greater that	igned to the proposed in a Class C during the
various reason believe that ar	s during the normal such termination	nal course of busines	Edwards has been engaged s have been terminated. A of any material nature to thing proposed.	A.G. Edwards does not

\*\*\* - Regarding Question 3 above: A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc. is a major underwriter of Public Finance and Corporate securities. In addition, the Firm has an extensive full-service securities business with over 17,000 employees and over 680 offices in 49 states. During the normal course of business over the past three years, A.G. Edwards or its employees are or have been subject to informal inquiries, investigations, disciplinary actions and litigation (collectively referred to as "actions") involving a variety of federal and state governmental entities, regulatory bodies and clients. While some of these actions relate to or have related to the Firm's municipal securities business, management believes that neither any of the actions considered individually, nor all such actions considered together, have had or will have a material adverse affect on the financial condition or operations of the firm, including the ability of A.G. Edwards to fulfill any obligations under this proposal.

Should the City of San Antonio desire additional information, all material legal proceedings are required to be reported by the firm in its periodic corporate filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, which filings are a matter of public record; and the National Association of Securities Dealers sponsors a public disclosure program by which members of the public may request information about arbitrations and enforcement actions affecting the firm.

# CITY OF SAN ANTONIO Discretionary Contracts Disclosure\* For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&: Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient. State "Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

\* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

#### Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the city in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the code of ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract;	
Robert G. Rodriguez, President & CEO	
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> that would be a party to the discretionary cont <u>Southwestern Capital Markets. Inc.</u>	ract:
and the name of:	
(A) any individual or business entity that would be a <i>subcontractor</i> on the discretion contract;	nary
None.	
	-
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a partner, or a parent or subside business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to discretionary contract;	
None.	
(3) the identity of any <i>lobbyist</i> or <i>public relations firm</i> employed for purposes relating to discretionary contract being sought by any individual or business entity who would be party to the discretionary contract.	
None.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A *business entity* means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city must disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract all political contributions totaling one hundred dollars (\$100) or more within the past twenty-four (24) months made directly or indirectly to any current or former member of City Council, any candidate for City Council, or to any political action committee that contributes to City Council elections, by any individual or business entity whose identity must be disclosed under (1), (2) or (3) above. Indirect contributions by an individual include, but are not limited to, contributions made by the individual's spouse, whether statutory or common-law. Indirect contributions by an entity include, but are not limited to, contributions made through the officers, owners, attorneys, or registered lobbyists of the entity.

To Whom Made:	Amount:	Date of Contribution:
None. MSRB Rule G-37 prohibits any dealer from engaging in municipal securities business with an issuer within 2 years any contribution to an official of such issuer.		

#### Disclosures in Proposals

Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract with the city shall disclose any known facts which, reasonably understood, raise a question<sup>2</sup> as to whether any city official or employee would violate Section 1 of Part B, Improper Economic Benefit, by participating in official action relating to the discretionary contract.

Signature:	Title: President & CEO Company: Southwestern Capital Markets, Inc.	Date: September 4, 2002	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

## CITY OF SAN ANTONIO Discretionary Contracts Disclosure\*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State "Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

\* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

#### Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the city in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the code of ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:
(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
NA
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> <sup>2</sup> that would be a party to the discretionary contract:
and the name of:
(A) any individual or business entity that would be a <i>subcontractor</i> on the discretionary contract;
W/a
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a <i>partner</i> , or a <i>parent</i> or <i>subsidiary</i> business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
÷.
W/A
(3) the identity of any <i>lobbyist</i> or <i>public relations firm</i> employed for purposes relating to the discretionary contract being sought by any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract.
WX -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city must disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract all political contributions totaling one hundred dollars (\$100) or more within the past twenty-four (24) months made directly or indirectly to any current or former member of City Council, any candidate for City Council, or to any political action committee that contributes to City Council elections, by any individual or business entity whose identity must be disclosed under (1), (2) or (3) above. Indirect contributions by an individual include, but are not limited to, contributions made by the individual's spouse, whether statutory or common-law. Indirect contributions by an entity include, but are not limited to, contributions made through the officers, owners, attorneys, or registered lobbyists of the entity.

To Whom Made:	Amount:	Date of Contribution:	
NA		and the second of the second o	

#### Disclosures in Proposals

Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract with the city shall disclose any known facts which, reasonably understood, raise a question<sup>3</sup> as to whether any city official or employee would violate Section 1 of Part B, Improper Economic Benefit, by participating in official action relating to the discretionary contract.

		4. 4
y + y + 1 **		
Signature:	Title: $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . $\mathcal{V}$ . $\mathcal{P}$ .	Date:
More Mg	Company: SWS Securities	9/5/02

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

# CITY OF SAN ANTONIO City Attorney's Office

## LITIGATION DISCLOSURE

Failure to fully and truthfully disclose the information required by this Litigation Disclosure form may result in the disqualification of your proposal from consideration or termination of the contract, once awarded.

	,			
1.	Have you or any member of convicted of a felony or misder			
	Circle One	YES	NO	
2.	Have you or any member of you performed for the City of San Entity?			
	Circle One	YES	NO	
3.	Have you or any member of yo City of San Antonio or any oth ten (10) years?			
	Circle One	YES	NO	Age of the state o

If you have answered "YES" to any of the above questions, please indicate the name(s) of the person(s), the nature, and the status and/or outcome of the indictment, conviction, termination, claim or litigation, as applicable. Any such information should be provided on a separate page, attached to this form and submitted with your proposal.