

NEW ISSUE – BOOK ENTRY ONLY

Moody's: Aaa
Standard & Poor's: AAA
Fitch: AAA
(See "RATINGS" herein.)

Interest on the 2011A Bonds is includible in gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes. Subject to compliance by the District with certain covenants, in the opinion of Co-Bond Counsel, under present law, interest on the 2011B Bonds and the 2011C Bonds is excludable from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes and is not included as an item of tax preference in computing the federal alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations, but such interest is taken into account in computing an adjustment used in determining the federal alternative minimum tax for certain corporations. Interest on the Bonds is not exempt from present State of Illinois income taxes. See "TAX MATTERS" herein for a more complete discussion.



\$400,000,000
**METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT OF
GREATER CHICAGO**
CONSISTING OF
\$30,000,000
**TAXABLE GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES A OF JULY, 2011**
\$270,000,000
**GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES B OF JULY, 2011**
\$100,000,000
**GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
UNLIMITED TAX SERIES C OF JULY, 2011**

Dated: Date of Delivery

Due: December 1, as shown on the inside cover

The Taxable General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series A of July, 2011 (the "2011A Bonds"), the General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series B of July, 2011 (the "2011B Bonds" and, together with the 2011A Bonds, the "Limited Tax Bonds"), and the General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Unlimited Tax Series C of July, 2011 (the "2011C Bonds" or, the "Unlimited Tax Bonds" and, together with the Limited Tax Bonds, the "Bonds") will be issued only as fully registered bonds and, when issued, will be registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC"). See "APPENDIX F – BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM" herein. Individual purchases will be made in book-entry form only through the facilities of DTC. The Bonds are issuable in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple of \$5,000. Purchasers will not receive physical delivery of bond certificates. Principal and interest are payable by The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, N.A., Chicago, Illinois, as the initial Bond Registrar and Paying Agent, to DTC, which will remit such principal and interest to DTC's Participants for payment to the Beneficial Owners of the Bonds, as described herein. Interest on the Bonds will be payable on June 1, 2012 and semiannually thereafter on each June 1 and December 1. **The 2011B and the 2011C Bonds are subject to optional redemption prior to maturity as described herein.** The 2011A Bonds are not subject to redemption prior to maturity.

Maturities, Principal Amounts, Interest Rates, Yields and CUSIP Numbers are set forth on the inside cover page.

The Bonds are direct and general obligations of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, Cook County, Illinois (the "District") for the payment of which the full faith and credit of the District have been pledged. The Limited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the District without limitation as to rate, but the amount of said taxes that may be extended to pay the Limited Tax Bonds is, however, limited as provided by law. The Unlimited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the District without limitation as to rate or amount. The rights of the owners of the Bonds and the enforceability of the Bonds may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS" herein.

The Bonds are offered when, as and if issued by the District, and accepted by the Underwriters and subject to prior sale, withdrawal or modification of the offer without notice, and to the approval of legality by Chapman and Cutler LLP, Chicago, Illinois and Gonzalez, Saggio and Harlan, L.L.C., Chicago, Illinois, Co-Bond Counsel. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the District by its Acting General Counsel. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the Underwriters by their Co-Underwriters' Counsel, Pugh, Jones, Johnson & Quandt, P.C., Chicago, Illinois, and Greene and Letts, Chicago, Illinois. It is anticipated that the Bonds will be available for delivery to DTC on or about July 27, 2011.

J.P. Morgan
BofA Merrill Lynch
Loop Capital Markets
Siebert Brandford Shank & Co., L.L.C.

Barclays Capital

Citi
Duncan-Williams, Inc.
Ramirez & Co., Inc.
William Blair & Company

Dated: July 21, 2011

MATURITY SCHEDULE

\$30,000,000

**TAXABLE GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES A OF JULY, 2011**

MATURITY (DECEMBER 1)	PRINCIPAL AMOUNT	INTEREST RATE	YIELD	CUSIP ¹
2013	\$ 4,520,000	0.891%	0.891%	167560PN5
2014	15,975,000	1.222	1.222	167560PP0
2015	4,175,000	1.729	1.729	167560PQ8
2016	5,330,000	2.229	2.229	167560PR6

\$270,000,000

**GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES B OF JULY, 2011**

MATURITY (DECEMBER 1)	PRINCIPAL AMOUNT	INTEREST RATE	YIELD	CUSIP ¹
2017	\$ 6,115,000	5.000%	1.88%	167560PS4
2018	26,855,000	5.000	2.30	167560PT2
2019	16,140,000	5.000	2.64	167560PU9
2020	7,335,000	5.000	2.89	167560PV7
2021	4,050,000	3.000	3.06	167560PW5
2021	5,500,000	5.000	3.06	167560QE4
2022	595,000	3.125	3.25	167560PX3
2022	6,985,000	5.000	3.25	167560QF1
2023	18,300,000	5.000	3.43	167560QG9
2024	18,000,000	5.000	3.58	167560PY1
2025	14,500,000	5.000	3.71	167560PZ8
2026	4,775,000	5.000	3.80	167560QA2
2029	10,000,000	5.000	4.07	167560QB0
2030	45,000,000	5.000	4.16	167560QC8
2031	45,850,000	5.000	4.26	167560QD6
2032	40,000,000	5.000	4.36	167560QH7

\$100,000,000

**GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
UNLIMITED TAX SERIES C OF JULY, 2011**

MATURITY (DECEMBER 1)	PRINCIPAL AMOUNT	INTEREST RATE	YIELD	CUSIP ¹
2013	\$16,720,000	3.000%	0.60%	167560QM6
2014	6,200,000	4.000	0.90	167560QN4
2015	16,900,000	5.000	1.20	167560QP9
2016	9,850,000	5.000	1.51	167560QQ7
2017	4,955,000	4.000	1.88	167560QR5
2018	1,640,000	3.000	2.30	167560QS3
2019	1,885,000	4.000	2.64	167560QT1
2020	350,000	3.000	2.89	167560QU8
2029	10,000,000	5.000	4.07	167560QJ3
2030	10,000,000	5.000	4.16	167560QK0
2031	865,000	4.125	4.26	167560QL8
2031	20,635,000	5.000	4.26	167560QV6

¹ Copyright 2011, American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, managed on behalf of the American Bankers Association by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC, a subsidiary of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. The CUSIP numbers listed above are being provided solely for the convenience of bondholders only at the time of issuance of the Bonds and the District does not make any representation with respect to such numbers or undertake any responsibility for their accuracy now or at any time in the future. The CUSIP number for a specific maturity is subject to being changed after the issuance of the Bonds as a result of various subsequent actions including, but not limited to, a refunding in whole or in part of such maturity or as a result of the procurement of secondary market portfolio insurance or other similar enhancement by investors that is applicable to all or a portion of certain maturities of the Bonds.

METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Honorable Terrence J. O'Brien, President
Honorable, Barbara J. McGowan, Vice President
Honorable Cynthia M. Santos, Chairman, Committee on Finance
Honorable Michael A. Alvarez
Honorable Frank Avila
Honorable Patricia Horton
Honorable Kathleen Therese Meany
Honorable Debra Shore
Honorable Mariyana T. Spyropoulos

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

David St. Pierre, Executive Director
Mary Ann Boyle, Treasurer
Ronald M. Hill, Acting General Counsel
Denice E. Korcal, Director of Human Resources
Manju Prakash Sharma, Director of Maintenance and Operations
Thomas Granato, Ph. D., Acting Director of Monitoring and Research
Darlene A. LoCascio, Director of Procurement and Materials Management
Keith D. Smith, Director of Information Technology
Kenneth A. Kits, Director of Engineering
Jacqueline Torres, Clerk/Director of Finance

CO-BOND COUNSEL

Chapman and Cutler LLP
Chicago, Illinois

Gonzalez, Saggio and Harlan, L.L.C.
Chicago, Illinois

CO-FINANCIAL ADVISORS

Public Financial Management, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Public Finance Advisors LLC
Chicago, Illinois

No dealer, broker, salesman or other person has been authorized to give any information or to make any representations other than those contained in this Official Statement, and, if given or made, such other information or representations may not be relied upon as statements of the District or the Underwriters. This Official Statement does not constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of any offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of the Bonds by any person in any jurisdiction in which it is unlawful to make such offer, solicitation or sale.

Unless otherwise indicated, the District is the source of all tables and statistical and financial information contained in this Official Statement. The information set forth herein relating to governmental bodies other than the District has been obtained from such governmental bodies or from other sources believed to be reliable, but is not guaranteed as to accuracy or completeness. The information and opinions expressed herein are subject to change without notice, and neither the delivery of this Official Statement nor any sale made hereunder shall, under any circumstances, create any implication that there has been no change in the financial condition or operations of the District since the date hereof.

The Underwriters have reviewed the information in this Official Statement in accordance with, and as part of, their responsibilities to investors under the federal securities laws as applied to the facts and circumstances of this transaction, but the Underwriters do not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of such information.

This Official Statement should be considered in its entirety and no one factor should be considered less important than any other by reason of its position in this Official Statement. Where statutes, ordinances, reports or other documents are referred to herein, reference should be made to such statutes, ordinances, reports or other documents for more complete information regarding the rights and obligations of parties thereto, facts and opinions contained therein and the subject matter thereof.

Any statements made in this Official Statement, including the Appendices, involving matters of opinion or estimates, whether or not so expressly stated, are set forth as such and not as representations of fact, and no representation is made that any of such estimates will be realized. This Official Statement contains certain forward-looking statements and information that are based on the District's beliefs as well as assumptions made by and information currently available to the District. Such statements are subject to certain risks, uncertainties and assumptions. Should one or more of these risks or uncertainties materialize, or should underlying assumptions prove incorrect, actual results may vary materially from those anticipated, estimated or expected.

Upon issuance, the Bonds will not be registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and will not be listed on any stock or other securities exchange, and neither the Securities and Exchange Commission nor any other federal, state, municipal or other governmental entity (other than the District) shall have passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of this Official Statement. Any representation to the contrary may be a criminal offense.

The tax advice contained in this Official Statement is not intended or written by the District, its Co-Bond Counsel, or any other tax practitioner to be used, and it cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer. The tax advice contained in this Official Statement was written to support the promotion or marketing of the Bonds. Each taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

In connection with this offering, the Underwriters may over-allot or effect transactions which stabilize or maintain the market price of the Bonds at a level which might not otherwise prevail in the open market. Such stabilizing, if begun, may be discontinued, and also may be recommenced at any time, in each case without notice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROJECT	2
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS.....	3
THE BONDS.....	3
General Description	3
Registration and Transfer.....	3
Optional Redemption.....	4
Mandatory Redemption	4
Selection of Bonds within a Maturity	4
Redemption Procedure and Notice of Redemption	4
SECURITY FOR THE BONDS.....	6
ADDITIONAL FINANCING.....	7
Long-Term Capital Needs.....	7
IEPA Projects.....	8
METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO.....	8
The District	8
Services	9
Organization.....	11
Administration	11
RECENT FINANCIAL INFORMATION	15
GENERAL CORPORATE FUND BALANCE.....	17
DEBT INFORMATION	18
Direct Debt.....	18
Estimated Overlapping Bonded Debt	18
Selected Debt Ratios	18
District’s Debt Service Extension Base Capacity	23
Capital Lease.....	24
Debt Limits and Borrowing Authority.....	24
CASH MANAGEMENT	26
Corporate Working Cash Fund	26
Debt Service Funds	27
Investment of District Funds.....	27
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS - ACCOUNTING POLICIES	28
RETIREMENT FUND	29
General.....	29
Determination of Employer Contributions	31
Actuarial Methods.....	33
Actuarial Assumptions.....	34
Funded Status of the Retirement Fund.....	35
Recent Legislative Changes	40
Projection of Funded Status	41
Source of Information	43

OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	43
BUDGETARY PROCEDURES.....	44
Budgetary Process.....	44
Comparative Budget Information	45
OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS	46
Principal Units	46
Other Major Governmental Units	46
Certain Other Public Bodies	47
Interrelationships.....	48
REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES	48
Real Property Assessment.....	48
Equalization	50
Exemptions	51
Tax Levy	53
Property Tax Extension Limitation Law and Debt Reform Act.....	53
Extensions	54
Collections	55
Truth in Taxation Law	56
TAXATION OF PROPERTY WITHIN DISTRICT—STATISTICAL INFORMATION.....	57
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	61
RATINGS	61
FINANCIAL ADVISORS.....	61
TAX MATTERS	62
2011A Bonds	62
2011B Bonds and 2011C Bonds.....	62
State and Local Considerations.....	65
UNDERWRITING	65
ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS	66
Environmental Remediation	66
Effluent Disinfection.....	67
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	68
LITIGATION.....	70
CONTINUING DISCLOSURE	71
Recent Disclosure	71
THE UNDERTAKING	72
Annual Financial Information Disclosure.....	72
Reportable Events Disclosure	73
Consequences of Failure of the District to Provide Information	73
Amendment; Waiver.....	74
Termination of Undertaking	74
Additional Information	74
Dissemination of Information; Dissemination Agent.....	75
CERTAIN LEGAL MATTERS	75
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - APPENDICES	75
AUTHORIZATION.....	76

APPENDIX A	—	Basic Financial Statements
APPENDIX B	—	Capital Improvements Program
APPENDIX C	—	Report of the Consulting Actuary on the District Retirement Fund
APPENDIX D	—	Demographic and Economic Information
APPENDIX E	—	Forms of Opinions of Co-Bond Counsel
APPENDIX F	—	Book-Entry System

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

\$400,000,000
METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT
OF GREATER CHICAGO

CONSISTING OF
\$30,000,000
TAXABLE GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES A OF JULY, 2011

\$270,000,000
GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
LIMITED TAX SERIES B OF JULY, 2011

\$100,000,000
GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
UNLIMITED TAX SERIES C OF JULY, 2011

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Official Statement, including the cover page and the Appendices, is to set forth certain information in conjunction with the sale by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (the "*District*") of \$30,000,000 principal amount of its Taxable General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series A of July, 2011 (the "*2011A Bonds*"), \$270,000,000 principal amount of its General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series B of July, 2011 (the "*2011B Bonds*" and, together with the 2011A Bonds, the "*Limited Tax Bonds*"), and \$100,000,000 principal amount of its General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Unlimited Tax Series C of July, 2011 (the "*2011C Bonds*" or, the "*Unlimited Tax Bonds*" and, together with the Limited Tax Bonds, the "*Bonds*"). Factors that may affect an investment decision concerning the Bonds are described throughout this Official Statement. Persons considering a purchase of any of the Bonds should read the Official Statement in its entirety.

The Bonds are authorized and issued under and pursuant to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act, as amended (70 ILCS 2605) (the "*Act*"), the Local Government Debt Reform Act of the State of Illinois, as amended (30 ILCS 350) (the "*Debt Reform Act*"), and two bond ordinances each adopted by the Board of Commissioners (the "*Board*") of the District on June 2, 2011, as supplemented by a Bond Order (together, the "*Bond Ordinances*").

The Bonds are direct and general obligations of the District, whose full faith and credit have been pledged for the punctual payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds. The Limited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the District, without limitation as to rate, but limited as to amount by the provisions of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law, as amended (35 ILCS 200/18-185 to 200/18-245) (the

“*Limitation Law*”). The Unlimited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the District without limitation as to rate or amount.

The Limited Tax Bonds are issued to finance construction projects identified in the District’s Capital Improvements Program and to pay the costs of issuance of the Limited Tax Bonds. The Unlimited Tax Bonds are issued to finance construction projects initiated before October 1, 1991, including projects included in the District’s Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (“*TARP*”) and to pay costs of issuance of the Unlimited Tax Bonds. For additional information concerning the District’s construction plan, see “THE PROJECT” and “APPENDIX B—CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.”

This Official Statement contains summaries of the terms of the Bonds, together with descriptions of the District and other pertinent information. All references to agreements and documents are qualified in their entirety by references to the agreements and documents. Any statements or information indicated to involve matters of opinion or estimates are represented as opinions or estimates in good faith, but no assurance can be given that the facts will materialize as so opined or estimated.

THE PROJECT

The project financed by the Bonds involves the replacing, remodeling, completing, altering, constructing and enlarging of sewage treatment works, water quality improvement projects or flood control facilities, and additions therefor, including, but not limited to, the construction of pumping stations, tunnels, conduits, intercepting sewers and outlet sewers, together with the equipment, including air pollution equipment, and appurtenances thereto, to acquire property, real, personal or mixed, necessary for said purposes, and for costs and expenses for the acquisition of the sites and rights-of-way necessary thereto, and for engineering expenses for designing and supervising the construction of such works and other related and incidental expenses (collectively, the “*Project*”). For additional information concerning the District’s construction plan, see “APPENDIX B—CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.”

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

The estimated sources and uses of funds are summarized as follows:

	<u>2011A BONDS</u>	<u>2011B BONDS</u>	<u>2011C BONDS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>SOURCES OF FUNDS</u>				
Principal Amount of Bonds ...	\$30,000,000.00	\$270,000,000.00	\$100,000,000.00	\$400,000,000.00
Net original issue premium ...	-0-	27,686,555.60	9,657,071.10	37,343,626.70
Total Sources of Funds...	<u>\$30,000,000.00</u>	<u>\$297,686,555.60</u>	<u>\$109,657,071.10</u>	<u>\$437,343,626.70</u>
<u>USES OF FUNDS</u>				
Project Costs.....	\$29,845,000.00	\$296,175,000.00	\$109,118,000.00	\$435,138,000.00
Costs of Issuance ⁽¹⁾	155,000.00	1,511,555.60	539,071.10	2,205,626.70
Total Uses of Funds.....	<u>\$30,000,000.00</u>	<u>\$297,686,555.60</u>	<u>\$109,657,071.10</u>	<u>\$437,343,626.70</u>

⁽¹⁾ Includes Underwriters' discount.

THE BONDS

General Description

The Bonds will be dated the date of issuance thereof and will mature on December 1 of the years and in the amounts shown on the inside cover page of this Official Statement. The Bonds bear interest from their dated date, at the rates set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement, computed upon the basis of a 360-day year of twelve 30-day months and payable on June 1, 2012 and semiannually thereafter on each June 1 and December 1. The Bonds are issuable only as fully registered bonds in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple of \$5,000 under a global book-entry only system operated by The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York (“DTC”). Individual purchases of the Bonds may be made only in book-entry form through the facilities of DTC. Purchasers will not receive certificates representing their interest in the Bonds purchased. See “APPENDIX F–BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM.” Principal of and interest on the Bonds are payable by The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, N.A., Chicago, Illinois, as the initial Bond Registrar and Paying Agent (the “*Bond Registrar*”).

Registration and Transfer

The Bond Registrar will maintain books for the registration of ownership and transfer of the Bonds. Subject to the provisions of the Bonds as they relate to book-entry form, any Bond may be transferred upon the surrender thereof at the office designated for such purpose of the Bond Registrar, together with an assignment duly executed by the registered owner or his or her attorney in such form as will be satisfactory to the Bond Registrar. No service charge shall be made for any transfer or exchange of Bonds, but the District or the Bond Registrar may require

payment of a sum sufficient to cover any tax or other governmental charge that may be imposed in connection with any transfer or exchange of Bonds except in the case of the issuance of a Bond or Bonds for the unredeemed portion of a Bond surrendered for redemption.

The Bond Registrar shall not be required to transfer or exchange any Bond during the period of fifteen (15) days preceding the giving of notice of redemption of any Bonds or to transfer and exchange any Bond all or a portion of which has been called for redemption.

Optional Redemption

2011A Bonds. The 2011A Bonds are not subject to optional redemption prior to maturity.

2011B Bonds. The Series 2011B Bonds maturing on or after December 1, 2022 are subject to optional redemption on or after December 1, 2021 at the option of the District, in whole or in part on any date, and if in part, the maturities to be redeemed to be selected by the District, at the redemption price equal to the principal amount of each 2011B Bond or portion thereof to be so redeemed, plus accrued interest to the redemption date.

2011C Bonds. The Series 2011C Bonds maturing on or after December 1, 2029 are subject to optional redemption on or after December 1, 2021 at the option of the District, in whole or in part on any date, and if in part, the maturities to be redeemed to be selected by the District, at the redemption price equal to the principal amount of each 2011C Bond or portion thereof to be so redeemed, plus accrued interest to the redemption date.

Mandatory Redemption

The Bonds are not subject to mandatory sinking fund redemption prior to maturity.

Selection of Bonds within a Maturity

The particular maturities of the 2011B Bonds and the 2011C Bonds to be redeemed at the option of the District will be determined by the District in its sole discretion.

If less than all of the 2011B Bonds or the 2011C Bonds of a given maturity are to be redeemed prior to maturity, the particular 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds or portions thereof to be redeemed will be selected by lot by the Bond Registrar of such maturity by such method of lottery as the Bond Registrar shall deem fair and appropriate; *provided*, that such lottery shall provide for the selection for redemption of 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds or portions thereof so that any \$5,000 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond or \$5,000 portion thereof shall be as likely to be called for redemption as any other such \$5,000 portion.

Redemption Procedure and Notice of Redemption

The District shall, at least 45 days prior to an optional redemption date (unless a shorter time period shall be satisfactory to the Bond Registrar), notify the Bond Registrar of such

redemption date and of the maturities and principal amounts of 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds to be redeemed.

Unless waived by the registered owner of 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds to be redeemed, official notice of any such redemption shall be given by the Bond Registrar on behalf of the District by mailing the redemption notice by first class mail not less than 30 days and not more than 60 days prior to the date fixed for redemption to each registered owner of the 2011B Bonds or the 2011C Bond to be redeemed at the address shown on the Bond Register or at such other address as is furnished in writing by such registered owner to the Bond Registrar.

All official notices of redemption shall identify the 2011B Bonds or the 2011C Bonds or portions thereof to be redeemed and will state (a) the redemption date, (b) the redemption price, (c) if less than all of the outstanding 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds of a particular maturity are to be redeemed, the identification (and, in the case of partial redemption of 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds within such maturity, the respective principal amounts) of the 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds to be redeemed, (d) a statement that on the redemption date the redemption price will become due and payable upon each such 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond or portion thereof called for redemption and that interest thereon shall cease to accrue from and after the date fixed for redemption, and (e) the place where such 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds are to be surrendered for payment of the redemption price, which place of payment will be the office designated for such purpose by the Bond Registrar.

Unless moneys sufficient to pay the optional redemption price of the 2011B Bonds or the 2011C Bonds to be redeemed shall have been received by the Bond Registrar prior to the giving of such notice of redemption, such notice of optional redemption may, at the option of the District, state that the redemption shall be conditional upon the receipt of such moneys by the Bond Registrar on or prior to the date fixed for redemption. If such moneys are not received, the redemption notice shall be of no force and effect, the District shall not redeem such 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds, and the Bond Registrar shall give notice, in the same manner in which the notice of redemption was given, that such moneys were not received and that such 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds will not be redeemed.

Official notice of redemption having been given, the 2011B Bonds or the 2011C Bonds or portions thereof so to be redeemed shall, on the redemption date, become due and payable at the redemption price therein specified, and from and after such date (unless the District shall default in the payment of the redemption price), such 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds or portions thereof shall cease to bear interest. Neither the failure to mail such redemption notice, nor any defect in any notice so mailed, to any particular registered owner of a 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond, shall affect the sufficiency of such notice with respect to other registered owners. Notice having been properly given, failure of a registered owner of a 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond to receive such notice shall not be deemed to invalidate, limit or delay the effect of the notice or redemption action described in the notice. Such notice may be waived in writing by a registered owner of a 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond entitled to receive such notice either before or after the event, and such waiver shall be the equivalent of such notice. Waivers of notice by registered owners shall be filed with the Bond Registrar, but such filing shall not be a condition precedent to the validity of any action taken in reliance upon such waiver. Upon surrender of such 2011B

Bonds or 2011C Bonds for redemption in accordance with said notice, such 2011B Bonds or 2011C Bonds shall be paid by the Bond Registrar at the redemption price. The procedure for the payment of interest due as part of the redemption price shall be as herein provided for payment of interest otherwise due. Upon surrender for any partial redemption of any 2011B Bond or the 2011C Bond, there shall be prepared for the registered owner a new 2011B Bond or 2011C Bond of like tenor, of authorized denominations, of the same maturity, bearing the same rate of interest and in the amount of the unpaid principal amount.

Such additional notice and information as may be agreed upon with DTC shall also be given so long as the 2011B Bonds and the 2011C Bonds are held by DTC. See "APPENDIX F-BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM."

SECURITY FOR THE BONDS

The Bonds are direct and general obligations of the District for the payment of which the full faith and credit of the District have been pledged. The Bond Ordinances provide for the levy of a tax on all taxable property within the District adequate to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds when due beginning June 1, 2012.

The Limited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the boundaries of the District without limitation as to rate, but the amount of said taxes that will be extended to pay the Limited Tax Bonds is, however, limited pursuant to the Limitation Law. The rights of the owners of the Limited Tax Bonds and the enforceability of the Limited Tax Bonds may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion.

The Unlimited Tax Bonds are payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the boundaries of the District without limitation as to rate or amount. The rights of the owners of the Unlimited Tax Bonds and the enforceability of the Unlimited Tax Bonds may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion.

The Bond Ordinances will be filed with the County Clerk of Cook County, Illinois (the "*County Clerk*"), and will serve as authorization to the County Clerk to extend and collect the property taxes as set forth in the Bond Ordinances to pay the Bonds.

The Debt Reform Act provides that the Limited Tax Bonds are payable from the "debt service extension base" of the District. The District's debt service extension base for the 2011 levy year is \$147,610,159 (the "*Debt Service Extension Base*"), which is increased each year by the lesser of 5% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (as defined in the Limitation Law). The District has covenanted in the Bond Ordinance for the Limited Tax Bonds that the sum of the annual amount of taxes to be extended to pay the Limited Tax Bonds and all other "limited bonds" (as defined in the Debt Reform Act) issued by the District will not exceed the Debt Service Extension Base, less the amount extended to pay certain other

non-referendum bonds previously or hereafter issued by the District. See “DEBT INFORMATION—District’s Debt Service Extension Base Capacity.” The debt service on general obligation bonds of the District, such as the 2011C Bonds, issued to finance construction projects initiated prior to October 1, 1991, including the District’s TARP, is excluded from the tax extension limitation and does not reduce the District’s capacity to issue limited tax bonds. See “REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES—Property Tax Extension Limitation Law and Debt Reform Act.”

Upon the issuance of the Limited Tax Bonds, the District will have remaining capacity to levy ad valorem taxes for the repayment of additional limited bonds. See the table entitled “District’s Debt Service Extension Base Capacity” under the caption “DEBT INFORMATION.”

ADDITIONAL FINANCING

Long-Term Capital Needs

The District has traditionally financed a substantial portion of its capital projects through the issuance of general obligation indebtedness. The District expects that future capital expenditures will continue to be financed in large part through the issuance of its general obligation indebtedness. There are currently no legislative proposals pending to eliminate or curtail the District’s power to issue its general obligation bonds without voter approval. Legislation has been adopted which extends the existing nonreferendum bonding authority of the District through 2024. For a description of certain of the District’s present and potential future capital projects, see APPENDIX B—“CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM,” “ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS—Effluent Disinfection” and “—National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.” The District evaluates on an ongoing basis whether market conditions will enable it to refinance outstanding indebtedness at favorable rates.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

IEPA Projects

The District is involved in an ongoing program of sewer and treatment plant rehabilitation and expansion projects for which the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (the “IEPA”) has approved partial funding through the State of Illinois Water Pollution Control Revolving Loan Fund (the “Revolving Loan Fund”). Under the terms of the Revolving Loan Fund, the District issues preliminary bonds in the amount of interim project loan advances to pay project costs (the “IEPA Preliminary Bonds”). The IEPA Preliminary Bonds are funded at project completion by the issuance to the IEPA of long term general obligation bonds of twenty-year maturities. Once repayment begins, the bonds amortize over the repayment period with level semiannual payments of principal and interest to maturity. In connection with these fundings, the District has authorized the issuance of the following Capital Improvement Bonds:

SERIES AND AUTHORIZATION	PRINCIPAL OUTSTANDING
1990 IEPA Series, \$45,000,000	\$ 3,724,276
1991 IEPA Series, \$59,000,000	1,833,986
1992 IEPA Series, \$204,000,000	31,656,944
1994 IEPA Series, \$210,000,000	24,808,734
1997 IEPA Series, \$190,000,000	63,912,697
2001 IEPA Series, \$180,000,000	129,275,607
2004 IEPA Series, \$150,000,000	108,468,477
2007 IEPA Series, \$160,000,000	135,027,595
2009 IEPA Series, \$258,000,000	132,866,810
TOTAL	<u>\$631,575,129</u>

See also, “DEBT INFORMATION—Combined Schedule of Bonds Issued and Outstanding.”

METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO

The District

The District is a sanitary district and a body corporate and politic of the State of Illinois (the “State”), organized and existing under the Act. The District is an independent government and taxing body encompassing approximately 91% of the land area and 98% of the assessed valuation of Cook County, Illinois. The District was originally organized as the Sanitary District of Chicago in 1889 under an act of the Illinois General Assembly which has been modified from time to time to increase the District’s powers and jurisdiction. From 1955 through 1988 the District was called The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. In order to provide a more accurate description of the District’s current functions and responsibilities, the name was changed, effective January 1, 1989, to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago.

The mission of the District is to protect the health and safety of the public in its service area, protect the quality of the water supply source (Lake Michigan), improve the quality of water in watercourses in its service area, protect businesses and homes from flood damages, and manage water as a vital resource for its service area.

The District is responsible for preventing pollution of Lake Michigan, the source of Chicago's water supply, and treating wastewater to improve the water quality in the Chicago, Des Plaines, Calumet and Illinois Rivers and all other waterways within its jurisdiction. While it exercises no direct control over wastewater collection and transmission systems maintained by cities, towns and villages in Cook County, the District does control municipal sewer construction by permits. It also provides the main trunk lines for the collection of wastewater from the local systems, and provides facilities for the treatment and disposal of the wastewater products. The District also provides facilities to store, treat and release combined sewage overflow and storm water runoff within its jurisdiction. Beginning in 2005, the District was assigned responsibility pursuant to Section 7h of the Act for stormwater management for all of Cook County, including areas outside of the District's corporate boundaries.

The District is currently undertaking a number of capital projects designed to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. A description of the District's Capital Improvements Program is set forth in APPENDIX B attached hereto.

Services

The District collects wastewater from municipalities in its service area, conveys it to wastewater reclamation plants, provides full secondary treatment and discharges clean water to local waterways. The District is also responsible for stormwater management for all of Cook County, including areas outside of the District's corporate boundaries for wastewater services.

As of December 31, 2010, the District served an equivalent population of 10.35 million people; this included domestic wastewater from approximately 5.25 million people, a commercial and industrial equivalent of 4.5 million people, and a combined sewer overflow of 0.6 million people. The District serves an area of 884 square miles which includes the City of Chicago and 125 suburban communities. The District's 559 miles of intercepting sewers and force mains range in size from 12 inches to 27 feet in diameter, and are fed by approximately 10,000 local sewer system connections.


The District's TARP is one of the country's largest public works projects for pollution and flood control. One hundred nine (109) miles of tunnels, 9 to 33 feet in diameter and 150 to 300 feet underground, have been constructed and are in operation.

The District owns and operates one of the world's largest water reclamation plants, in addition to six other plants and 22 pumping stations. The District treats an average of 1.2 billion gallons of wastewater each day. The District's total wastewater treatment capacity is over 2.0 billion gallons per day.

The District controls approximately 76 miles of navigable waterways, which are part of a national system connecting the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

Organization



Administration

The District is governed by a nine member Board of Commissioners. Commissioners are elected at large and serve on a salaried part-time basis. Three Commissioners are elected every two years for six-year terms. The Board elects a President, Vice President, and Chairman of the Committee on Finance biannually from its membership.

THE CURRENT COMMISSIONERS ARE:

<u>BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS</u>	<u>YEAR FIRST ELECTED</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
Terrence J. O'Brien, President	1988	2012
Barbara J. McGowan, Vice President	1998	2016
Cynthia M. Santos, Chairman, Committee on Finance	1996	2014
Michael A. Alvarez	2010	2016
Frank Avila	2002	2014
Patricia Horton	2006	2012
Kathleen Therese Meany	1990	2014
Debra Shore	2006	2012
Mariyana Spyropoulos	2009*	2016

* Appointed by the Governor of the State of Illinois on August 5, 2009 to fill a vacancy; subsequently, Ms. Spyropoulos was elected by the voters at the November 2, 2010 election to a full six-year term.

The District's day-to-day operations are managed by the Executive Director, who is appointed by and reports directly to the Board. With the consent of the Board, the Executive Director appoints eight department heads who report directly to him. The Executive Director is responsible for administering board policies, as well as preparing and implementing the District's annual budget and long-range plan. The Treasurer of the District, its chief financial officer, is also appointed by and reports directly to the Board. The Treasurer is responsible for the District's financial planning and investment management. The Board appoints a Civil Service Board that has statutory responsibilities for the District's classified service employees.

Mr. David St. Pierre was appointed Executive Director of the District by the Board on June 16, 2011. Mr. St. Pierre has more than 25 years of experience working in the water and wastewater industries in various cities throughout the United States, and is a registered Professional Engineer and holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from Southern Illinois University.

Ms. Mary Ann Boyle was appointed the Treasurer of the District by the Board on March 3, 2011. Ms. Boyle served as the District's Assistant Treasurer for 6.5 years prior to assuming her current position. Ms. Boyle has over 25 years experience in various finance and accounting roles, holds a B.S. in Accountancy from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and is a Certified Public Accountant by the State of Illinois.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

The District’s other principal officers serve as heads of the following departments under the Executive Director.

OTHER PRINCIPAL OFFICERS	TITLE	DEPARTMENT
Kenneth A. Kits	Director of Engineering	Engineering
Manju Prakash Sharma	Director of Maintenance and Operations	Maintenance and Operations
Thomas Granato, Ph. D.	Acting Director of Monitoring and Research	Monitoring and Research
Ronald M. Hill	Acting General Counsel	Law
Denice E. Korcal	Director of Human Resources	Human Resources
Darlene A. LoCascio	Director of Procurement and Materials Management	Procurement and Materials Management
Keith D. Smith	Director of Information Technology	Information Technology
Jacqueline Torres	Clerk/Director of Finance	Finance

The departments have responsibility for the following activities:

Engineering Department – This department conducts and/or supervises: facilities planning, design and construction inspection for the District, including new water reclamation plants; remodeling, alteration and expansion of existing plants; the District’s TARP; flood control reservoirs; construction of new and upgrading of existing sewer lines and pumping stations; solids management and disposal; and stormwater management activities within Cook County. The department provides liaison with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (the “USEPA”), the IEPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; evaluates compliance with directives; applies for construction project state revolving fund loans; and provides coordination with other local governmental agencies, including county, township, and municipal agencies.

Maintenance and Operations Department – The responsibilities of this department include: protecting the water quality of Lake Michigan, which is the major water supply of the Chicago area; intercepting and treating domestic and industrial wastewater to minimize pollution of the waterways; and operating and maintaining all the facilities of the District. In performing the above responsibilities, a high quality treatment plant effluent is produced in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits, provides for the proper utilization of the solids that are recovered from the various treatment processes, and controls collection facilities and the District’s TARP system to minimize combined sewer overflows and treatment plant bypasses. The department has the added responsibilities of operating and maintaining flood control reservoirs to handle storm water run-off, operating and maintaining waterway aeration stations and Sidestream Elevated Pool Aeration (SEPA) Stations for the maintenance of water quality dissolved oxygen standards, maintaining a program of debris clearance from the waterways, controlling the state-allocated Lake Michigan diversion and operating and maintaining the hydroelectric Lockport powerhouse, which generates revenue estimated at \$1.2 million per year for the District.

Monitoring and Research Department – This department conducts ongoing research in wastewater treatment, stormwater management, solids utilization and related fields; monitors water reclamation plant operations, effluent quality and solids utilization for compliance with federal and state permits; monitors water quality of the Chicago area waterways, Illinois waterways and Lake Michigan for compliance with federal and state water quality standards; and administers the Sewage and Waste Control Ordinance and User Charge Ordinance for compliance with the requirements of the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1977 and regulations of the USEPA.

Law Department – This department is responsible for all legal matters relating to the District. The department also reviews necessary legislation for presentation to the Illinois General Assembly and provides legal interpretation of governing statutes.

Human Resources Department – This department is responsible for providing effective human resources management programs including: recruitment and selection, employee training and development, compensation and benefits, labor and employee relations and safety. Approximately 830 of the District's 2,066 employees are represented by 15 different unions. These unions comprise six different bargaining units. The District and the unions representing its employees have enjoyed a long tradition of amicable and professional relations. Multi-year collective bargaining agreements were negotiated with all unions in 2008 and were scheduled to expire on June 30, 2011. Historically, the parties have agreed to extend the agreements on a month to month basis until successor agreements were reached. The District has taken this approach during these negotiations.

Procurement and Materials Management Department – This department is responsible for procuring all materials and services in compliance with the Purchasing Act of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. The department operates four major storerooms at the District facilities providing planning, receiving, storing and issuing of materials. The department is also responsible for the sale of obsolete, used and surplus materials.

Information Technology Department – The mission of the Information Technology Department (ITD) is to align information technology with the stated goals and objectives of the District and to maintain the technology infrastructures and architectures at levels that promote productivity and efficiency throughout the District. In pursuit of this mission, the ITD coordinates the planning and implementation of information technology throughout the District. In addition, ITD establishes District-wide computer standards, monitors and oversees computer security, and provides support for numerous District-wide applications. The ITD provides information technology services in the following key areas: Planning and Program Management, Design and Implementation, Applications Development and Support, Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance, User Support and Customer Satisfaction, and Security and Disaster Recovery.

Finance Department – This department is responsible for reporting financial transactions and preparing the District's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). Additionally, the department maintains all official records of District Proceedings, pursues revenue collections and pays obligations of the District in compliance with relevant statutes, professional standards, and District policy.

General Administration – This organizational unit includes the Office of the Executive Director, Affirmative Action, Management & Budget, Public Affairs and the General Administration Division. The Office of the Executive Director has overall administrative responsibility for the entire District. Affirmative Action administers the Affirmative Action ordinance to provide opportunities for protected class enterprises in the District purchasing process. Management & Budget is responsible for central budget preparation and administration, fiscal planning, and organizational studies. Public Affairs provides public and employee understanding of District functions and activities through media, publications, responses to public inquiries, tours, events and employee newsletters. The General Administration Division provides centralized support services such as Security, Public Information, and Building Administration across departmental lines.

Civil Service Board – The Civil Service Board is an administrative body appointed by the Board whose purpose is to hear charges that are brought against employees, hear employee appeals of actions taken by the Director of Human Resources, and to approve to the Personnel Rules and the job classification plan of the District. Decisions of the Civil Service Board are subject to administrative review, as described in the Code of Civil Procedure of the State.

RECENT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The Board adopted the 2011 Budget on December 9, 2010 and made amendments on December 16, 2010. The operation, maintenance, and investment in the District's infrastructure, and other essential services continue to receive primary focus, while some discretionary activities and non-essential services are being reduced. The District's 2011 tax levy of \$467,637,525 represents a 1.2% increase from the 2010 levy as adjusted. The 2011 Budget includes \$401.1 million in appropriations for the General Corporate Fund, a decrease of \$16.4 million or 4.1% from the 2010 budget. The District's budget for fiscal year 2011 is available online at the District's website at www.mwrdd.org, but the content of such website is not incorporated into this Official Statement by reference.

Local property taxes account for 78.1% of the 2011 estimated revenues for the General Corporate Fund, which is a slight decrease in percentage from the 2010 actual levels at 78.4%. The next largest revenue category, User Charges, account for 13.0% of the 2011 estimated revenues for the General Corporate Fund, which is an estimated decrease of 1.6% from the 2010 actual levels at 14.6%. The current General Corporate Fund 2011 estimated revenues of \$336.4 million exceed the final budget estimates of \$323.5 million, primarily due to increased tax increment financing district surplus distributions. The current General Corporate Fund 2011 estimated expenditures of \$328.3 million are lower than the final budget estimates of \$341.1 million, primarily due to not filling some vacant positions. The General Corporate Fund does not receive any regular funding from the State of Illinois.

General Corporate Fund Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes

(amounts in thousands)

	2007 Actual Amounts	2008 Actual Amounts	2009 Actual Amounts	2010 Actual Amounts	2011 Estimated Amounts	2011 Percent of Total
Revenues:						
Property taxes	\$ 230,181	\$ 237,641	\$ 240,271	\$ 234,741	241,788	71.9%
Personal property replacement tax	28,297	30,621	29,378	20,896	25,788	7.7%
Total tax revenue	258,478	268,262	269,649	255,637	267,576	
Tax Adjustments	(3,058)	264	(13,732)	5,052	(4,851)	
Tax revenue available for current operation	255,420	268,526	255,917	260,689	262,725	78.1%
Interest on investments	11,983	6,654	2,774	1,816	1,600	0.5%
Land sales	19	-	-	3,039	2	0.0%
Tax increment financing distributions	699	858	1,031	2,650	15,250	4.5%
Miscellaneous	3,866	8,552	8,098	4,033	1,700	0.5%
User charges	51,950	54,142	47,943	48,367	43,700	13.0%
Land rentals	9,488	9,457	9,775	9,842	10,300	3.1%
Claims and damage settlements	-	606	291	690	0	0.0%
Fees, forfeits and penalties	2,974	901	1,319	1,192	1,170	0.3%
Total revenues	\$ 336,399	\$ 349,696	\$ 327,148	\$ 332,318	\$ 336,447	100.0%
Expenditures by Department:						
Board of Commissioners	\$ 3,489	\$ 3,724	\$ 3,648	\$ 3,627	\$ 3,599	1.1%
General Administration	25,707	21,594	18,497	15,393	14,861	4.5%
Monitoring and Research	25,335	26,535	28,263	27,891	24,385	7.4%
Procurement and Materials Management	8,146	8,719	8,932	8,416	8,376	2.6%
Human Resources	61,833	61,379	43,577	46,915	52,033	15.8%
Information Technology	15,857	19,250	20,105	15,821	16,571	5.0%
Law	6,114	7,207	7,456	8,153	6,849	2.1%
Finance	3,089	3,201	3,205	3,201	3,105	0.9%
Engineering	4,324	6,697	7,943	5,389	6,668	2.0%
Maintenance and Operations	177,801	194,457	206,696	189,376	183,593	55.9%
Claims and judgments	9,353	7,627	9,464	6,728	8,293	2.5%
Total expenditures	\$ 341,048	\$ 360,390	\$ 357,786	\$ 330,910	\$ 328,331	100.0%
Revenues over (under) expenditures	(4,649)	(10,694)	(30,638)	1,408	8,116	
Revenues and other financing sources (uses)						
Transfers	8,000	7,000			8,000	
Fund balances at beginning of the year as adjusted	146,062	158,777	145,752	103,756	105,164	
Fund balances at end of year	\$ 149,413	\$ 155,083	\$ 115,114	\$ 105,164	\$ 121,280	
Expenditures by Type						
Total all departments:						
Personal services	\$ 204,688	\$ 214,477	\$ 204,153	\$ 206,056	\$ 205,198	62.50%
Contractual services	91,315	101,807	113,715	95,655	94,300	28.7%
Materials and supplies	21,301	23,482	23,268	19,405	18,900	5.8%
Machinery and equipment	4,193	8,747	6,685	2,554	1,100	0.3%
Land	9,731	4,179	0	0	200	0.1%
Fixed and other charges	467	71	501	512	340	0.1%
Total Corporate Division	331,695	352,763	348,322	324,182	320,038	97.5%
Total Reserve Claim Division	9,353	7,627	9,464	6,728	8,293	2.5%
Total Expenditures General Corporate Fund	\$ 341,048	\$ 360,390	\$ 357,786	\$ 330,910	\$ 328,331	100.0%

Source: Amounts are presented on a budgetary basis. The actual results were obtained from Exhibit A-3 of the District's Basic Financial Statements attached hereto as APPENDIX A. The 2011 estimated amounts are based on both the 2011 budget as well as actual results for the first half of the current fiscal year.

GENERAL CORPORATE FUND BALANCE

The year end 2010 balance was \$204.8 million or 61.8% of corporate expenditures. This level of fund balance should ensure the District's ability to maintain all operations even in the event of unanticipated revenue shortfalls, and provide time to adjust budget and operations.

General Corporate Fund Balance⁽¹⁾	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Year End Balance (on GAAP Basis)	\$245.0	\$234.5	\$229.4	\$210.7	\$204.8

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

(1) The General Corporate Fund Balance is made up of the Corporate, Reserve Claim, and Working Cash Funds and is presented on a GAAP basis of accounting. See Exhibit A-1 of the District's Basic Financial Statements attached hereto as APPENDIX A.

**DEBT INFORMATION
(UNAUDITED)**

The following tables set forth direct and overlapping debt applicable to the District as of June 30, 2011, adjusted to include the Bonds.

Direct Debt

	AMOUNT
IEPA Preliminary Bonds.....	\$ 260,732,210
General Obligation Bonds Outstanding (includes IEPA Final Bonds).....	1,945,660,000
Plus: The Bonds.....	400,000,000
Total Direct Debt	\$2,606,392,210

Estimated Overlapping Bonded Debt⁽¹⁾

	BONDED DEBT ⁽²⁾	PERCENT APPLICABLE ⁽³⁾	AMOUNT APPLICABLE
City of Chicago.....	\$7,319,692,000	100%	\$ 7,319,692,000
Chicago Board of Education ⁽⁴⁾	5,579,522,000	100%	5,579,522,000
Chicago Park District ⁽⁴⁾	899,420,000	100%	899,420,000
Cook County.....	3,499,615,000	97.96%	3,428,223,000
Cook County Forest Preserve District.....	101,935,000	97.96%	99,856,000
Total Overlapping Debt			\$ 17,326,713,000
Total Direct and Overlapping Debt.....			\$ 19,933,105,210
Population (2010 Estimate) ⁽⁵⁾			5,194,675
Equalized Assessed Valuation (2009) ⁽³⁾			\$174,467,642,684
Estimated Fair Market Value (2008) ⁽⁶⁾			\$616,163,594,142

Source of data: Office of County Clerk, Tax Extension Division and as otherwise noted in footnotes (2), (5) and (6).

- (1) Excludes outstanding tax anticipation notes and warrants. Except as stated, does not include debt issued by other taxing authorities located in Cook County.
- (2) Source: Each of the respective taxing districts.
- (3) Based on 2009 Equalized Assessed Valuations, which are the most recent available. For 2009, the Equalized Assessed Valuation from the portion of the District within the City of Chicago was \$461,195,000.
- (4) Includes approximately \$5 billion and \$449 million of general obligation bonds of the Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Park District, respectively, issued as "alternate revenue" bonds secured by alternate revenue sources. An ad valorem property tax levy is filed in an amount sufficient to pay debt service on the alternate revenue bonds. When sufficient revenues have accumulated to pay annual debt service on the alternate revenue bonds, the property tax levy is abated. To date, alternate revenues have been available in amounts sufficient to pay principal and interest coming due on the alternate revenue bonds issued by the Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Park District.
- (5) Source of data: U.S. Census Estimate.
- (6) Source of data: The Civic Federation, Chicago, Illinois (based upon information from the Illinois Department of Revenue).

Selected Debt Ratios

	PER CAPITA ⁽¹⁾	% OF EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUE ⁽²⁾	% OF ESTIMATED FULL VALUE ⁽³⁾
Direct Debt.....	\$ 501.74	1.49%	0.42%
Total Direct and Overlapping Debt ⁽⁴⁾	\$3,837.21	11.43%	3.24%

- (1) 2010 Estimated Cook County Population: 5,194,675 (source of data: U.S. Census Estimate).
- (2) 2009 Equalized Assessed Value: \$174,467,642,684.
- (3) 2008 Estimated Full Value: \$616,163,594,142.
- (4) Does not include debt issued by other taxing authorities located in Cook County which are not included under table entitled "Estimated Overlapping Bonded Debt" above.

Combined Schedule of Bonds Issued and Outstanding

(As of June 30, 2011) (unaudited)

(amounts in thousands)

Series	Interest Rate (%)	Final Maturity ⁽¹⁾	Annual Payments (\$)						Initial Principal (\$)	Amount Retired (\$)	Principal Outstanding (\$)
Capital Improvement											
December 2002 Unltd C	5.375	2013	2013	6,100					64,000	57,900	6,100
December 2002 Ltd D	4.00-5.375	2013	2011	15,800	2012	16,500	2013	11,300	100,000	56,400	43,600
July, 2006 Ltd	5.00	2022	2011	12,995	2017	11,150	2020	13,280	250,000	125,065	124,935
			2012	12,380	2018	11,770	2021	12,105			
			2015	11,995	2019	11,945	2022	15,800			
			2016	11,515							
August 2009 Ltd	5.72	2038	2033	45,000	2035	105,000	2037	115,000	600,000	-	600,000
			2034	100,000	2036	110,000	2038	125,000			
IEPA Revolving Loan (4)	2.50-3.745	2030	2011	16,529	2018	25,434	2025	13,927	648,329	256,714	391,615
Fund Bonds			2012	32,639	2019	23,910	2026	10,628			
			2013	31,807	2020	21,235	2027	8,874			
			2014	30,454	2021	21,117	2028	5,842			
			2015	29,331	2022	20,464	2029	3,958			
			2016	28,784	2023	19,780	2030	1,126			
			2017	28,435	2024	17,340					
Total Capital Improvement and IEPA Revolving Loan Fund									1,662,329	496,079	1,166,250
Refunding											
May, 2006 Unltd (2)	5.00	2031	2023	31,860	2026	36,535	2029	41,935	346,600	-	346,600
			2024	33,335	2027	38,255	2030	43,795			
			2025	34,895	2028	40,055	2031	45,935			
May, 2006 Ltd (2)	5.00	2031	2023	5,035	2026	5,480	2029	5,985	50,790	-	50,790
			2024	5,165	2027	5,645	2030	6,050			
			2025	5,315	2028	5,820	2031	6,295			
March, 2007 Unltd A (3)	4.00-5.00	2022	2014	18,760	2017	17,955	2020	22,250	188,315	-	188,315
			2015	19,675	2018	20,015	2021	23,395			
			2016	20,585	2019	21,125	2022	24,555			
March, 2007 Unltd B (3)	5.25	2035	2034	45,965	2035	45,880			91,845	-	91,845
March, 2007 Ltd C (3)	5.25	2033	2025	2,595	2027	405	2033	48,210	101,860	-	101,860
			2026	2,465	2032	48,185					
Total Refunding									779,410	-	779,410
Total - All Series									2,441,739	496,079	1,945,660

(Footnotes appear on the following page.)

Notes to Combined Schedule of Bonds Issued and Outstanding

- (1) Bonds issued on or after August 1992 mature on December 1 of the years indicated, except IEPA Revolving Loan Fund Bonds which mature semiannually on January 1 and July 1.
- (2) Two refunding bond issues were refunded by May 2006 Refunding Bond Issue Unlimited and Limited as provided below:

\$363,000,000	Variable Rate General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Unlimited Tax Series A of June 2002 (5)
\$53,000,000	Variable Rate General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Limited Tax Series B of June 2002 (5)
- (3) Four bond issues were fully or partially refunded by the March, 2007 Refunding Bond Issues, Unlimited Tax Series A and B, and Limited Tax Series C, as provided below:

\$57,900,000	Capital Improvement, Unlimited Tax Series of December 2002, maturing 2014 to 2016.
\$146,000,000	Capital Improvement, Unlimited Tax Series E of December 2002, maturing 2022.
\$100,000,000	Capital Improvement, Unlimited Tax Series of July 2006, maturing 2035.
\$110,435,000	Capital Improvement, Limited Tax Series of July 2006, maturing 2027 and 2033.
- (4) Excludes \$260,732,210 of Preliminary Bond Principal and Interest outstanding under the IEPA Revolving Loan Fund Program.
- (5) Five bond issues were partially refunded by June 2002 Refunding Bond Issue Unlimited Series A and Limited Series B as provided below:

\$39,950,000	Capital Improvement, June 1991, maturing 2008 and 2011.
\$145,500,000	Capital Improvement, March 1993, maturing 2008-2010 and 2012.
\$68,415,000	Capital Improvement, January 1995, maturing 2007 and 2010-2012.
\$100,000,000	Capital Improvement, Unlimited Series June 2001 A, maturing 2008-2014 at 100%, callable December 1, 2012, at 101%.
\$20,510,000	Capital Improvement, Limited Series June 2001 B, maturing 2007-2008.


General Obligation Bonded Debt Service Schedule⁽¹⁾
(As of June 30, 2011 and including the Bonds)

YEAR	BONDS OUTSTANDING ⁽²⁾			THE BONDS			TOTAL			% PRINCIPAL RETIRED	
	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	TOTAL	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	TOTAL	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	TOTAL	ANNUAL	CUMULATIVE
2011	\$ 45,324,505	\$ 46,182,454	\$ 91,506,959	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,324,505	\$ 46,182,454	\$ 91,506,959	2.16%	2.16%
2012	61,518,608	90,304,459	151,823,067	-	24,633,118	24,633,118	61,518,608	114,937,577	176,456,185	4.17%	6.33%
2013	49,207,618	88,016,204	137,223,822	21,240,000	18,322,154	39,562,154	70,447,618	106,338,358	176,785,976	4.17%	10.50%
2014	49,213,632	86,275,950	135,489,582	22,175,000	17,780,281	39,955,281	71,388,632	104,056,231	175,444,863	4.14%	14.65%
2015	61,001,000	84,618,761	145,619,762	21,075,000	17,337,066	38,412,066	82,076,000	101,955,827	184,031,827	4.35%	18.99%
2016	60,883,753	82,341,153	143,224,906	15,180,000	16,419,881	31,599,881	76,063,753	98,761,034	174,824,787	4.13%	23.12%
2017	57,539,754	80,021,111	137,560,865	11,070,000	15,808,575	26,878,575	68,609,754	95,829,686	164,439,440	3.88%	27.00%
2018	57,218,934	77,895,605	135,114,539	28,495,000	15,304,625	43,799,625	85,713,934	93,200,230	178,914,164	4.23%	31.23%
2019	56,980,141	75,672,943	132,653,083	18,025,000	13,912,675	31,937,675	75,005,141	89,585,618	164,590,759	3.89%	35.12%
2020	56,764,671	73,431,133	130,195,804	7,685,000	13,030,275	20,715,275	64,449,671	86,461,408	150,911,079	3.56%	38.68%
2021	56,616,752	71,117,333	127,734,085	9,550,000	12,653,025	22,203,025	66,166,752	83,770,358	149,937,110	3.54%	42.22%
2022	60,819,356	68,803,880	129,623,235	7,580,000	12,256,525	19,836,525	68,399,356	81,060,405	149,459,761	3.53%	45.75%
2023	56,675,231	66,279,404	122,954,636	18,300,000	11,888,681	30,188,681	74,975,231	78,168,085	153,143,316	3.62%	49.37%
2024	55,839,679	63,937,823	119,777,502	18,000,000	10,973,681	28,973,681	73,839,679	74,911,504	148,751,183	3.51%	52.88%
2025	56,731,905	61,599,687	118,331,592	14,500,000	10,073,681	24,573,681	71,231,905	71,673,368	142,905,273	3.37%	56.26%
2026	55,108,441	59,126,696	114,235,137	4,775,000	9,348,681	14,123,681	59,883,441	68,475,377	128,358,818	3.03%	59.29%
2027	53,178,862	56,650,375	109,829,237	-	9,109,931	9,109,931	53,178,862	65,760,306	118,939,168	2.81%	62.10%
2028	51,716,958	54,231,378	105,948,335	-	9,109,931	9,109,931	51,716,958	63,341,309	115,058,267	2.72%	64.81%
2029	51,878,325	51,793,899	103,672,224	20,000,000	9,109,931	29,109,931	71,878,325	60,903,830	132,782,155	3.14%	67.95%
2030	50,971,495	49,320,431	100,291,926	55,000,000	8,109,931	63,109,931	105,971,495	57,430,362	163,401,857	3.86%	71.81%
2031	52,230,000	46,814,100	99,044,100	67,350,000	5,359,931	72,709,931	119,580,000	52,174,031	171,754,031	4.06%	75.86%
2032	48,185,000	44,202,600	92,387,600	40,000,000	2,000,000	42,000,000	88,185,000	46,202,600	134,387,600	3.17%	79.04%
2033	93,210,000	41,672,888	134,882,888	-	-	-	93,210,000	41,672,888	134,882,888	3.19%	82.22%
2034	145,965,000	36,567,863	182,532,863	-	-	-	145,965,000	36,567,863	182,532,863	4.31%	86.53%
2035	150,880,000	28,434,700	179,314,700	-	-	-	150,880,000	28,434,700	179,314,700	4.23%	90.77%
2036	110,000,000	20,020,000	130,020,000	-	-	-	110,000,000	20,020,000	130,020,000	3.07%	93.84%
2037	115,000,000	13,728,000	128,728,000	-	-	-	115,000,000	13,728,000	128,728,000	3.04%	96.88%
2038	125,000,000	7,150,000	132,150,000	-	-	-	125,000,000	7,150,000	132,150,000	3.12%	100.00%
	<u>\$1,945,659,620</u>	<u>\$1,626,210,829</u>	<u>\$3,571,870,449</u>	<u>\$400,000,000</u>	<u>\$262,542,582</u>	<u>\$662,542,582</u>	<u>\$2,345,659,620</u>	<u>\$1,888,753,412</u>	<u>\$4,234,413,032</u>	100.00%	

(1) Unaudited.

(2) Excludes \$260,732,210 of Preliminary Bond Principal and Interest outstanding under the IEPA Revolving Loan Fund Program.

District General Obligation Bonded Debt Service
 (Includes IEPA Debt)
 As of June 30, 2011 and including the Bonds



District's Debt Service Extension Base Capacity

(As of June 30, 2011 and including the 2011A Bonds and the 2011B Bonds) (Unaudited)

The following table sets forth the capacity of the Debt Service Extension Base of the District to cover debt service on future limited bonds.

TAX LEVY YEAR	LEVY FOR OUTSTANDING LIMITED TAX BONDS (1) (2)	AGGREGATE LEVY FOR THE 2011A BONDS AND THE 2011B BONDS	TOTAL APPLICABLE DEBT SERVICE LEVY	DEBT SERVICE EXTENSION BASE ⁽³⁾	REMAINING CAPACITY ⁽³⁾
2011	\$ 87,731,992	\$18,599,479	\$106,331,471	\$147,610,159	\$ 41,278,688
2012	68,707,992	18,354,323	87,062,315	147,610,159	60,547,844
2013	56,800,617	29,769,050	86,569,667	147,610,159	61,040,492
2014	68,795,617	17,773,835	86,569,453	147,610,159	61,040,706
2015	67,715,867	18,856,649	86,572,517	147,610,159	61,037,642
2016	66,775,117	19,522,844	86,297,961	147,610,159	61,312,198
2017	66,837,617	39,957,094	106,794,711	147,610,159	40,815,448
2018	66,424,117	27,899,344	94,323,461	147,610,159	53,286,698
2019	67,161,867	18,287,344	85,449,211	147,610,159	62,160,948
2020	65,322,867	20,135,594	85,458,461	147,610,159	62,151,698
2021	68,412,617	17,769,094	86,181,711	147,610,159	61,428,448
2022	56,857,617	28,121,250	84,978,867	147,610,159	62,631,292
2023	56,735,867	26,906,250	83,642,117	147,610,159	63,968,042
2024	59,222,617	22,506,250	81,728,867	147,610,159	65,881,292
2025	58,855,630	12,056,250	70,911,880	147,610,159	76,698,279
2026	54,613,829	7,042,500	61,656,329	147,610,159	85,953,830
2027	52,226,832	7,042,500	59,269,332	147,610,159	88,340,827
2028	48,563,390	17,042,500	65,605,890	147,610,159	82,004,269
2029	46,047,988	51,542,500	97,590,488	147,610,159	50,019,672
2030	45,990,488	50,142,500	96,132,988	147,610,159	51,477,172
2031	87,565,738	42,000,000	129,565,738	147,610,159	18,044,422
2032	130,061,025	-0-	130,061,025	147,610,159	17,549,134
2033	131,746,000	-0-	131,746,000	147,610,159	15,864,159
2034	131,026,000	-0-	131,026,000	147,610,159	16,584,159
2035	130,020,000	-0-	130,020,000	147,610,159	17,590,159
2036	128,728,000	-0-	128,728,000	147,610,159	18,882,159
2037	132,150,000	-0-	132,150,000	147,610,159	15,460,159
2038	-0-	-0-	-0-	147,610,159	147,610,159
2039	-0-	-0-	-0-	147,610,159	147,610,159

(1) Includes Capital Improvement Bonds Series D of December 2002, the Series of July 2006 and Series of August 2009; Refunding Bonds Series of May 2006 and Series of March 2007; IEPA Series 04A, 04B, 04C, 04D, 04E, 04G, 04H, 07A and 07D.

(2) Excludes \$260,732,210 of Preliminary Bond Principal and Interest outstanding under the IEPA Revolving Loan Fund Program.

(3) Debt Service Extension Base and Remaining Capacity are for 2011 levy year; as described in "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS," the Debt Service Extension Base is increased each year by the lesser of 5% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Capital Lease

In December 2000, the Board authorized the District to enter into a long-term contract with a contractor to design, build, finance, own, operate, and maintain a 150 dry ton per day biosolids processing facility at the District's Stickney Water Reclamation Plant and beneficially use the final product for a period of 20 years. The contractor obtained its own financing to design, build, and own the facility.

The cost of the biosolids processing facility is considered a capital lease since it will become the property of the District at the end of the contract. The District also has an option to purchase the facility at the end of the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth year of operation for the remaining principal portion of the debt. Total payments for the capital lease are estimated at \$83 million for the full term of the contract, which will be paid from the Capital Improvements Bond Fund. As of December 31, 2010, the future minimum lease payments are approximately \$4.1 million for each of the years 2011-2030. The contract expires 20 years from the date of commercial operation, which was declared in July 2010. Under Illinois law the capital lease constitutes indebtedness includible within the District's 5.75% general debt limit, but is not includible in the District's 3.35% non-referendum bonded debt limit.

Debt Limits and Borrowing Authority

The Illinois General Assembly establishes the statutory debt limitations and borrowing authority of the District. Currently, such limits and authority are as follows:

Corporate Fund: To defray current operating expenses, the District may fund up to 100% of the aggregate total of the estimated amount of taxes levied or to be levied for corporate purposes plus the Corporate Fund portion of the Personal Property Replacement Tax allocation certified for distribution during the budget year through borrowing from the Corporate Working Cash Fund and issuance of tax anticipation notes or warrants.

Corporate Working Cash Fund: The fund may be used solely for the financing of Corporate Fund operations. The amount of non-referendum Corporate Working Cash Fund Bonds, which when added to (a) proceeds from the sale of Working Cash Fund bonds previously issued, (b) any amounts collected from the Corporate Working Cash Fund levy, and (c) amounts transferred from the Construction Working Cash Fund, may not exceed 90% of the amount produced by multiplying the maximum general corporate tax rate permitted by the last known equalized assessed valuation of all property in the District at the time the bonds are issued, plus 90% of the District's last known entitlement of the Personal Property Replacement Tax. At December 31, 2010, the District's remaining Corporate Working Cash Fund bond authorization is \$396,556,000.

Construction Fund: The Illinois General Assembly has adopted legislation allowing the District to levy property taxes to fund construction of District facilities. In anticipation of the collection of such taxes, the District may issue tax anticipation notes or warrants in a total amount not to exceed 85% of its Construction Fund levy. In any tax year, the Construction Fund may borrow through the issuance of its tax anticipation notes or warrants plus loans from the

Construction Working Cash Fund up to the aggregate total of 100% of its estimated or actual extended tax levy plus 100% of the Construction Fund allocation of the estimated Personal Property Replacement Tax distribution to be received in that tax year.

Construction Working Cash Fund: The fund may be used solely for the financing of Construction Fund operations. The maximum permitted balance, and the maximum amount of bonds which are authorized to be issued to provide such balance, is the total of 90% of the maximum permissible Construction Fund Tax Levy plus 90% of the last known Construction Fund entitlement to the Personal Property Replacement Tax.

Capital Improvement Bonds: The maximum amount of non-referendum Capital Improvement Bonds which may be outstanding at any one time is 3.35% of the last known equalized assessed valuation of taxable property within the District. The Act authorizes the District to issue Capital Improvement Bonds through December 31, 2024. At June 30, 2011, the District's outstanding capital improvement and refunding bonds of \$2,206,391,830 did not exceed the limitation of \$5,844,666,000.

Stormwater Management Fund: To meet ordinary disbursements for salaries and other storm water purposes, the District may fund up to 100% of the total estimated amount of taxes to be levied for storm water purposes through borrowings from the Storm Water Working Cash Fund. The District may issue bonds under Section 9.6a of the Act for purposes of funding storm water management projects.

Stormwater Working Cash Fund: The fund may be used solely for the financing of storm water management fund operations. The District may transfer funds into the storm water working cash fund, in an amount not to exceed 100% of the amount produced by multiplying the maximum tax rate permitted for storm water purposes by the last known assessed valuation of all taxable property within the territorial boundaries of the District, as equalized and determined for state and local taxes.

Personal Property Replacement Tax Anticipation Notes: Pursuant to 50 ILCS 420/4.1(e) General Obligation Personal Property Replacement Tax Anticipation Notes may be issued in anticipation of receipt of such taxes, in an amount not to exceed 75% of the last known certified Personal Property Replacement Tax entitlement less the aggregate amount of such entitlement which the governing body estimates will be required to be set aside for the payment of the proportional amount of debt service and pension or retirement obligations as required by Section 12 of "An Act in relation to State revenue sharing with local government entities", approved July 31, 1969, as amended.

District Debt Limitation: The maximum amount of debt which the District may have outstanding at any time is 5.75% of the last known equalized assessed valuation of taxable property within the District. See "Calculation of Statutory Debt Margin" below.

The foregoing are impacted by the Limitation Law. See "REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES – Property Tax Extension Limitation Law and Debt Reform Act."

Calculation of Statutory Debt Margin
(amounts in thousands)

	December 31				
	2010 ⁽¹⁾	2009	2008	2007	2006
Equalized Assessed Valuation	\$174,467,643	\$174,467,643	\$170,097,382	\$155,972,794	\$141,468,643
Statutory Debt Limit ⁽²⁾	10,031,889	10,031,889	9,780,599	8,968,436	8,134,447
Calculation of Debt Applicable to Debt Limit:					
Principal Amount of Bonds					
Outstanding.....	1,961,974	1,979,203	1,392,699	1,465,854	1,579,401
Bond Anticipation Notes ⁽³⁾	196,225	86,286	64,894	63,131	25,261
Capital lease	53,688	-	-	-	-
Liabilities of Tax Financed					
Funds.....	<u>50,019</u>	<u>50,924</u>	<u>47,735</u>	<u>43,783</u>	<u>31,934</u>
Total Debt	<u>2,261,906</u>	<u>2,116,413</u>	<u>1,505,328</u>	<u>1,572,768</u>	<u>1,636,596</u>
Less: Applicable Assets:					
Debt Service Funds Cash and Investments					
	\$88,710	\$88,849	\$89,397	\$77,599	\$108,814
Interest Payable in the Next 12 Months					
	<u>(92,619)</u>	<u>(59,873)</u>	<u>(73,103)</u>	<u>(68,877)</u>	<u>(69,111)</u>
Total Applicable Assets.....	<u>(3,909)</u>	<u>\$28,976</u>	<u>\$16,294</u>	<u>\$8,722</u>	<u>\$39,703</u>
Net Debt Applicable to Debt Limit	<u>2,265,815</u>	<u>2,087,437</u>	<u>1,489,034</u>	<u>1,564,046</u>	<u>1,596,893</u>
Statutory Debt Margin	<u>\$ 7,766,074</u>	<u>\$ 7,944,452</u>	<u>\$ 8,291,565</u>	<u>\$ 7,404,390</u>	<u>\$ 6,537,554</u>

- (1) Debt limit calculation based on 2009 equalized assessed valuation, 2010 value is not yet available.
(2) 5.75% of equalized assessed valuation.
(3) Consists of IEPA Preliminary Bonds.

CASH MANAGEMENT

Corporate Working Cash Fund

The delay of more than a year between appropriations and tax collections requires the District to provide interim financing for its corporate operations. A 1983 statutory change in the working cash fund's maximum limitation permitted expansion of the fund thereby allowing the District to use it as the sole outside source for funding corporate operating needs and making the future issuance of tax anticipation notes unnecessary. As of the date of this Official Statement, the District has no corporate notes outstanding.

By law, working cash funds are non-appropriable and all loans to the Corporate Fund must be repaid with tax receipts from the year against which such funds were borrowed, and any other available property tax and Personal Property Replacement Tax revenues received in the year. Illinois law provides that working cash fund loans not repaid within the second budget

year following the year in which the loans were made shall be general obligations of the Corporate Fund which must be repaid.

Debt Service Funds

For accounting and legal purposes, the District has created and maintains a debt service fund with sub-funds for each issue of its bonds. At the time of the sale of each issue, the applicable fund is credited with accrued interest plus any premium received by the District. Amounts credited to the District's various debt service funds are invested on a consolidated basis; but such investments and earnings thereon are recorded in the appropriate investment inventory of the applicable fund. Payment of principal of and interest on each issue of the District's bonds is made directly from the applicable debt service fund.

Property taxes collected are allocated among the debt service funds to achieve total distribution to each in the proportion of its levy to the total levy in that year for debt service. Distributions of Personal Property Replacement Tax revenue are credited to the District's Retirement Fund (as hereafter defined) as required by statute, the Corporate Fund, and certain other funds proportionately as specified by the annual budget.

Investment of District Funds

The District is committed to a policy of maximizing the return on all funds available for investment within the constraints of its Investment Policy. Tax levies necessary for the operation of the District are in effect reduced in direct relation to the income earned on investments.

The investments which the District may purchase are limited by Illinois law to the following: (1) securities which are fully guaranteed by the U.S. Government as to principal and interest; (2) certain U.S. Government Agency securities; (3) certificates of deposit or time deposits of banks and savings and loan associations which are insured by a Federal corporation; (4) short-term discount obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association; (5) certain short-term obligations of corporations (commercial paper) rated in the highest classifications by at least two of the major rating services; (6) fully collateralized repurchase agreements; (7) the State Treasurer's Illinois and Prime Funds; (8) money market mutual funds and certain other instruments; and (9) municipal bonds of the State, or of any other state, or of any political subdivisions thereof, whether interest is taxable or tax-exempt under federal law, rated within the four highest classifications by a major rating service. District policies require that repurchase agreements be collateralized only with direct U.S. Treasury securities that are maintained at a value of at least 102% of the investment amount (at market).

The District may invest funds in any of these categories over time, depending on their competitive interest rate structures. All certificates of deposit or time deposits are required to be collateralized with securities of the U.S. Government or letters of credit issued by the Federal Home Loan Bank in an amount equal to 105% or 102%, respectively, of the funds on deposit. All investment collateral is held in safekeeping in the District's name by financial institutions acting as the District's agent. Collateral is priced to market semi-monthly and monitored regularly with additional collateral requested as necessary.

The District attempts to match its investment maturities with anticipated cash flow requirements. All funds are invested for periods of one day to five years from date of purchase based upon cash flow requirements and interest rate projections. Investments are placed on the basis of bids received on a daily basis from banks and brokers.

Investments and Interest Income
(amounts in millions)

FUND	2011 ⁽¹⁾	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Interest Income:						
Corporate and Working Cash.....	\$ 2.1	\$ 1.9	\$ 1.2	\$ 4.4	\$ 8.9	\$ 8.1
Capital Improvement.....	7.1	5.7	4.0	15.9	29.5	23.2
Debt Service.....	0.2	0.3	1.0	3.1	5.3	8.8
Other	1.4	1.2	1.4	3.7	5.0	3.6
Total.....	<u>\$ 10.8</u>	<u>\$ 9.1</u>	<u>\$ 7.6</u>	<u>\$ 27.1</u>	<u>\$ 48.7</u>	<u>\$ 43.7</u>
Aggregate Investments Purchased (at Par)	<u>\$2,900.0</u>	<u>\$3,076.0</u>	<u>\$4,375.0</u>	<u>\$3,933.0</u>	<u>\$5,681.0</u>	<u>\$6,029.0</u>
Average Annual Return	<u>0.4%</u>	<u>0.6%</u>	<u>0.6%</u>	<u>2.6%</u>	<u>4.9%</u>	<u>5.0%</u>

(1) Estimated and unaudited, cash basis only.

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS - ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounting system of the District is operated and maintained on a fund accounting basis. A “fund” is defined as an independent fiscal and accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts recording cash and other financial resources, together with all related liabilities, and residual equities or balances and change therein, which are segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives in accordance with special regulations, restrictions or limitations.

The District’s General Corporate Fund, Special Revenue Fund, Debt Service Fund, Capital Projects Fund, and Stormwater Management Fund are maintained using the modified accrual basis of accounting. Under the modified accrual basis, revenues are recognized when measurable and available to finance operations. Expenditures, other than interest on long-term debt, are recorded at the time liabilities are incurred. District expenditures for the payment of principal and interest on long-term debt are recognized when such debt is due and payable.

The fiduciary funds of the District are the Retirement Fund and OPEB Trust Fund (as hereafter defined). The Funds’ financial statements are prepared using the accrual basis of accounting with assets recorded at market value.

Property taxes, user charge revenues and personal property replacement taxes are accrued to the extent that they are available to satisfy liabilities relating to the reporting period.

The District uses the modified approach to report its infrastructure assets, with the exception of the District’s TARP deep tunnels, drop shafts, main office buildings and certain

intangible assets (as defined in GASB 51) which are depreciated. The District has implemented all applicable Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements through Statement No. 54.

RETIREMENT FUND

General

The District provides funding for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Retirement Fund (the "*Retirement Fund*"), which is established by and administered under Article 13 of the Illinois Pension Code (the "*Pension Code*"). The Retirement Fund's goal is to provide retirement annuities, death and disability benefits for certain employees of the District and employees of the Retirement Fund.

The Retirement Fund is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees (the "*Retirement Fund Board*"). The Retirement Fund Board is composed of four member-elected trustees and three appointed trustees, one of whom is a retiree. The Retirement Fund Board is authorized by the Pension Code to make investments, pay benefits, hire staff and consultants and perform all functions necessary for operation of the Retirement Fund. The Retirement Fund operates pursuant to the authority granted by the Illinois State Legislature, including the defined benefits and the employer and employee contribution levels that are set forth in the Pension Code and that may be amended or terminated only by the Illinois State Legislature.

As of December 31, 2010, the end of the Retirement Fund's fiscal year, the Retirement Fund had a total membership of 4,404, consisting of 2,024 active employees, 2,248 retirees and beneficiaries currently receiving benefits, and 132 inactive employees entitled to benefits or a refund of contributions.

The Retirement Fund is a single-employer, defined benefit public employee retirement system. "Single-employer" refers to the fact that there is a single plan sponsor, in this case, the District. "Defined benefit" refers to the fact that the Retirement Fund pays a periodic benefit to retired employees and survivors in a fixed amount determined at the time of retirement. The amount of the periodic benefit is generally determined pursuant to a statutory formula on the basis of the employee's service credits and salary. Eligible employees receive the defined benefit on a periodic basis for life, along with certain benefits to spouses and children that survive the death of the employee.

To fund the benefits to be paid by the Retirement Fund, both employees and the District make contributions. Generally, employees contribute a fixed percentage of their annual salary and the District contributes an amount levied annually in accordance with a formula set forth in the Pension Code that, when combined with the projected investment earnings on plan assets, is sufficient to pay the benefits under the pension plan. See "Determination of Employer Contributions" below. District employees are required to contribute 9.0% of their salary to the Retirement Fund.

Section 5 of Article XIII of the Illinois Constitution provides that “[m]embership in any pension retirement system of the State, any unit of local government or school district, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, shall be an enforceable contractual relationship, the benefits of which shall not be diminished or impaired.” The benefits available under the Retirement Fund accrue throughout the time a member is employed by the District or by the Retirement Fund. Although benefits accrue during employment, certain age and service requirements must be achieved for an employee to receive a retirement or survivor’s periodic defined benefit payment upon retirement or termination from the District.

The Retirement Fund Board manages the investments of the Retirement Fund. The Retirement Fund’s investment authority is established by and subject to the provisions of State law. The Retirement Fund Board invests the Retirement Fund’s assets in accordance with the “prudent person” rule and the Retirement Fund’s formal investment policy, which requires members of the Retirement Fund Board, who are fiduciaries of the Retirement Fund, to discharge their duties with the care, prudence and diligence that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with such matters would use in a similar situation. In carrying out this duty, the Retirement Fund Board, acting upon the advice of an investment consultant who has acknowledged a fiduciary status, appoints and monitors investment managers, acting as fiduciaries, to manage the investment assets of the Retirement Fund. Such investment managers are granted discretionary authority to manage the Retirement Fund’s assets in accordance with the prudent person rule. Additional information regarding the Retirement Fund’s investments and investment management may be found on the Retirement Fund’s website at www.mwrdrf.org, but the content of such website is not incorporated into this Official Statement by reference. See also “APPENDIX C—Report of the Consulting Actuary on the District Retirement Fund” (the “*Actuary’s Report*”). Table 1 provides information on the investment returns experienced by the Retirement Fund for the period 2001 through 2010.

Table 1 - Investment Rates of Return, 2001-2010⁽¹⁾

	INVESTMENT RETURN ⁽²⁾
2001	-1.4%
2002	-6.9%
2003	18.9%
2004	9.4%
2005	4.9%
2006	9.6%
2007	5.4%
2008	-25.5%
2009	23.1%
2010	15.9%
5-YR. RETURN ⁽³⁾	4.2%
10-YR RETURN ⁽³⁾	4.4%

Source: The Retirement Fund.

- (1) For all fiscal years after fiscal year 2001, the Retirement Fund has assumed, for actuarial purposes, an investment rate of return of 7.75%. Prior to fiscal year 2002, the Retirement Fund's assumed investment rate of return was 8.00%. See "Actuarial Assumptions" herein.
- (2) Investment returns are reported net of investment fees, except for 2008.
- (3) Annualized.

Determination of Employer Contributions

Actuaries and the Actuarial Process

Under the Pension Code, the District's contributions to fund the Retirement Fund are determined pursuant to a statutory formula on an annual basis. Actuaries use demographic data (such as employee age, salary and service credits), economic assumptions (such as estimated salary and interest rates), and decrement assumptions (such as employee turnover, mortality and retirement rates) to determine the amount that an employer is required to contribute in a given year to provide sufficient funds to a pension plan to pay benefits when due. The actuary then produces a report, called the "*Actuarial Valuation*," in which the actuary reports on such pension plan's assets, liabilities and the following fiscal year's Actuarially Required Contribution (as defined below). The Retirement Fund's Actuarial Valuations are publicly available and may be obtained from the Retirement Fund and certain of these Actuarial Valuations are available on the Retirement Fund's website, www.mwrdrf.org; *provided, however*, that the content of these reports and such website is not incorporated by reference herein.

The Actuarial Valuation

The primary purpose of the Actuarial Valuation is to determine the recommended amount the District should contribute to the Retirement Fund in a given fiscal year (the "*Actuarially Required Contribution*")[†] to satisfy its current and future obligations to pay benefits to eligible members of the Retirement Fund. The Actuarially Required Contribution consists of two components: (1) the portion of the present value of retirement benefits that are allocable to active members' current year of service, termed the "*Normal Cost*" and (2) an amortized portion of any UAAL (as hereinafter defined) sufficient to eliminate the UAAL over a period of time.

To determine the Actuarially Required Contribution, the actuary calculates both the "*Actuarial Accrued Liability*" and the "*Actuarial Value of Assets*." The Actuarial Accrued Liability is an estimate of the present value of the benefits the Retirement Fund must pay to current and retired employees as a result of their employment with the District and participation in the Retirement Fund. See "Calculation of Employer Contributions to the Retirement Fund Under the Pension Code" below. The Actuarial Accrued Liability is calculated by use of a variety of demographic and other data (such as employee age, salary and service credits) and

[†] GASB (as hereinafter defined) pronouncements refer to this concept as the Annual Required Contribution. For the convenience of the reader, this disclosure refers to the concept as the Actuarially Required Contribution to denote the fact that the Actuarially Required Contribution is the amount an actuary would require the District to contribute in a given year, to differentiate it from the amount the District will be permitted to contribute under applicable law.

various assumptions (such as estimated salary increases, interest rates, employee turnover, mortality and disability rates). The Actuarial Value of Assets reflects the value of the investments and other assets held by the Retirement Fund. Various methods exist for calculating the Actuarial Value of Assets and the Actuarial Accrued Liability. For a discussion of the methods and assumptions used to calculate the Retirement Fund's Actuarial Accrued Liability and Actuarial Value of Assets, see "Actuarial Methods" and "Actuarial Assumptions" below.

Any shortfall between the Actuarial Value of Assets and the Actuarial Accrued Liability is referred to as the "*Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability*" or "*UAAL*." The UAAL represents the present value of benefits earned to date that are not covered by plan assets. In addition, the actuary will compute the "*Funded Ratio*," which is equal to the ratio of the Actuarial Value of Assets to the Actuarial Accrued Liability, expressed as a percentage. The Funded Ratio and the UAAL are used to measure the financial health of a pension plan. An increasing UAAL or a decreasing Funded Ratio from year to year signals a deterioration in the financial health of a pension plan because it indicates the incurrence of additional liability without a corresponding increase in assets necessary to pay those additional liabilities. Conversely, a decreasing UAAL or an increasing Funded Ratio indicates an improvement in the financial health of a pension plan because such a change reflects the closing of the gap between the liabilities accrued by the pension plan and the assets necessary to pay those liabilities when they become due.

Calculation of Employer Contributions to the Retirement Fund Under the Pension Code

The actuary uses the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the Actuarial Value of Assets, the UAAL and the Normal Cost to compute the Actuarially Required Contribution. However, with respect to the Retirement Fund, the District's ability to contribute the Actuarially Required Contribution in any given fiscal year is limited by the Pension Code. The Pension Code provides that District contributions to the Retirement Fund are to be made from the proceeds of an annual levy of taxes (the "*Pension Levy*") by the District for such purpose. The Pension Levy is levied solely for the purpose of contributing to the Retirement Fund, and such levy is separate and distinct from all other taxes levied by the District. The amount of the Pension Levy may not exceed 2.19 times (the "*Multiplier*")[†] the amount contributed by the District's employees two years prior to the year in which the tax is levied (the "*Contribution Limitation*"). In the event that the Actuarially Required Contribution is lower than the Contribution Limitation, the District will levy a tax equal to the Actuarially Required Contribution.

The Retirement Fund's Actuarially Required Contribution is equal to its Normal Cost plus a 30-year level percent of payroll amortization of any UAAL. This method of calculating the Actuarially Required Contribution is acceptable under the standards promulgated by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("*GASB*"). However, the amount of contribution generated through application of the Contribution Limitation may not conform to GASB standards in certain situations because it may operate to prevent the District from contributing

[†] Beginning in 2003 through 2007, the Multiplier did not apply to employee contributions made to the optional plan provided for under the Pension Code for which the tax levy is made on a dollar for dollar basis.

normal cost plus an amount necessary to amortize the UAAL. See “History of Contributions to the Retirement Fund” below.

Actuarial Methods

The Retirement Fund’s actuaries employ a variety of actuarial methods to arrive at the Actuarial Value of Assets and the Actuarial Accrued Liability.

Actuarial Value of Assets

The Actuarial Value of Assets measures the value of the assets available in the pension plan to pay benefits. In calculating the Actuarial Value of Assets, the Retirement Fund recognizes investment gains and losses on such assets equally over a five-year period. This method of valuation is called the “*Asset Smoothing Method.*” Under the Asset Smoothing Method, the Retirement Fund will recognize in the current year 20% of the investment gain or loss realized in each of the previous four years. The Asset Smoothing Method, which is a method for determining the Actuarial Value of Assets approved by GASB, prevents extreme fluctuations in the Actuarial Value of Assets, the UAAL and the Funded Ratio that may otherwise occur as a result of market volatility. However, asset smoothing delays recognition of gains and losses, thereby providing an Actuarial Value of Assets that does not reflect the true value of pension plan assets at the time of measurement. As a result, presenting the Actuarial Value of Assets as determined under the Asset Smoothing Method might provide a more or less favorable presentation of the current financial position of a pension plan than would a method that recognizes investment gains and losses annually. Table 2 provides a comparison of the Retirement Fund’s assets on a fair value basis and after application of the Asset Smoothing Method.

Table 2 - Asset Smoothed Value of Assets vs. Fair Value of Net Assets⁽¹⁾

FISCAL YEAR	ACTUARIAL VALUE OF ASSETS ⁽²⁾	FAIR VALUE OF NET ASSETS	ACTUARIAL VALUE AS A PERCENTAGE OF FAIR VALUE
2001	\$1,155,825	\$1,044,144	110.70%
2002	1,136,907	949,796	119.70%
2003	1,146,521	1,088,406	105.34%
2004	1,161,779	1,150,768	100.96%
2005	1,171,845	1,159,313	101.08%
2006	1,209,602	1,223,297	98.88%
2007	1,256,890	1,232,068	102.01%
2008	1,211,838	878,797	137.90%
2009	1,177,810	1,014,819	116.06%
2010	1,151,595	1,092,648	105.39%

Source: The Retirement Fund.

(1) In thousands of dollars.

(2) The Actuarial Value of Assets is calculated through use of the Asset Smoothing Method.

Actuarial Accrued Liability

As the final step in the Actuarial Valuation, the actuary applies a cost method assigning portions of the total value of benefits to past, present and future periods of employee service. This allocation is accomplished by the development of normal cost and the Actuarial Accrued Liability. The Retirement Fund uses the entry age normal actuarial cost method (the “*Entry Age Normal Method*”) with costs allocated on the basis of earnings. The Entry Age Normal Method is a GASB-approved actuarial cost method.

Under the Entry Age Normal Method, the present value of the projected pension of each member is assumed to be funded by annual installments, equal to a level percent of the member’s earnings for each year between entry age and assumed exit age. The Normal Cost for the member for the current year is equal to the portion of the value so determined, assigned to the current year. Therefore, the “Normal Cost” for the plan for the year is the sum of the normal costs of all active members.

The Actuarial Accrued Liability is the portion of the present value of benefits assigned by the cost method to years of service up to the valuation date or, in other words, for past service. This value changes as the member’s salary and years of service change, and as some members leave and are replaced by new members. Future normal cost is the portion of the present value of benefits assigned to future years of service and is assumed to be funded annually.

Actuarial Assumptions

The Retirement Fund’s actuaries use a variety of assumptions to calculate the Actuarial Accrued Liability and the Actuarial Value of Assets. These assumptions generally fall into two categories: (i) economic assumptions, such as estimated salary increases and interest rates; and (ii) decrement assumptions, such as employee turnover, mortality and retirement rates. The assumptions used by the Retirement Fund are based on the experience of the Retirement Fund and are formally adopted by the Retirement Fund Board upon recommendation by the Retirement Fund’s actuary. No assurance can be given that any of the assumptions underlying the Actuarial Valuations will reflect the actual results experienced by the Retirement Fund. Variances between the assumptions and actual results may cause an increase or decrease in the Actuarial Value of Assets, the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the UAAL, the Funded Ratio or the Actuarially Required Contribution.

Additional information on the Retirement Fund’s actuarial assumptions is available in the Retirement Fund’s Actuarial Valuation. Certain of the Retirement Fund’s actuarial assumptions in the current year’s Actuarial Valuation are as follows:

- Mortality rate assumptions: for male participants, were made using the UP-1994 Mortality Table for Males, rated down two years; and for female participants, were made using the UP-1994 Mortality Table for Females, rated down one year;

- Salary increases were assumed to be 5.0% per year, compounded annually;
- The investment rate of return was assumed to be 7.75% per year compounded annually;
- 76% of participants were assumed to be married; and
- Spouses of male employees were assumed to be four years younger than the employee and spouses of female employees were assumed to be four years older than the employee.

Funded Status of the Retirement Fund

The Pension Code requires that the District fund the Retirement Fund through the levy, collection and contribution of the Pension Levy. The District contributes to the Retirement Fund a percentage of the Pension Levy equal to the percentage actually collected by the District from its separate total annual levy. For fiscal years prior to 2005, the District reduced its contribution to the Retirement Fund by an assumed 13% loss in collecting the Pension Levy. For fiscal years 2005 and after, the District reduced its contribution to the Retirement Fund by an assumed 3.5% loss in collecting the Pension Levy. These reductions in contribution to the Retirement Fund had the effect of increasing the Retirement Fund's UAAL and decreasing its Funded Ratio.

In each year, the District has contributed to the Retirement Fund as required by the Pension Code in any year. Despite the District making the maximum contribution allowed by the Pension Code, the Retirement Fund's UAAL has continued to rise and the Retirement Fund's Funded Ratio has continued to decline. The District has experienced these changes in the UAAL and the Funded Ratio in large part due to the Contribution Limitation, which limits the Pension Levy to an amount insufficient to fully fund the Retirement Fund to the amount of the Actuarially Required Contribution.

Table 3 provides information on the Actuarially Required Contribution, the District's actual contributions in accordance with the Pension Code, the percentage of the Actuarially Required Contribution made in each year and the Multiplier that would have been necessary in each year to allow the District to contribute the Actuarially Required Contribution for each year 2001 through 2010.

Table 3 - History of Contributions⁽¹⁾

FISCAL YEAR	ACTUARIALLY REQUIRED CONTRIBUTION	ACTUAL EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION	PERCENTAGE OF ACTUARIALLY REQUIRED CONTRIBUTION CONTRIBUTED	ESTIMATED MULTIPLIER NECESSARY TO MATCH ACTUARIALLY REQUIRED CONTRIBUTION
2001	\$28,553	\$28,027	98.16%	2.30
2002	33,415	30,067	89.98%	2.68
2003	38,039	28,779	75.66%	2.92
2004	40,146	30,982	77.17%	2.83
2005	43,165	26,174	60.64%	3.64
2006	47,369	34,476	72.78%	3.76
2007	47,090	27,947	59.35%	3.40
2008	49,758	33,407	67.14%	3.48
2009	54,790	32,154	58.69%	3.68
2010	61,873	29,918	48.35%	4.19

Sources: The Retirement Fund.

(1) In thousands of dollars.

(2) The District has levied a tax, which is in the process of collection. The actual employer contribution, which will come from that levy, cannot be determined until the levy has been collected.

As of the end of fiscal year 2010, the Retirement Fund had an aggregate UAAL of approximately \$885.085 million on an actuarial basis (using the Asset Smoothing Method) and \$944.032 million on a fair value basis. The respective Funded Ratios for these UAALs are 56.5% and 53.6%. The dramatic increase in the Retirement Fund's UAAL and the decrease in its Funded Ratio beginning in fiscal year 2008 correlates directly to the severe global economic downturn. The downturn had a significant impact on the value of the Retirement Fund's investments and, as such, the value of the assets available to the Retirement Fund. The impact of the economic downturn on the District and the Retirement Fund was similar to the experience of other governmental entities during the same period of time.

The following tables summarize the current financial condition and the funding progress of the Retirement Fund.

TABLE 4
FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE RETIREMENT FUND
FISCAL YEARS 2001-2010
(\$ IN THOUSANDS)

FISCAL YEAR	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Beginning Net Assets (Fair Value)	\$1,080,619	\$1,044,144	\$949,796	\$1,088,406	\$1,150,768	\$1,159,313	\$1,223,297	\$1,232,068	\$878,797	\$1,014,819
Income										
- Employee Contributions	14,987	16,308	14,230	15,151	14,468	14,955	15,628	14,778	15,690	15,873
- Employer Contributions	28,027	30,067	28,779	30,982	26,174	34,476	27,947	33,407	32,154	29,918
- Investment Income ⁽¹⁾	(15,217)	(69,628)	171,012	96,902	53,777	106,512	62,463	(299,744)	194,068	142,662
- Miscellaneous Income ⁽²⁾	<u>114</u>	<u>(1,403)</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>253</u>
Total	\$27,910	\$(24,656)	\$214,032	\$143,039	\$94,424	\$155,946	\$106,246	\$(250,957)	\$241,920	\$188,705
Expenditures										
- Benefits	62,542	67,574	73,231	78,113	83,293	89,079	94,846	100,069	103,405	108,219
- Refunds	702	952	1,042	1,321	1,288	1,411	1,164	965	1,175	1,380
- Administration	<u>1,141</u>	<u>1,166</u>	<u>1,149</u>	<u>1,243</u>	<u>1,299</u>	<u>1,472</u>	<u>1,465</u>	<u>1,280</u>	<u>1,319</u>	<u>1,277</u>
Total	<u>\$64,385</u>	<u>\$69,692</u>	<u>\$75,422</u>	<u>\$80,677</u>	<u>\$85,879</u>	<u>\$91,962</u>	<u>\$97,475</u>	<u>\$102,314</u>	<u>\$105,898</u>	<u>\$110,876</u>
Ending Net Assets (Fair Value)	\$1,044,144	\$949,796	\$1,088,406	\$1,150,768	\$1,159,313	\$1,223,297	\$1,232,068	\$878,797	\$1,014,819	\$1,092,648
Actuarial Value of Assets ⁽³⁾	\$1,155,825	\$1,136,907	\$1,146,521	\$1,161,779	\$1,171,845	\$1,209,602	\$1,256,890	\$1,211,838	\$1,177,810	\$1,151,595
Actuarial Accrued Liabilities	\$1,346,223	\$1,470,939	\$1,517,869	\$1,578,367	\$1,654,188	\$1,724,705	\$1,795,177	\$1,852,280	\$1,939,172	\$2,036,680
UAAL (Fair Value) ⁽⁴⁾	\$302,079	\$521,143	\$429,462	\$427,598	\$494,875	\$501,408	\$563,108	\$973,482	\$924,353	\$944,032
UAAL (Actuarial Value) ⁽³⁾	\$190,398	\$334,032	\$371,348	\$416,588	\$482,344	\$515,103	\$538,287	\$640,441	\$761,362	\$885,085
Funded Ratio (Fair Value) ⁽⁴⁾	77.6%	64.6%	71.7%	72.9%	70.1%	70.9%	68.6%	47.4%	52.3%	53.6%
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value) ⁽³⁾	85.9%	77.3%	75.5%	73.6%	70.8%	70.1%	70.0%	65.4%	60.7%	56.5%

Source: The Retirement Fund (Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports of the Retirement Fund). Table may not add due to rounding. For additional information, see the Actuary's Report.

(1) Investment income is shown net of fees and expenses.

(2) Beginning in fiscal year 2007, includes income from the Retirement Fund's securities lending program. For more information, see Note 6 to the Financial Statements in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the Retirement Fund for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2010.

(3) The actuarial value is determined by application of the Asset Smoothing Method as discussed in "Actuarial Methods—Actuarial Value of Assets" above.

(4) Calculated using net assets.

TABLE 5
SCHEDULE OF FUNDING PROGRESS
FISCAL YEARS 2001-2010
(\$ IN THOUSANDS)

FISCAL YEAR	ACTUARIAL ACCRUED LIABILITY	ACTUARIAL VALUE OF ASSETS ⁽¹⁾	FAIR VALUE OF NET ASSETS	UAAL (ACTUARIAL) ⁽²⁾	UAAL (FAIR VALUE) ⁽³⁾	FUNDED RATIO (ACTUARIAL) ⁽²⁾	FUNDED RATIO (FAIR VALUE) ⁽³⁾	PAYROLL	UAAL TO PAYROLL (ACTUARIAL) ⁽²⁾	UAAL TO PAYROLL (FAIR VALUE) ⁽³⁾
2001	\$1,346,223	\$1,155,825	\$1,044,144	\$190,398	\$302,079	85.9%	77.6%	\$136,382	139.6%	221.5%
2002	1,470,939	1,136,907	949,796	334,032	521,143	77.3%	64.6%	137,680	242.6%	378.5%
2003	1,517,869	1,146,521	1,088,406	371,348	429,462	75.5%	71.7%	142,594	260.4%	301.2%
2004	1,578,367	1,161,779	1,150,768	416,588	427,598	73.6%	72.9%	146,360	284.6%	292.2%
2005	1,654,188	1,171,845	1,159,313	482,344	494,875	70.8%	70.1%	149,246	323.2%	331.6%
2006	1,724,705	1,209,602	1,223,297	515,103	501,408	70.1%	70.9%	152,767	337.2%	328.2%
2007	1,795,177	1,256,890	1,232,068	538,287	563,108	70.0%	68.6%	158,832	338.9%	354.5%
2008	1,852,280	1,211,838	878,797	640,441	973,482	65.4%	47.4%	167,865	381.5%	579.9%
2009	1,939,172	1,177,810	1,014,819	761,362	924,353	60.7%	52.3%	176,915	430.4%	522.5%
2010	2,036,680	1,151,595	1,092,648	885,085	944,032	56.5%	53.6%	174,486	507.3%	541.0%

Source: The Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports of the Retirement Fund for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2002, through December 31, 2010. For additional information, see the Actuary's Report.

- (1) The actuarial value is determined by application of the Asset Smoothing Method as discussed in "Actuarial Methods—*Actuarial Value of Assets*" above.
- (2) For purposes of this column, "Actuarial" refers to the fact that the calculation was made using the Actuarial Value of Assets.
- (3) For purposes of this column, "Fair Value" refers to the fact that the calculation was made using the Fair Value of Net Assets.

The cumulative value of the annual differences between the District’s contribution to the Retirement Fund and the Actuarially Required Contribution is referred to as its “*Net Pension Obligation*” or its “*Net Pension Asset*.” If the cumulative difference between the District’s Retirement Fund contribution and the Actuarially Required Contribution is positive, the District would have a Net Pension Asset. Conversely, if the cumulative difference is negative, the District would have a Net Pension Obligation.

In any year that the District fulfills its obligation to contribute to the Retirement Fund under the Pension Code, the District will have a Net Pension Obligation for such year equal to the shortfall resulting from the difference between the amount contributed pursuant to the Pension Levy and the Actuarially Required Contribution. The Pension Levy and the Actuarially Required Contribution differ in any given year as a result of the Contribution Limitation, as discussed in “Calculation of Employer Contributions to the Retirement Fund Under the Pension Code” above. Table 6 provides a schedule of the total Net Pension Obligation or Net Pension Asset at the end of each of the last ten fiscal years.

Table 6 - Net Pension Obligation⁽¹⁾

FISCAL YEAR	NET PENSION ASSET/ (OBLIGATION)
2001	\$ 65,564
2002	60,473
2003	52,572
2004	44,589
2005	28,602
2006	16,353
2007	(2,423)
2008	(18,829)
2009	(41,889)
2010	(74,786)

Sources: The District (Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports of the District).

(1) In thousands of dollars.

A variety of factors impact the Retirement Fund’s UAAL and Funded Ratio. Increases in member salary and benefits, a lower return on investment than that assumed by the Retirement Fund, and insufficient contributions when compared to the Normal Cost plus interest will all cause an increase in the UAAL and a decrease in the Funded Ratio. Conversely, decreases in member salary and benefits, a higher return on investment than assumed, and employer contributions in excess of Normal Cost plus interest will decrease the UAAL and increase the funded ratio. In addition, changes in actuarial assumptions and certain other factors will have an impact on the UAAL and the Funded Ratio. The UAAL increased between the end of fiscal year 2009 and the end of fiscal year 2010 primarily as a result of investment returns below the

assumed rate of return and insufficient District contributions as compared to the Actuarially Required Contribution, as set forth in Table 7 below.

Table 7 - Components of Change in Unfunded Liability⁽¹⁾

FISCAL YEAR	SALARY INCREASES/ (DECREASES)	INVESTMENT RETURNS (HIGHER)/LOWER THAN ASSUMED	EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS HIGHER/(LOWER) THAN NORMAL COST PLUS INTEREST ⁽²⁾	LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS	CHANGES IN ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS	OTHER FACTORS ⁽³⁾	TOTAL CHANGE IN UNFUNDED LIABILITY
2001	\$ 7,893	\$ 21,245	\$ (983)	\$ 3,792	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ 33,556
2002	2,081	85,695	1,786	10,976	41,663	1,433	143,634
2003	(134)	44,863	15,812	-	(38,915)	15,691	37,316
2004	(5,428)	37,744	16,460	-	-	(3,535)	45,240
2005	(4,928)	33,020	25,174	-	-	12,490	65,756
2006	(2,688)	8,916	22,369	-	(4,786)	8,949	32,760
2007	4,365	(9,437)	29,263	-	-	(1,008)	23,183
2008	1,117	86,292	26,927	-	(22,900)	10,718	147,954
2009	2,554	67,693	35,218	-	-	15,455	120,921
2010	<u>(20,417)</u>	<u>49,970</u>	<u>46,823</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>39,769</u>	<u>7,577</u>	<u>123,723</u>
TOTAL	\$ (15,587)	\$426,000	\$218,849	\$14,768	\$14,831	\$69,381	\$728,242

Source: The Retirement Fund. Totals may not add due to rounding.

(1) In millions.

(2) To determine whether employer contributions represented an increase or decrease in UAAL, such contributions are measured against contributions based on the Normal Cost plus interest. If employer contributions exceed Normal Cost plus interest, the UAAL will decrease. If employer contributions are less than Normal Cost plus interest, the UAAL will increase.

(3) "Other Factors" consists of the following miscellaneous experience of the Retirement Fund: changes in liabilities related to optional retirement, retirement in general, mortality, reciprocal annuities, death and employee withdrawal from service.

Recent Legislative Changes

The Retirement Fund has not experienced significant legislative benefit increases since 2002.

On April 14, 2010, the Governor of the State signed Public Act 96-0889 (the "*Pension Reform Act*") into law. The Pension Reform Act establishes a "two-tier" benefit system with less generous benefits for employees who become members of the Retirement Fund on or after January 1, 2011, as compared to those provided to employees prior to such date. Among other changes, the Pension Reform Act:

- Increases the time required for pension benefits to vest to ten years from five years;
- Increases the minimum age at which an active employee may retire with unreduced benefits to age 67 from age 60 or younger based on a formula combining the age of the employee and the number of years of service;
- Increases the minimum age at which an active employee may retire with reduced benefits to age 62 from age 50;
- Reduces the cost of living adjustment to the lower of 3% or 50% of the change in the consumer price index for all urban consumers, whichever is lower, and eliminates

- compounding for employees hired after January 1, 2011, from a cost of living adjustment of 3%, compounded; and
- Caps the salary on which a pension may be calculated at \$106,800 (subject to certain adjustments for inflation).

The Pension Reform Act does not impact persons that first became members or participants prior to its effective date of January 1, 2011.

Taken independently of any other legislative or market effects, the reduced benefits afforded new hires by the Pension Reform Act is expected to reduce the growth in the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the UAAL and the Actuarially Required Contribution. In calculating the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the actuaries make assumptions about future benefit levels. As the value of future benefits decreases, as will occur when a greater percentage of the District's workforce is covered by the Pension Reform Act, the Actuarial Accrued Liability is expected to decrease. Consequently, the UAAL is expected to decrease and the Funded Ratio to improve. As the growth in the UAAL slows, the Actuarially Required Contribution is expected to be reduced as the amount of UAAL to be amortized decreases. However, no assurance can be given that these expectations will be the actual experience of the Retirement Fund going forward.

Projection of Funded Status

The funding level for the Retirement Fund has decreased most notably in recent years due to a combination of factors, including the following: adverse market conditions and investment returns as a result of the financial downturn experienced in 2008; and District contributions that are lower than the Actuarially Required Contribution due to the Contribution Limitation. The declining Funded Ratios that the Retirement Fund has experienced in recent years are similar to the funding challenges faced by other large governmental pension funds in the United States. The District recognizes its responsibility to the employees' retirement program and is currently working with the Retirement Fund Board to propose solutions that would improve the funded ratio of the Retirement Fund. The Retirement Fund's consulting actuary has been engaged to provide projections that estimate the increase in funding required to return the Retirement Fund to a funding status of at least 80%.

Table 8 provides a projection of the Actuarial Value of Assets, the Actuarial Accrued Liability, the UAAL and the Funded Ratio until 2020.

Table 8 - Projection of Future Funding Status⁽¹⁾

FISCAL YEAR	ACTUARIAL ACCRUED LIABILITY (a)	ACTUARIAL VALUE OF ASSETS ⁽²⁾ (b)	UNFUNDED ACCRUED ACTUARIAL LIABILITIES (UAAL) (a-b)	FUNDED RATIO (b/a)
2011	\$2,109.2	\$1,118.3	\$ 990.9	53.0%
2012	2,180.9	1,084.6	1,096.3	49.7%
2013	2,252.7	1,122.1	1,130.6	49.8%
2014	2,324.6	1,138.2	1,186.4	49.0%
2015	2,395.8	1,140.5	1,255.3	47.6%
2016	2,466.4	1,139.1	1,327.3	46.2%
2017	2,536.0	1,133.0	1,403.0	44.7%
2018	2,604.4	1,122.2	1,482.2	43.1%
2019	2,670.5	1,105.2	1,565.3	41.4%
2020	2,734.8	1,082.4	1,652.4	39.6%

Source: Goldstein & Associates, Chicago, Illinois. Goldstein & Associates serves as consulting actuary to the Retirement Fund.

(1) In millions of dollars. These projections are based on the legislative structure in place as of the date of this Official Statement and assume *no* changes to such legislative structure.

(2) The actuarial value is determined by application of the Asset Smoothing Method as discussed in "Actuarial Methods—Actuarial Value of Assets" above.

The projections in Table 8 are based upon numerous variables that are subject to change, and are forward-looking statements regarding future events based on the Retirement Fund's actuarial assumptions and assumptions made regarding such future events, including that there are no changes to the current legislative structure. No assurance can be given that these assumptions will be realized or that actual events will not cause material changes to the data presented. As shown in Table 8, based on the current legislative structure, including the Pension Reform Act, the Retirement Fund's actuary projects that the Retirement Fund will experience a 39.6% Funded Ratio by the end of fiscal year 2020. The actuary is projecting a continual decrease in the funding level of the Retirement Fund beyond 2020 based upon the 2010 Actuarial Valuation. The lack of any corrective action by the District jeopardizes the solvency of the Retirement Fund.

The District recognizes that legislative changes are necessary to properly fund the Retirement Fund and is exploring the options available for rectifying this funding problem. These solutions include increases to both the employee and employer contributions to the Retirement Fund. Some of the solutions may require legislative changes to the Act and the Pension Code to allow for increased contributions to the Retirement Fund. As such, the District plans to present possible solutions to the Illinois General Assembly for consideration during the fall 2011 veto session. In the event that such a proposal is brought before the Illinois General Assembly, no assurance can be given that such a proposal will be enacted.

Source of Information

The information contained herein relies on information produced by the Retirement Fund, their independent accountants and its independent actuaries (the “*Source Information*”). The information presented herein is presented on the basis of the Source Information. The District has not independently verified the Source Information and makes no representations nor expresses any opinion as to the accuracy of the Source Information.

The comprehensive annual financial report of the Retirement Fund for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2001 through December 31, 2010, and the Actuarial Valuations of the Retirement Fund for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2001 through December 31, 2010, may be obtained by contacting the Retirement Fund. The majority of these reports are also available on the Retirement Fund’s website at www.mwrdrf.org; *provided, however*, that the content of these reports and such website is not incorporated by reference herein.

Additional information on the Retirement Fund is available in the Actuary’s Report, attached as Appendix C to this Official Statement.

OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Metropolitan Water Reclamation District’s Retiree Health Care Plan (the “*OPEB Plan*”) is a single-employer defined benefit post-employment health care plan that covers eligible retired employees of the District. The OPEB Plan, which is administered by the District, allows employees who retire and meet certain eligibility requirements to continue medical and prescription drug coverage as a participant in the OPEB Plan. Spouses and dependents of eligible retirees are also eligible for medical coverage. All employees of the District are eligible to receive post-employment health care benefits. Lifetime coverage for retirees and their spouses and dependents is provided. As of December 31, 2010, there were 2,116 active employees and 2,776 retirees and beneficiaries receiving health care coverage.

The funding of the OPEB Plan is accomplished in two parts. The District (i) pays the current year’s retiree health care claim payments and insurance premiums from operating funds of the District on a pay-as-you-go basis, and (ii) contributes an advance funding amount to the OPEB Trust Fund (as defined below). The OPEB Trust Fund was established to advance fund benefits provided under the OPEB Plan. Currently, benefit payments and premiums are not paid from the OPEB Trust Fund, as described below.

In 2007, the District established the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Retiree Health Care Trust (the “*OPEB Trust Fund*”) and adopted a funding policy (the “*OPEB Funding Policy*”) that is meant to (i) improve the District’s financial position by reducing the amount of future employer contributions and (ii) serve to establish a reserve to help ensure the financial ability to provide healthcare coverage for District retirees and annuitants in the future. The OPEB Trust Fund is considered a component unit of the District and, as such, is included in the District’s financial statements as a retiree health care trust fund.

Pursuant to Section 9.6d of the Act, the Board has discretionary authority to determine contribution amounts to be paid by the District into the OPEB Trust Fund. The OPEB Funding Policy includes a target funded ratio (as described below) of 50% with an expected funding period of 50 years (beginning in 2007), with \$50,000,000 to be contributed by the end of 2011. Through June 30, 2011, \$50,000,000 has been contributed by the District to the OPEB Trust Fund and the OPEB Funding Policy goal of funding \$10,000,000 in each of the first five years (beginning in 2007) for an aggregate of \$50,000,000 by the end of 2011 has been met. Contributions were not made ratably by the District over the five year period due to the availability of funds: in 2007, \$25,000,000 was contributed; in 2008, \$22,000,000 was contributed; in 2009 and 2010, no contributions were made; and in 2011, \$3,000,000 was contributed. There is currently no requirement for the District to partially or fully fund the OPEB Trust Fund and any funding is on a voluntary basis.

It is projected that the OPEB Trust Fund will begin to pay claims in 2037 using the investment redemptions of the funding contributions made by the District. While there are no legal restrictions on utilizing the assets in the OPEB Trust Fund to pay benefits claims by the District until 2037, all benefit claim payments prior to that date are anticipated be paid directly by the District on a pay-as-you-go basis from operating funds of the District.

As of December 31, 2009 (the most recent actuarial valuation date), the funded ratio for the OPEB Plan was 9.1% and the unfunded actuarial accrued liability was \$478,585,000. The funded ratio is the ratio of actuarial value of assets to the actuarial liability and is a measure of the ability of the OPEB Plan to pay all future benefits from the assets held in the OPEB Trust Fund. Additional information pertaining to the other post-employment benefits is contained in Note 8 to the Basic Financial Statements attached hereto as APPENDIX A.

The comprehensive annual financial report of the OPEB Trust Fund for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2007 through December 31, 2010 may be obtained by contacting the District and are also available on the District's website at www.mwrdr.org; *provided, however*, that the content of such reports and website is not incorporated by reference herein.

BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

Budgetary Process

The District prepares its budget in conformity with practices prescribed or permitted by the applicable statutes of the State. The Board is required to adopt an annual budget by no later than the close of the previous fiscal year. The annual budget serves as the foundation for the District's financial planning and control. A summary of the District's budgeting process is contained in Note 1(d) to the Basic Financial Statements attached hereto as APPENDIX A. The District's budget for fiscal year 2011 is on display at the District's offices and available online at the District's website at www.mwrdr.org, but the content of such website is not incorporated into this Official Statement by reference.

Comparative Budget Information

The following table summarizes the appropriations set forth in the annual budgets of the District for fiscal year 2011, as amended through December 16, 2010, and for 2010 as adjusted (in millions of dollars):

APPROPRIATIONS (IN MILLIONS)	2011	2010	INCREASE/ (DECREASE)	PERCENT CHANGE
Corporate Fund.....	\$ 341.1	\$ 354.5	\$ (13.4)	(3.8)%
Stormwater Management.....	39.9	39.9	0.0	0.0
Construction Fund.....	17.7	27.1	(9.4)	(34.6)
Retirement Fund.....	32.4	32.8	(0.4)	(1.2)
Reserve Claim Fund.....	60.0	63.0	(3.0)	(4.8)
Capital Improvements Bond Fund.....	385.1	975.2	(590.1)	(60.5)
Bond Redemption and Interest Fund.....	154.2	162.9	(8.7)	(5.3)
Total.....	<u>\$1,030.4</u>	<u>\$1,655.4</u>	<u>\$(625.0)</u>	<u>(37.8)%</u>

The total appropriation request for 2011 is \$1,030.4 million, a decrease of \$625 million. Major changes are presented below.

- The Corporate Fund appropriation, the District's operating fund, is \$341.1 million, a decrease of \$13.4 million or 3.8% from 2010. Approximately \$7 million of the reduction is due to reducing the appropriation for the OPEB Trust Fund, in accordance with the OPEB Funding Policy. The Corporate Fund appropriation also reflects a decrease from the 2010 appropriation in salaries, including a reduction of 33 positions and the reduction of non-essential services.
- The Stormwater Management Fund appropriation of \$39.9 million represents no change from 2010. The Detailed Watershed Plans (DWPs) for the North Branch of the Chicago River and the Lower Des Plaines River were finalized earlier this year, completing the six DWPs. In 2011, the District will continue preliminary engineering for projects approved by the Board, and commence final design of projects for which preliminary engineering has been completed. The appropriation for 2011 will provide resources to continue work, studies, and investigations to implement Public Act 093-1049. The District will also be able to provide funding for projects approved by other regional, state, and federal agencies. The appropriation for 2011 includes \$2.5 million for the Small Streams Maintenance Program (SSMP). The SSMP provides debris and blockage removal of all small streams within the District, improving small stream flow, and reducing the chance of flooding.
- The Capital Improvements Bond Fund appropriation of \$385.1 million is a decrease of \$590.1 million and reflects the award pattern of major projects. Scheduled for award in 2011 are plant expansion and improvement projects (\$29.5 million), collection projects (\$56.3 million), and replacement facilities

projects (\$112.4 million). The remaining \$186.9 million appropriation is required for salaries, project support, and land and easements.

- The Construction Fund appropriation of \$17.7 million, a decrease of \$9.4 million, is due to an adjusted project award schedule and the anticipated expenditures for existing projects. Two projects are budgeted for award in 2011, at a total contract cost of \$2.9 million and requiring an appropriation of \$0.5 million. The remaining \$17.2 million appropriation is required for salaries, support, and projects under construction.
- The decrease of \$8.7 million in the Bond Redemption and Interest Fund is primarily due to a decrease in debt service of \$9.1 million related to the amortization schedule for the \$600 million General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series of August, 2009 (the “*Series 2009 Bonds*”). The 2010 appropriation included \$9.1 million of additional interest expense due on the Series 2009 Bonds compared to the 2011 appropriation.
- The decrease of \$3.0 million in the Reserve Claim Fund, the District’s self insurance fund, to \$60.0 million is primarily due to 2010 estimated revenues and 2009 final statements for year-end cash and investments carried forward for fund balance. The Reserve Claim Fund is statutorily authorized to accumulate fund balance to meet claims against the District.

OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

Principal Units

There are numerous governmental units located within the boundaries of the District, each of which (i) is separately incorporated under the laws of the State, (ii) has an independent tax levy, (iii) derives its power and authority under the laws of the State, and (iv) maintains its own financial records and accounts. Each of these units may levy taxes upon property within its particular boundaries, and each is authorized to issue debt obligations. The principal municipality within the District is the City of Chicago. Other municipalities in Cook County with populations in excess of 50,000 include Arlington Heights, Berwyn, Cicero, Des Plaines, Evanston, Mount Prospect, Oak Lawn, Oak Park, Orland Park, Palatine, Schaumburg, Skokie and Tinley Park. Approximately 47% of the Equalized Assessed Valuation of taxable property in Cook County is located within the City of Chicago with the balance located in other municipalities and unincorporated areas.

Other Major Governmental Units

Cook County (the “*County*”) is governed by a board of seventeen Commissioners, each elected for four-year terms from one of seventeen districts. All taxable property situated in the District is located within the boundaries of the County. The County is a home rule unit under the Illinois Constitution of 1970 (the “*Illinois Constitution*”).

The Forest Preserve District of Cook County (the “*Forest Preserve District*”) is coterminous with the County. The Forest Preserve District creates, maintains and operates forest preserves within the County. The Forest Preserve District is governed by a seventeen-member board composed of the members of the County Board.

The City of Chicago (the “*City*”) was incorporated in 1837 and exercises broad governmental powers as a home rule unit under the Illinois Constitution. The City is governed by a Mayor elected at large for a four-year term, and the City Council. The City Council consists of 50 members (“*Aldermen*”), each representing one of the City’s 50 wards. Aldermen are elected for four-year terms.

The Board of Education of the City of Chicago (the “*Board of Education*”) exercises general supervision and jurisdiction over the public school system in the City. The Board of Education consists of seven members appointed by the Mayor of the City without consent or approval of the City Council. The Board of Education adopts the budget, approves contracts (including collective bargaining agreements), levies real property taxes and establishes general policies of the public schools.

The Chicago Park District (the “*Park District*”) is responsible for the maintenance and operation of parks, boulevards, marinas, and certain other public property within the City. The Park District is governed by a seven-member board, appointed by the Mayor of the City, with the approval of the City Council.

Community College District No. 508 (the “*Community College District*”) maintains a system of community colleges within the City. The Community College District is governed by a seven-member board, appointed by the Mayor of the City, with the approval of the City Council.

Certain Other Public Bodies

The Public Building Commission of Chicago (the “*PBC*”) is a municipal corporation authorized to acquire, construct and improve public buildings and facilities for use by one or more local governmental units. The PBC issues bonds to finance its projects and leases its facilities to respective units of local government. At the present time the City, the Park District, the Board of Education and the Community College District lease facilities from the PBC.

The Regional Transportation Authority (the “*RTA*”) is a municipal corporation authorized to provide planning, funding, coordination and fiscal oversight of three separately governed operating entities which provide public mass transportation services in a six county area of northeastern Illinois, including the County. The RTA is governed by a 16-member board, consisting of City and suburban members appointed by elected officials in the six county RTA region. The RTA is primarily funded from sales taxes imposed by the RTA on sales in the six county area and a portion of sales taxes imposed by the State. The RTA is also authorized to impose, but does not currently impose, taxes on automobile rentals, motor fuel and offstreet parking facilities. By law, motor fuel and off-street parking taxes may not be imposed concurrently with sales taxes. The RTA may not levy real property taxes.

The Chicago Transit Authority (the “CTA”) is a municipal corporation empowered to acquire, construct, own, operate and maintain a transportation system in the metropolitan area of the County. The CTA is governed by a seven-member board. The CTA may not levy real property or other taxes.

The Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority (the “MPEA”), formerly known as the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority, is a municipal corporation which owns and operates the McCormick Place convention and exposition facilities and the Navy Pier recreational facilities. MPEA periodically issues revenue bonds to finance the construction of certain facilities and is authorized to impose certain taxes to provide security for such bonds. The MPEA may not levy real property taxes.

Interrelationships

The governmental units and other public bodies described above share, in varying degrees, a common property tax base with the District. See “DEBT INFORMATION.” However, they are all separate legal and financial units, and the financial condition or circumstances of any one unit does not necessarily imply similar financial conditions or circumstances for the District.

REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES

All of the “equalized assessed valuation” or “EAV” (described below) of taxable real property in the District is located in the County. Information under this caption describes the current procedures for real property assessment, tax levy and tax collection in the County. There is no assurance that the procedures described under this caption will not be changed. Illinois laws relating to the real property taxation are contained in the Illinois Property Tax Code (the “*Property Tax Code*”).

Real Property Assessment

The Cook County Assessor (the “*County Assessor*”) is responsible for the assessment of all taxable real property within the County, including that in the District, except for certain railroad property and pollution control facilities, which are assessed directly by the Illinois Department of Revenue (the “*Department of Revenue*”). For triennial reassessment purposes, the County is divided into three districts: west and south suburbs (the “*South Tri*”), north and northwest suburbs (the “*North Tri*”), and the City of Chicago (the “*City Tri*”). The South Tri is to be reassessed for the 2011 tax levy year, the City Tri was last reassessed for the 2009 tax levy year, and the North Tri was last reassessed for the 2010 tax levy year.

In response to the downturn of the real estate market, the County Assessor reduced the 2009 assessed value on suburban residential properties (specifically, those properties located in the South Tri and the North Tri) not originally scheduled for reassessment in 2009. For tax year 2009, each suburban township received an adjustment percentage for tax year 2009, lowering the existing assessed values of all residential properties in such township within a range of 4% to 15%, beginning with the second-installment tax bills payable in the fall of 2010.

Real property in the County is separated into classes for assessment purposes. After the County Assessor establishes the fair market value of a parcel of property, that value is multiplied by the appropriate classification percentage to arrive at the assessed valuation (the “*Assessed Valuation*”) for the parcel. Such classification percentages range from 10% for certain residential, commercial and industrial property to 25% for other industrial and commercial property.

Property is classified for assessment into six basic categories, each of which is assessed (beginning with the 2009 tax levy year) at various percentages of fair market value as follows: Class 1 - unimproved real estate (10%); Class 2 - residential (10%); Class 3 - rental-residential (16% in tax year 2009, 13% in tax year 2010, and 10% in tax year 2011 and subsequent years); Class 4 - not-for-profit (25%); Class 5a - commercial (25%); and Class 5b - industrial (25%).

In addition, property may be temporarily classified into one of eight additional assessment classification categories. Upon expiration of such classification, property so classified will revert to one of the basic six assessment classifications described above. The additional assessment classifications are as follows:

<u>CLASS</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION OF QUALIFYING PROPERTY</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT PERCENTAGE</u>	<u>REVERTS TO CLASS</u>
6b	Newly constructed industrial properties or substantially rehabilitated sections of existing industrial properties	10% for first 10 years and any 10 year renewal; if not renewed, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5b
C	Industrial property that has undergone environmental testing and remediation	10% for first 10 years, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5b
	Commercial property that has undergone environmental testing and remediation	10% for first 10 years, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5a
7a/7b	Newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated commercial properties in an area in need of commercial development	10% for first 10 years, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5a
8	Industrial properties in enterprise communities or zones in need of substantial revitalization	10% for first 10 years and any 10-year renewal; if not renewed, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5b
	Commercial properties in enterprise communities or zones in need of substantial revitalization	10% for first 10 years, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5a
9	New or substantially rehabilitated multi-family residential properties in target areas, empowerment or enterprise zones	10% for first 10 years and any 10 year renewal	As Applicable
S	Class 3 properties subject to Section 8 contracts renewed under the “Mark up to Market” option	10% for term of Section 8 contract renewal and any subsequent renewal	3
L	Substantially rehabilitated Class 3, 4 or 5b properties qualifying as “Landmark” or “Contributing” buildings	10% for first 10 years and any 10-year renewal; if not renewed, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	3, 4, or 5b
	Substantially rehabilitated Class 5a properties qualifying as “Landmark” or “Contributing” buildings	10% for first 10 years, 15% in year 11, 20% in year 12	5a

The County Assessor has established procedures enabling taxpayers to contest their proposed Assessed Valuations. Once the County Assessor certifies its final Assessed Valuations, a taxpayer can seek review of its assessment by appealing to the Cook County Board of Review (the "*Board of Review*"), which consists of three commissioners elected by the voters of the County. The Board of Review has the power to adjust the Assessed Valuations set by the County Assessor.

Owners of residential property having six or fewer units are able to appeal decisions of the Board of Review to the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board (the "*PTAB*"), a statewide administrative body. The PTAB has the power to determine the Assessed Valuation of real property based on equity and the weight of the evidence. Taxpayers may appeal the decision of PTAB to either the Circuit Court of Cook County (the "*Circuit Court*") or the Illinois Appellate Court under the Illinois Administrative Review Law.

As an alternative to seeking review of Assessed Valuations by PTAB, taxpayers who have first exhausted their remedies before the Board of Review may file an objection in the Circuit Court. The procedure under this alternative is similar to the judicial review procedure described in the immediately preceding paragraph, however, the standard of proof differs. In addition, in cases where the County Assessor agrees that an assessment error has been made after tax bills have been issued, the County Assessor can correct any factual error, and thus reduce the amount of taxes due, by issuing a Certificate of Error. Certificates of Error are not issued in cases where the only issue is the opinion of the valuation of the property.

Equalization

After the Assessor has established the Assessed Valuation for each parcel for a given year, and following any revisions by the Board of Review or PTAB, the Illinois Department of Revenue is required by statute to review the Assessed Valuations. The Illinois Department of Revenue establishes an equalization factor (the "*Equalization Factor*"), commonly called the "multiplier," for each county to make all valuations uniform among the 102 counties in the State of Illinois (the "*State*"). Under State law, the aggregate of the assessments within each county is equalized at 33-1/3% of the estimated fair cash value of real property located within the county prior to any applicable exemptions. One multiplier is applied to all property in the County, regardless of its assessment category, except for certain farmland property and wind energy assessable property, which are not subject to equalization. The following table sets forth the Equalization Factor for the County for the last ten tax levy years, and the tentative Equalization Factor for 2010.

<u>TAX LEVY YEAR</u>	<u>EQUALIZATION FACTOR</u>
2000	2.2235
2001	2.3098
2002	2.4689
2003	2.4598
2004	2.5757
2005	2.7320
2006	2.7076
2007	2.8439
2008	2.9786
2009	3.3701
2010	3.1773*

Once the Equalization Factor is established, the Assessed Valuation, as revised by the Board of Review or PTAB, is multiplied by the Equalization Factor to determine the equalized assessed valuation (the “EAV”) of that parcel. The EAV for each parcel is the final property valuation used for determination of tax liability. The aggregate EAV for all parcels in any taxing body’s jurisdiction, plus the valuation of property assessed directly by the Department of Revenue, constitute the total real estate tax base for the taxing body, which is used to calculate tax rates (the “Assessment Base”).

Exemptions

The Property Tax Code exempts certain property from taxation. Certain property is exempt from taxation on the basis of ownership and/or use, including, but not limited to, public parks, not-for-profit schools, public schools, churches, not-for-profit hospitals and public hospitals. In addition, the Property Tax Code provides a variety of homestead exemptions, which are discussed below.

An annual General Homestead Exemption provides that the EAV of certain property owned and used for residential purposes may be reduced by the amount of any increase over the 1977 EAV, up to a maximum reduction of \$6,000 for assessment year 2009 and thereafter.

The Alternative General Homestead Exemption limits EAV increases for homeowners (who also reside on the property as their principal place of residence) to 7% a year, up to a certain maximum dollar amount each year as defined by statute. Any amount of increase that exceeds the maximum exemption as defined is added to the 7% increase and is part of that property’s taxable EAV. Homes that do not increase by at least 7% a year are entitled, in the alternative, to the General Homestead Exemption as discussed above.

* Preliminary: the final Equalization Factor will not be calculated until the Board of Review has finished hearing appeals and has certified the final assessments for 2010.

For properties in the City Tri, the Alternative General Homestead Exemption cannot exceed \$20,000 for assessment year 2009, \$16,000 for assessment year 2010 and \$12,000 for assessment year 2011. For properties in the North Tri, the Alternative General Homestead Exemption cannot exceed \$20,000 for assessment years 2009 and 2010, \$16,000 for assessment year 2011 and \$12,000 for assessment year 2012. For properties in the South Tri, the Alternative General Homestead Exemption cannot exceed \$26,000 for assessment year 2009, \$20,000 for assessment year 2010 and 2011 and \$12,000 for assessment year 2012.

The Long-Time Occupant Homestead Exemption limits the increase in EAV of a taxpayer's homestead property to 10% per year if such taxpayer has owned the property for at least 10 years as of January 1 of the assessment year (or 5 years if purchased with certain government assistance) and has a household income of \$100,000 or less ("*Qualified Homestead Property*"). If the taxpayer's annual income is \$75,000 or less, the EAV of the Qualified Homestead Property may increase by no more than 7% per year. There is no exemption limit for Qualified Homestead Properties.

The Homestead Improvement Exemption applies to residential properties that have been improved and to properties that have been rebuilt in the two years following a catastrophic event, as defined in the Property Tax Code. The exemption is limited to \$75,000 per year, to the extent the Assessed Valuation is attributable solely to such improvements or rebuilding.

Additional exemptions exist for senior citizens. The Senior Citizens Homestead Exemption annually reduces the EAV on residences owned and occupied by senior citizens. The maximum exemption is \$4,000. Beginning in tax year 2010, County taxpayers seeking to claim this exemption must reapply for the exemption on an annual basis.

The Senior Citizens Assessment Freeze Homestead Exemption freezes property tax assessments for homeowners who are 65 and older, reside in their property as their principal place of residence and receive a household income not in excess of \$55,000. This exemption grants to qualifying senior citizens an exemption equal to the difference between (i) the current EAV of the residence and (ii) the EAV of a senior citizen's residence for the year prior to the year in which he or she first qualifies and applies for the exemption, plus the EAV of improvements since such year.

Three exemptions are available to veterans of the United States armed forces. The Disabled Veterans' Exemption exempts up to \$70,000 of the Assessed Valuation of property owned and used exclusively by veterans, their spouses or unmarried surviving spouses. Qualification for this exemption requires the veteran's disability to be of such a nature that the federal government has authorized payment for purchase of specially adapted housing under the U.S. Code as certified to annually by the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Disabled Veterans' Standard Homestead Exemption provides an annual homestead exemption of (i) \$5,000 to those veterans with a service-connected disability of 70% (75% for exemptions granted from 2007 to 2009) and (ii) \$2,500 to those veterans with a service-connected disability of less than 70% (75% for exemptions granted from 2007 to 2009), but at least 50%.

The Returning Veterans' Homestead Exemption is available for property owned and occupied as the principal residence of a veteran in the assessment year, or the year following the assessment year, in which the veteran returns from an armed conflict while on active duty in the United States armed forces. This provision grants a one-time homestead exemption of \$5,000.

Finally, the Disabled Persons' Homestead Exemption provides an annual homestead exemption in the amount of \$2,000 for property that is owned and occupied by certain disabled persons who meet State-mandated guidelines.

Tax Levy

As part of the annual budgetary process of governmental units (the "*Units*") with power to levy taxes in the County, the designated body for each Unit annually adopts proceedings to levy real estate taxes. The administration and collection of real estate taxes is statutorily assigned to the Cook County Clerk (the "*County Clerk*") and the Cook County Treasurer (the "*County Treasurer*"). After the Units file their annual tax levies, the County Clerk computes the annual tax rate for each Unit. The County Clerk computes the Unit's maximum allowable levy by multiplying the maximum tax rate for that Unit by the prior year's EAV for all property currently in the taxing district. The prior year's EAV includes the EAV of any new property, the current year value of any annexed property and any recovered tax increment value, minus any disconnected property for the current year under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (the "*Limitation Law*"). The tax rate for a Unit is computed by dividing the lesser of the maximum allowable levy or the actual levy by the current year's EAV.

Property Tax Extension Limitation Law and Debt Reform Act

The Limitation Law is applied after the prior year EAV limitation. The Limitation Law limits the annual growth in the amount of property taxes to be extended for certain Illinois non-home rule units, including the District. The effect of the Limitation Law is to limit the amount of property taxes that can be extended for a taxing body. In addition, general obligation bonds, notes and installment contracts payable from ad valorem taxes, unlimited as to rate and amount, cannot be issued by the affected taxing bodies unless they are approved by referendum, are alternate bonds or are for certain refunding purposes; these limitations on the extensions of property taxes contained in the Limitation Law do not apply to the taxes levied by the District (i) to pay the principal of and interest on its outstanding general obligation bonds issued prior to March 1, 1995; (ii) to pay the principal of and interest on bonds issued to refund or continue to refund those bonds issued before March 1, 1995; (iii) to pay the principal of and interest on bonds to finance construction projects initiated prior to October 1, 1991 (consisting primarily of the TARP projects as described in APPENDIX B); or (iv) to pay interest or principal on bonds issued to refund or continue to refund bonds issued after March 1, 1995 that are approved by referendum.

The Debt Reform Act permits units of local government, including the District, to issue limited tax bonds that have otherwise been authorized by applicable law. The base for such bond issues is the debt service extension for the levy year 1994. The District could also increase its debt service extension base by referendum. The Limitation Law provides that the debt service

extension base of a taxing district must be increased by the lesser of 5% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the 12-month calendar year preceding the levy year.

Under legislation enacted in 1997, the Limitation Law was amended so that the issuance of bonds by the District to construct construction projects initiated before October 1, 1991, including the TARP projects, will not reduce the District's ability to issue limited tax bonds for other major capital projects.

The use of prior year EAV's to limit the allowable tax levy may reduce tax rates for funds that are at or near their maximum rates in districts with rising EAVs. These reduced rates and all other rates for those funds subject to the Limitation Law are added together, which results in the aggregate preliminary rate. The aggregate preliminary rate is then compared to the limiting rate. If the limiting rate is more than the aggregate preliminary rate, there is no further reduction in rates due to the Limitation Law. If the limiting rate is less than the aggregate preliminary rate, the aggregate preliminary rate is further reduced to the limiting rate. In all cases, taxes are extended using current year EAV under Section 18-140 of the Property Tax Code.

The District has the authority to levy taxes for many different purposes. See "TAXATION OF PROPERTY WITHIN DISTRICT—STATISTICAL INFORMATION—Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Tax Rates by Fund." The ceiling at any particular time on the rate at which these taxes may be extended for the District is either (i) unlimited (as provided by statute), (ii) initially set by statute but permitted to be increased by referendum, (iii) capped by statute, or (iv) limited to the rate approved by referendum. The only ceiling on a particular tax rate is the ceiling set by statute above, at which the rate is not permitted to be further increased by referendum or otherwise. Therefore, taxing districts (such as the District) have increased flexibility to levy taxes for the purposes for which they most need the money. The total aggregate tax rate for the various purposes subject to the Limitation Law, however, will not be allowed to exceed the District's limiting rate computed in accordance with the provisions of the Limitation Law.

In general, the annual growth permitted under the Limitation Law is the lesser of 5% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the calendar year preceding the levy year. Taxes can also be increased due to new construction, referendum approval of tax rate increases, mergers and consolidations. Local governments, including the District, can issue limited tax bonds in lieu of general obligation bonds that have otherwise been authorized by applicable law. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS" herein.

Extensions

The County Clerk then computes the total tax rate applicable to each parcel of real property by aggregating the tax rates of all of the Units having jurisdiction over the particular parcel. The County Clerk extends the tax by entering the tax (determined by multiplying the total tax rate by the EAV of that parcel for the current assessment year) in the books prepared for the Cook County Collector (the "*Warrant Books*") along with the tax rates, the Assessed Valuation and the EAV. The Warrant Books are the Cook County Collector's (the "*County*

Collector”) authority for the collection of taxes and are used by the County Collector as the basis for issuing tax bills to all property owners.

Collections

Property taxes are collected by the County Collector, who also serves as the County Treasurer, who remits to each Unit its share of the collections. Taxes levied in one year become payable during the following year in two installments, the first due on March 1 and the second on the later of August 1 or 30 days after the mailing of the tax bills. A payment due is deemed to be paid on time if the payment is postmarked on the due date. Beginning with the first installment payable in 2010, the first installment is equal to 55% of the prior year’s tax bill. However, if a Certificate of Error is approved by a court or certified on or before November 30 of the preceding year and before the estimated tax bills are prepared, then the first installment is instead based on the certain percentage of the *corrected* prior year’s tax bill. The second installment covers the balance of the current year’s tax bill, and is based on the then current tax year levy, Assessed Valuation and Equalization Factor, and reflects any changes from the prior year in those factors. The first installment penalty date has been the first business day in March for each of the last ten years. However, for 2010, the first installment penalty date was established as April 1 by statute. The following table sets forth the second installment penalty date for the last ten tax levy years in the County.

<u>TAX LEVY YEAR</u>	<u>SECOND INSTALLMENT PENALTY DATE</u>
2000	November 2, 2001
2001	November 1, 2002
2002	October 1, 2003
2003	November 15, 2004
2004	November 1, 2005
2005	September 1, 2006
2006	December 3, 2007
2007	November 3, 2008
2008	December 1, 2009
2009	December 13, 2010

It is possible that the changes to the assessment appeals process described above will cause delays similar to those experienced in past years in preparation and mailing of the second installment in future years. In the future, the County may provide for tax bills to be payable in four installments instead of two.

During the periods of peak collections, tax receipts are forwarded to each Unit on a weekly basis. Upon receipt of taxes from the County Collector, the District promptly credits the taxes received to the funds for which they were levied.

Within 90 days following the second installment due date, the County Collector presents the Warrant Books to the Circuit Court and applies for a judgment for all unpaid taxes. The

court orders resulting from the application for judgment provides for an Annual Tax Sale (the “*Annual Tax Sale*”) of unpaid taxes shown on that year’s Warrant Books. A public sale is held, at which time successful tax buyers pay the unpaid taxes plus penalties. In each such public sale, the collector can use any “automated means.” Unpaid taxes accrue penalties at the rate of 1.5% per month from their due date until the date of sale. Taxpayers can redeem their property by paying the amount paid at the sale, plus a maximum of 12% for each six-month period after the sale. If no redemption is made within the applicable redemption period (ranging from six months to two and a half years depending on the type and occupancy of the property) and the tax buyer files a petition in the Circuit Court, notifying the necessary parties in accordance with the applicable law, the tax buyer receives a deed to the property. In addition, there are miscellaneous statutory provisions for foreclosure of tax liens.

If there is no sale of the tax lien on a parcel of property at the Annual Tax Sale, the taxes are forfeited and the property becomes eligible to be purchased at any time thereafter at an amount equal to all delinquent taxes and interest accrued to the date of purchase. Redemption periods and procedures are the same as applicable to the Annual Tax Sale.

The Scavenger Sale (the “*Scavenger Sale*”), like the Annual Tax Sale, is a sale of unpaid taxes. The Scavenger Sale is held every two years on all property on which two or more years’ taxes are delinquent. The sale price of the unpaid taxes is the amount bid at such sale, which may be less than the amount of delinquent taxes. Redemption periods vary from six months to two and a half years depending upon the type and occupancy of the property.

Truth in Taxation Law

Legislation known as the Truth in Taxation Law (the “*Law*”) limits the aggregate amount of certain taxes which can be levied by, and extended for, a taxing district to 105% of the amount of taxes extended in the preceding year unless specified notice, hearing and certification requirements are met by the taxing body. The express purpose of the Law is to require published disclosure of, and hearing upon, an intention to adopt a levy in excess of the specified levels.

TAXATION OF PROPERTY WITHIN DISTRICT—STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Equalized Assessed Valuation by Major Classification

(amounts in thousands)

<u>YEAR OF LEVY</u>	<u>REAL PROPERTY</u>	<u>RAILROAD AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROPERTY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2009	\$174,255,389	\$212,254	\$174,467,643
2008	169,911,146	186,235	170,097,382
2007	155,800,132	172,662	155,972,794
2006	141,311,943	156,699	141,468,642
2005	130,438,124	148,797	130,586,921
2004	118,889,944	148,616	119,038,560
2003	110,120,812	145,816	110,266,628
2002	102,405,543	431,822	102,837,365
2001	92,500,093	404,997	92,905,090
2000	85,149,867	367,141	85,517,008

Source of data: Office of County Clerk

Equalized Assessed Valuation – Chicago and Suburbs

(amounts in thousands)

<u>YEAR OF LEVY</u>	<u>CHICAGO</u>	<u>SUBURBS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2009	\$84,586,808	\$89,880,835	\$174,467,643
2008	80,977,543	89,119,839	170,097,382
2007	73,645,316	82,327,478	155,972,794
2006	69,511,192	71,957,450	141,468,642
2005	59,304,530	71,282,391	130,586,921
2004	55,277,096	63,761,464	119,038,560
2003	53,168,632	57,097,996	110,266,628
2002	45,330,892	57,506,473	102,837,365
2001	41,981,912	50,923,178	92,905,090
2000	40,480,075	45,036,933	85,517,008

Source of data: Office of County Clerk

Estimated Full Value – Chicago and Suburbs⁽¹⁾
 (amounts in thousands)

YEAR OF LEVY	CHICAGO	SUBURBS	TOTAL
2008	\$310,888,609	\$305,274,985	\$616,163,594
2007	320,503,503	335,971,241	656,474,744
2006	329,770,733	336,452,329	666,223,062
2005	283,137,884	298,233,411	581,371,295
2004	262,080,627	279,861,423	541,942,050
2003	223,572,427	248,399,242	471,971,669
2002	201,938,231	226,167,677	428,105,908
2001	185,912,246	206,294,563	392,206,809
2000	162,593,364	186,372,891	348,966,255
1999	135,522,333	173,910,877	309,433,210

Source of data: The Civic Federation, Chicago, Illinois (based upon information from the Illinois Department of Revenue.)

(1) Information for 2009 not yet available.

Comparative Tax Rates of Major Local Governmental Units
 (Per \$100 Equalized Assessed Valuation)

	TAX YEARS ⁽¹⁾							
	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District	\$0.261	\$0.252	\$0.263	\$0.284	\$0.315	\$0.347	\$0.361	\$0.371
City of Chicago	0.887	0.928	1.004	1.012	1.153	1.188	1.262	1.452
Chicago Board of Education.....	2.366	2.472	2.583	2.697	3.026	3.104	3.142	3.562
Chicago Park District	0.309	0.323	0.355	0.379	0.443	0.431	0.439	0.515
County of Cook	0.394	0.415	0.446	0.500	0.533	0.593	0.630	0.690
Cook County Forest Preserve District ..	0.049	0.051	0.053	0.057	0.060	0.060	0.059	0.061
Community College District #508.....	0.150	0.156	0.159	0.205	0.234	0.242	0.246	0.280
Chicago School Finance Authority.....	–	–	0.091	0.118	0.127	0.177	0.151	0.177
City of Chicago Library Fund	0.099	0.102	0.040	0.050	0.090	0.114	0.118	0.139
City of Chicago School Bldg/Improvement.....	0.112	0.117	–	–	–	–	–	–
TOTAL.....	<u>\$4.627</u>	<u>\$4.816</u>	<u>\$4.994</u>	<u>\$5.302</u>	<u>\$5.981</u>	<u>\$6.256</u>	<u>\$6.408</u>	<u>\$7.247</u>

Source of data: Office of County Clerk

(1) Based upon taxes extended for collection in succeeding years as a percentage of the Equalized Assessed Valuation for the tax year.

Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Tax Rates by Fund
 (Per \$100 Equalized Assessed Valuation)

	TAX YEARS							
	2010 ⁽¹⁾	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Corporate Fund	\$0.138	\$0.135	\$0.141	\$0.150	\$0.151	\$0.158	\$0.167	\$0.163
Retirement Fund	0.015	0.016	0.015	0.016	0.018	0.018	0.024	0.024
Debt Service Fund	0.092	0.097	0.083	0.087	0.087	0.113	0.139	0.143
Reserve Claim Fund.....	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004
Corporate Working Cash Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.004
Construction Fund.....	0.005	0.006	-	0.003	0.013	0.014	0.013	0.023
Construction Working Cash Fund.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stormwater Management Fund.....	0.014	0.005	0.009	0.003	0.011	0.008	-	-
TOTAL.....	0.265	0.261	0.252	0.263	0.284	0.315	0.347	0.361

Source of data: Office of County Clerk

(1) District's tax rates are estimated based on 2009 equalized assessed valuation, the most recent available.

Statutory Tax Rate Limitation by Fund
 (Per \$100 Equalized Assessed Valuation)

Corporate Fund	\$0.410
Retirement Fund ⁽¹⁾	Unlimited
Debt Service Fund ⁽¹⁾	Unlimited
Reserve Claim Fund ⁽²⁾	0.005
Corporate Working Cash Fund.....	0.005
Construction Fund	0.100
Construction Working Cash Fund	0.005
Stormwater Management Fund.....	0.050

Source of data: Office of County Clerk

(1) Subject to the provisions of the Tax Extension Limitation Law. See "REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES – Property Tax Extension Limitation Law and Debt Reform Act."

(2) Subject to maximum accumulated value of 0.05% of the most recent equalized assessed valuation.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

Tax Levies, Collections, and Receivables⁽¹⁾

(amounts in thousands) (Unaudited)

	2010 ⁽³⁾			2009			2008			2007			2006		
	Amount	% of Levy	% of APT ⁽²⁾	Amount	% of Levy	% of APT ⁽²⁾	Amount	% of Levy	% of APT ⁽²⁾	Amount	% of Levy	% of APT ⁽²⁾	Amount	% of Levy	% of APT ⁽²⁾
Gross Property Tax Levy:															
Corporate Fund.....	\$240,207	52.0		\$237,116	52.1		\$240,082	56.0		\$233,982	57.0		\$213,860	53.2	
Construction Fund	8,749	1.9		10,411	2.3		–	0.0		5,181	1.3		17,766	4.4	
Debt Service Fund	160,782	34.8		169,051	37.1		140,614	32.8		135,730	33.1		123,608	30.8	
Retirement Fund	26,478	5.7		26,752	5.9		25,665	6.0		24,843	6.1		25,072	6.2	
Stormwater Management Fund.....	24,029	5.2		8,849	1.9		15,212	3.5		3,942	1.0		15,508	3.9	
Corporate Working Cash Fund.....	–	0.0		–	0.0		–	0.0		–	0.0		–	0.0	
Reserve Claim Fund	1,951	0.4		3,182	0.7		7,073	1.7		6,530	1.6		5,957	1.5	
Total Gross Property Tax Levy.....	\$462,196	100.0		\$455,361	100.0		\$428,646	100.0		\$410,208	100.0		\$401,771	100.0	
Less Allowance for Estimated Uncollectible Taxes	16,177	3.5		15,938	3.5		15,003	3.5		14,358	3.5		14,062	3.5	
Anticipated Property Tax Collections....	\$446,019	96.5	100.0	\$439,423	96.5	100.0	\$413,643	96.5	100.0	\$395,850	96.5	100.0	\$387,709	96.5	100.0
Property Tax Collected:															
First Year	233,966	50.6	52.5	\$383,612	84.2	87.3	\$400,048	93.3	96.7	\$390,440	95.2	98.6	\$353,566	88.0	91.2
Second Year				59,818	13.1	13.6	23,091	5.4	5.6	14,689	3.6	3.7	43,145	10.7	11.1
Third Year							(1,431)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(2,766)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(3,096)	(0.8)	(0.8)
Fourth Year.....										(1,484)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(2,555)	(0.6)	(0.7)
Fifth Year													(1,581)	(0.4)	(0.4)
Total Property Tax Collected.....	\$233,966	50.6	52.5	\$443,430	97.4	100.9	\$421,708	98.4	101.9	\$400,879	97.7	101.3	\$389,479	96.9	100.5
Net Property Tax Receivable	\$212,053	45.9	47.5	–			–			–			–		
Net Property Tax Receivable by Fund:															
Corporate Fund.....	\$110,206														
Construction Fund	4,013														
Debt Service Fund	73,767														
Retirement Fund	12,148														
Stormwater Management Fund.....	11,024														
Corporate Working Cash Fund.....	–														
Reserve Claim Fund	895														
Net Property Tax Receivable	\$212,053														

(1) As of June 30, 2011.

(2) Anticipated Property Tax Collections.

(3) Reflects the first installment of property taxes collected. See “REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT, TAX LEVY AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES—Collections” herein for a description of the property tax collection process in the County.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The District's Basic Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2010, included in this Official Statement as APPENDIX A, have been audited by Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP, independent public accountants, as stated in their Independent Auditors' Report dated April 25, 2011. The supplementary information referred to in the Independent Auditors' Report is not included in APPENDIX A. Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP has not been engaged to perform and has not performed, since the date of its report included herein, any procedures on the financial statements addressed in that report. Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP also has not performed any procedures relating to this Official Statement. The District's entire Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2010 and several prior years are available online at the District's website at www.mwrdd.org, but the content of such website is not incorporated into this Official Statement by reference.

RATINGS

The Bonds and the District's outstanding general obligation bonds are rated "Aaa" by Moody's Investors Service, "AAA" by Standard & Poor's Ratings Services, a division of The McGraw Hill Companies, and "AAA" by Fitch Ratings.

A rating reflects only the views of the rating agency assigning such rating and an explanation of the significance of such rating or the status of any review of such rating may be obtained from such agency. Certain information and materials concerning the Bonds, the District and certain overlapping entities have been furnished to the rating agencies by the District. Generally, rating agencies base their ratings on such information and materials and investigations, studies and assumptions by the respective agency. There is no assurance that each such rating will be maintained for any given period of time or that one or more of such ratings may not be raised, lowered or withdrawn entirely by the respective rating agency, if in its judgment, circumstances so warrant. Any downward change in or withdrawal of any such rating may have an adverse effect on the price at which the Bonds may be resold.

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

The District has engaged Public Financial Management, Inc. and Public Finance Advisors LLC, as financial advisors (the "*Financial Advisors*"), in connection with the authorization, issuance and sale of the Bonds. The Financial Advisors have provided advice on the plan of financing and structure of the Bonds and have reviewed certain legal and disclosure documents, including this Official Statement, with respect to certain financial matters. Under the terms of their engagement, the Financial Advisors are not obligated to undertake any independent verification of or assume any responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or fairness of the information contained in this Official Statement.

TAX MATTERS

2011A Bonds

Interest on the 2011A Bonds is includible in gross income for federal income purposes. Ownership of the 2011A Bonds may result in other federal income tax consequences to certain taxpayers. 2011A Bondholders should consult their tax advisors with respect to the inclusion of interest on the 2011A Bonds in gross income for federal income tax purposes and any collateral tax consequences.

The District may deposit moneys or securities in escrow in such amount and manner as to cause the 2011A Bonds to be deemed to be no longer outstanding under the Bond Ordinance (a “*defeasance*”). A defeasance of the 2011A Bonds may be treated as an exchange of the 2011A Bonds by the holders thereof and may therefore result in gain or loss to the holders. 2011A Bondholders should consult their own tax advisors about the consequences if any of such a defeasance. The District is required to provide notice of defeasance of the Bonds as a reportable event under its Continuing Disclosure Undertaking. See “THE UNDERTAKING – Reportable Events Disclosure.”

2011B Bonds and 2011C Bonds

Federal tax law contains a number of requirements and restrictions which apply to the 2011B Bonds and the 2011C Bonds (collectively, the “*Tax-Exempt Bonds*”), including investment restrictions, periodic payments of arbitrage profits to the United States, requirements regarding the proper use of bond proceeds and the facilities financed therewith, and certain other matters. The District has covenanted to comply with all requirements that must be satisfied in order for the interest on the Tax-Exempt Bonds to be excludable from gross income for federal income tax purposes. Failure to comply with certain of such covenants could cause interest on the Tax-Exempt Bonds to become includible in gross income for federal income tax purposes retroactively to the date of issuance of the Tax-Exempt Bonds.

Subject to the District’s compliance with the above-referenced covenants, under present law, in the opinion of Co-Bond Counsel, interest on the Tax-Exempt Bonds is excludable from the gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes and is not included as an item of tax preference in computing the federal alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations, but interest on the Tax-Exempt Bonds is taken into account, however, in computing an adjustment used in determining the federal alternative minimum tax for certain corporations.

In rendering its opinion, Co-Bond Counsel will rely upon certifications of the District with respect to certain material facts within the District’s knowledge. Co-Bond Counsel’s opinions represent their legal judgment based upon their review of the law and the facts that each deems relevant to render such opinions and are not a guarantee of a result.

The Code includes provisions for an alternative minimum tax (“*AMT*”) for corporations in addition to the corporate regular tax in certain cases. The AMT, if any, depends upon the

corporation's alternative minimum taxable income ("AMTI"), which is the corporation's taxable income with certain adjustments. One of the adjustment items used in computing the AMTI of a corporation (with certain exceptions) is an amount equal to 75% of the excess of such corporation's "adjusted current earnings" over an amount equal to its AMTI (before such adjustment item and the alternative tax net operating loss deduction). "Adjusted current earnings" would generally include certain tax-exempt interest, including interest on the Tax-Exempt Bonds.

Ownership of the Tax-Exempt Bonds may result in collateral federal income tax consequences to certain taxpayers, including, without limitation, corporations subject to the branch profits tax, financial institutions, certain insurance companies, certain S corporations, individual recipients of Social Security or Railroad Retirement benefits and taxpayers who may be deemed to have incurred (or continued) indebtedness to purchase or carry tax-exempt obligations. Prospective purchasers of the Tax-Exempt Bonds should consult their tax advisors as to applicability of any such collateral consequences.

The issue price (the "*Issue Price*") for each maturity of the Tax-Exempt Bonds is the price at which a substantial amount of such maturity of the Tax-Exempt Bonds is first sold to the public. The Issue Price of a maturity of the Tax-Exempt Bonds may be different from the price set forth, or the price corresponding to the yield set forth, on the inside cover page hereof.

If the Issue Price of a maturity of the Tax-Exempt Bonds is less than the principal amount payable at maturity, the difference between the Issue Price of each such maturity, if any, of the Tax-Exempt Bonds (the "*OID Bonds*") and the principal amount payable at maturity is original issue discount.

For an investor who purchases an OID Bond in the initial public offering at the Issue Price for such maturity and who holds such OID Bond to its stated maturity, subject to the condition that the District complies with the covenants discussed above, (a) the full amount of original issue discount with respect to such OID Bond constitutes interest which is excludable from the gross income of the owner thereof for federal income tax purposes; (b) such owner will not realize taxable capital gain or market discount upon payment of such OID Bond at its stated maturity; (c) such original issue discount is not included as an item of tax preference in computing the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations under the Code but is taken into account in computing an adjustment used in determining the alternative minimum tax for certain corporations under the Code, as described above; and (d) the accretion of original issue discount in each year may result in an alternative minimum tax liability for corporations or certain other collateral federal income tax consequences in each year even though a corresponding cash payment may not be received until a later year. Based upon the stated position of the Illinois Department of Revenue under Illinois income tax law, accreted original issue discount on such OID Bonds is subject to taxation as it accretes, even though there may not be a corresponding cash payment until a later year. Owners of OID Bonds should consult their own tax advisors with respect to the state and local tax consequences of original issue discount on such OID Bonds.

Owners of Tax-Exempt Bonds who dispose of Tax-Exempt Bonds prior to the stated maturity (whether by sale, redemption or otherwise), purchase Tax-Exempt Bonds in the initial public offering, but at a price different from the Issue Price or purchase Tax-Exempt Bonds subsequent to the initial public offering should consult their own tax advisors.

If a Tax-Exempt Bond is purchased at any time for a price that is less than the Tax-Exempt Bond's stated redemption price at maturity or, in the case of an OID Bond, its Issue Price plus accreted original issue discount (the "*Revised Issue Price*"), the purchaser will be treated as having purchased a Tax-Exempt Bond with market discount subject to the market discount rules of the Code (unless a statutory *de minimis* rule applies). Accrued market discount is treated as taxable ordinary income and is recognized when a Tax-Exempt Bond is disposed of (to the extent such accrued discount does not exceed gain realized) or, at the purchaser's election, as it accrues. Such treatment would apply to any purchaser who purchases an OID Bond for a price that is less than its Revised Issue Price. The applicability of the market discount rules may adversely affect the liquidity or secondary market price of such Tax-Exempt Bond. Purchasers should consult their own tax advisors regarding the potential implications of market discount with respect to the Tax-Exempt Bonds.

An investor may purchase a Tax-Exempt Bond at a price in excess of its stated principal amount. Such excess is characterized for federal income tax purposes as "bond premium" and must be amortized by an investor on a constant yield basis over the remaining term of the Tax-Exempt Bond in a manner that takes into account potential call dates and call prices. An investor cannot deduct amortized bond premium relating to a tax-exempt bond. The amortized bond premium is treated as a reduction in the tax-exempt interest received. As bond premium is amortized, it reduces the investor's basis in the Tax-Exempt Bond. Investors who purchase a Tax-Exempt Bond at a premium should consult their own tax advisors regarding the amortization of bond premium and its effect on the Tax-Exempt Bond's basis for purposes of computing gain or loss in connection with the sale, exchange, redemption or early retirement of the Tax-Exempt Bond.

There are or may be pending in the Congress of the United States legislative proposals, including some that carry retroactive effective dates, that, if enacted, could alter or amend the federal tax matters referred to above or affect the market value of the Tax-Exempt Bonds. It cannot be predicted whether or in what form any such proposal might be enacted or whether, if enacted, it would apply to bonds issued prior to enactment. Prospective purchasers of the Tax-Exempt Bonds should consult their own tax advisors regarding any pending or proposed federal tax legislation. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion regarding any pending or proposed federal tax legislation.

The Internal Revenue Service (the "*Service*") has an ongoing program of auditing tax-exempt obligations to determine whether, in the view of the Service, interest on such tax-exempt obligations is includible in the gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes. It cannot be predicted whether or not the Service will commence an audit of the Tax-Exempt Bonds. If an audit is commenced, under current procedures the Service may treat the District as a taxpayer and the Bondholders may have no right to participate in such

procedure. The commencement of an audit could adversely affect the market value and liquidity of the Tax-Exempt Bonds until the audit is concluded, regardless of the ultimate outcome.

Payments of interest on, and proceeds of the sale, redemption or maturity of, tax-exempt obligations, including the Tax-Exempt Bonds, are in certain cases required to be reported to the Service. Additionally, backup withholding may apply to any such payments to any Tax-Exempt Bond owner who fails to provide an accurate Form W-9 Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification, or a substantially identical form, or to any Tax-Exempt Bond owner who is notified by the Service of a failure to report any interest or dividends required to be shown on federal income tax returns. The reporting and backup withholding requirements do not affect the excludability of such interest from gross income for federal tax purposes.

State and Local Considerations

Interest on the Bonds is not exempt from present State of Illinois income taxes. Ownership of the Bonds may result in other state and local tax consequences to certain taxpayers, and Bond Counsel expresses no opinion regarding any such consequences arising with respect to the Bonds. Prospective purchasers of the Bonds should consult their tax advisors regarding the applicability of any such state and local taxes.

UNDERWRITING

The Underwriters have jointly and severally agreed, subject to certain conditions, to purchase the Bonds from the District. The purchase price for the 2011A Bonds shall be \$29,908,246.94 (the par amount of the 2011A Bonds less an underwriting discount of \$91,753.06). The purchase price for the 2011B Bonds shall be \$296,732,538.04 (the par amount of the 2011B Bonds less an underwriting discount of \$954,017.56 and plus original issue premium of \$27,686,555.60). The purchase price for the 2011C Bonds shall be \$109,325,102.56 (the par amount of the 2011C Bonds less an underwriting discount of \$331,968.54 and plus original issue premium of \$9,657,071.10). The Underwriters reserve the right to join with dealers and other underwriters in offering the Bonds to the public. The District maintains various banking relationships with certain of the Underwriters. Various officers of the Underwriters hold positions on governing boards of certain overlapping units of government.

The obligation of the Underwriters to accept delivery of the Bonds is subject to various conditions set forth in the Bond Purchase Agreement with respect to the Bonds. The Underwriters are obligated to purchase all of the Bonds if they purchase any of the Bonds.

The Underwriters may offer and sell the Bonds to certain dealers (including those dealers depositing the Bonds into investment trusts) and others at prices lower than the public offering prices stated on the cover page. After the initial public offering, the public offering prices may be changed from time to time by the Underwriters.

J.P. Morgan Securities LLC (“JPMS”), one the Underwriters of the Bonds, has entered into negotiated dealer agreements (each, a “*Dealer Agreement*”) with each of UBS Financial Services Inc. (“UBSFS”) and Charles Schwab & Co., Inc. (“CS&Co.”) for the retail distribution

of certain securities offerings, including the Bonds, at the original issue prices. Pursuant to each Dealer Agreement (if applicable to this transaction), each of UBSFS and CS&Co. will purchase Bonds from JPMS at the original issue price less a negotiated portion of the selling concession applicable to any Bonds that such firm sells.

Citigroup Inc., parent company of Citigroup Global Markets Inc., an underwriter of the Bonds, has entered into a retail brokerage joint venture with Morgan Stanley. As part of the joint venture, Citigroup Global Markets Inc. will distribute municipal securities to retail investors through the financial advisor network of a new broker-dealer, Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC. This distribution arrangement became effective on June 1, 2009. As part of this arrangement, Citigroup Global Markets Inc. will compensate Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC for its selling efforts with respect to the Bonds.

ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

Environmental Remediation

Under current environmental protection laws, the District may be ultimately responsible for the environmental remediation of some of its properties that have been leased to other parties. The District has developed preliminary estimates of environmental remediation costs for major lease sites. The range of estimated remediation costs at December 31, 2010 was between \$14.5 million and \$44.4 million. The District is of the opinion that the tenants (except for those who are bankrupt, out of business, or otherwise financially unable to perform) would ultimately be liable for the bulk, if not all, of these site clean-up costs. Negotiations are under way between the District's lawyers and the tenants to resolve remedial activity and costs liability issues. As a result of the implementation of GASB Statement No. 49, the District determined a current estimated remediation cost of \$29,450,000 with an estimated remediation cost recoverable of \$18,650,000 resulting in \$10,800,000 being recognized at December 31, 2010, in the long-term liabilities of the government-wide financial statements. These estimates are subject to changes as a result of price increases, changes in technology, and new laws and regulations. These estimates were generated using the expected cash flows technique. GASB Statement No. 49 addresses accounting and financial reporting standards for pollution (including contamination) remediation obligations, which are obligations to address the current or potential detrimental effects of existing pollution by participating in pollution remediation activities, such as site assessments and cleanups. The scope of the document excludes pollution prevention or control obligations with respect to current operations, and future pollution remediation activities that are required upon retirement of an asset.

The District has statutory authority for a Reserve Claim Fund to pay judgments or claims against the District, including environmental liabilities. Statutory authority authorizes an accumulation in this Fund of .05% of the equalized assessed property valuation or about \$87.2 million, and for a 0.5-cent annual property tax levy.

The District's Reserve Claim Fund collected revenues totaling \$7.7 million in 2010 (primarily from property taxes and Personal Property Replacement Taxes) and made payments

totaling \$6.7 million (primarily employee injury claims). The fund balance at December 31, 2009 was \$61.3 million and at December 31, 2010 was \$62.3 million.

Effluent Disinfection

In October 2007, the IEPA initiated a rulemaking with the Illinois Pollution Control Board (the “*IPCB*”) arising out of its Proposed Use Attainability Analysis (“*UAA*”) seeking to upgrade the recreational and aquatic use designations and standards for the Chicago Area Waterway System (“*CAWS*”) and Lower Des Plaines River. The rulemaking is captioned “*In the Matter of: Water Quality Standard and Effluent Limitations for the Chicago Area Waterway System and the Lower Des Plaines River: Adm. Code Parts 301, 302, 303 and 304*”(R08-09). The *IPCB* has divided this rulemaking into a general docket and four sub-dockets, which are: (A) recreational uses; (B) disinfection; (C) aquatic life uses; and (D) water quality standards and criteria to meet aquatic life uses. The rulemaking involves a number of issues. The two issues with the greatest potential impact on the District are the disinfection of effluent and the supplemental aeration and flow augmentation of the waterway to meet proposed water quality standards for dissolved oxygen (“*DO*”). For sub-docket A, the *IPCB* in August 2010 proposed a rule which would upgrade the water quality standards of specific segments of the *CAWS* to “incidental contact recreation,” but did not designate any segments as “primary contact” (swimming and related activities). On May 11, 2011, the USEPA sent a letter to the IEPA and the *IPCB* which advised that new or revised use designations would be needed for specific segments of the *CAWS* to provide for recreation on and in the waterway. The USEPA noted that such activity would likely require disinfection of the District’s effluent at the North Side and Calumet plants. On June 2, 2011, the *IPCB* proposed an amended rule that would designate certain segments of the *CAWS* as primary contact. On June 7, 2011, the District adopted a policy that requires the District to move forward with disinfection at the North Side and Calumet plants. The capital costs for ultraviolet disinfection at these two plants are approximately \$241 million, which the District anticipates incurring over the course of the next nine years with the majority of such costs to be incurred towards the end of this timeframe. On July 7, 2011, the *IPCB* issued a first notice proposed rule in sub-docket B. That proposed rule requires that discharges into the waterways in the *CAWS* designated as primary contact must meet an effluent limit of 400 fecal coliforms colony forming units per 100 ml from March 1 through November 30. To meet this limit, the District will be required to disinfect the effluent discharged from its North Side and Calumet plants during that period. The *IPCB* declined to establish an effluent limit for other segments of the *CAWS* designated as incidental contact waters. As a result, at this time the District is not required to disinfect the effluent discharged from its Stickney plant. Once this proposed rule is published in the *Illinois Register*, there will be a 45-day comment period at which time all interested parties may file comments with the *IPCB* regarding the proposed rule. The *IPCB* has up to a year to issue a second notice proposed rule from the date of publication in the *Illinois Register*.

With respect to the aquatic life uses and water quality standards necessary to meet such aquatic life uses (sub-dockets C and D), compliance with the IEPA proposed standards may require the District to install numerous aeration stations in specific segments of the *CAWS*. The preliminary estimated capital costs for supplemental aeration are approximately \$595 million. In response to the IEPA’s proposed aquatic life uses and water quality standards protective of those

uses, on June 17, 2011, the District filed its own Proposed Aquatic Uses and Dissolved Oxygen Water Quality Standards. That alternate proposal calls for significantly less aeration stations. The preliminary estimated capital costs for supplemental aeration and aerated flow augmentation under the District's alternate proposal are approximately \$55 million.

The projected cost figures as described above are subject to review by the District and are subject to change. The District is discussing various financing alternatives if such capital costs are incurred by the District, including the issuance of additional "limited bonds" by the District pursuant to the Act and the Debt Reform Act and payable from ad valorem taxes levied upon all taxable property within the boundaries of the District without limitation as to rate but limited as to the amount of said taxes that would be extended to pay such bonds pursuant to the Limitation Law. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS" herein for a description of "limited bonds".

For sub-docket A, the IPCB is expected to issue a final rule by August 2011. Sometime after closure of each remaining sub-docket, which IPCB has indicated could be by the end of 2011, the IPCB will review the record and issue its decision for notice and comment.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

NPDES Permits. The District operates its water reclamation plants (the "WRPs") in accordance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits issued by the IEPA. The NPDES permits for the Stickney, Calumet and North Side WRPs expired in 2007 and the District timely reapplied for renewal. The IEPA issued draft permits in November 2009 and the comment period closed in April 2010. Final NPDES permits have yet to be issued. The District has and will continue to lawfully operate its WRPs under the expired permits until the IEPA issues new permits. While the draft permits did not contain phosphorus and nitrogen limits, in the intervening period from when the draft permits were issued, the USEPA directed the IEPA to evaluate whether phosphorus and nitrogen discharges are causing or contributing to water quality violations. Whether the District's final NPDES permits will contain nutrient limits and the potential cost of complying with any such limits is uncertain at this time. The cost of complying with any such limits depends upon the particular nutrients that are regulated and the numeric limits imposed.

NPDES Consent Decree. The District's NPDES permits, in addition to controlling discharges from the WRPs, also impose conditions upon combined sewer system overflows (the "CSOs"). In compliance with the NPDES permits, the District's TARP was developed as a long term control plan to control CSOs. The USEPA has alleged that discharges from the District's CSOs have and continue to violate certain permit requirements, including the prohibition on discharging pollutants into waters that cause or contribute to violations of applicable water quality standards for dissolved oxygen, solids, and floatables. IEPA has joined the USEPA in alleging the stated water quality violations. Entities with combined sewer systems that allegedly are in violation of applicable water quality standards are subject to an enforceable schedule for the implementation of a long term control plan, with "enforceable" requiring a judgment or a consent decree entered in a federal district court. The District has been in discussions with the USEPA and IEPA for several years and recently has engaged in extended settlement discussions

to enter into a consent decree for entry with the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (the “*Northern District*”).

If agreed by all parties and entered by the court, the consent decree would resolve the federal and state claims associated with the District’s CSOs. The proposed consent decree would, among other things: (a) establish a construction schedule with interim milestones for completion and operation of portions of the District’s TARP plan; (b) obligate the District to advance funds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the “*Corps*”) for portions of the District’s TARP for which the Corps is responsible should federal funds be unavailable to the Corps by the stated deadlines; (c) establish performance criteria and develop post-construction monitoring for portions of the TARP system; (d) require the District to continue seasonal operation of debris boats and pontoon boats to control floatables in the CAWS; (e) require the District to submit annual reports on its compliance with the terms of the consent decree; (f) impose stipulated penalties for violations of the decree; (g) impose a total civil penalty of \$675,000; and (h) require the District to expend an additional \$325,000 on a supplemental environmental project, which relates to “green infrastructure” and other technologies, in lieu of an additional civil penalty. The consent decree is not finalized and as negotiations continue additional factors may be required, such as requests for the District to add “substantial green infrastructure.” The aggregate costs and timeline are not predictable and are uncertain at this time.

NPDES Suit. In May 2011, the National Resources Council, Inc., Sierra Club, Inc., and Prairie Rivers Network (the “*Private Parties*”) filed a Clean Water Act (“*CWA*”) citizen suit against the District in the Northern District alleging violations of CWA-based water quality standards. The complaint alleged that the District’s CSO discharges into the CAWS violated certain conditions of the District’s NPDES permits which require that effluent not cause a violation of any water quality standard, and also require that all CSO discharges be treated to prevent accumulation of sludge deposits, floating debris and solids, and to prevent depression of oxygen levels, resulting in violations of certain DO standards. Additionally, the complaint alleges that the District’s discharge of phosphorous from its WRPs is in violation of the District’s NPDES permits. Currently, with respect to the District’s three major WRPs, the existing NPDES permits contain no effluent limits for phosphorus nor are water quality standards in place for phosphorus with respect to the bodies of water to which they discharge.

The Private Parties are seeking a permanent injunction preventing the alleged violations of the CWA, an order requiring the District to complete all actions necessary to comply with its permits and CWA, and an award of civil penalties as well as attorney’s fees. An adverse ruling could result in significant costs and expenses to the District. Violations of the CWA can result in statutory penalties of up to \$37,500 per violation. Furthermore, if the District were required to reduce the phosphorus in its effluent at its three major WRPs, the capital costs are estimated to range from \$50 million to meet a standard of 1.0 mg/l up to \$1.1 billion to meet a standard of 0.5 mg/l. Of such capital costs, the District anticipates incurring within the next three years approximately \$5 million if the standard is 1.0 mg/l and approximately \$80 million to \$100 million if the standard is 0.5 mg/l. After the facilities are operational, the District anticipates incurring annual operating and chemical costs, which are estimated at \$26 million per year if the standard is 1.0 mg/l and \$69 million per year if the standard is 0.5 mg/l. The District is

vigorously defending this lawsuit and denies that the Private Parties are entitled to the relief sought.

LITIGATION

Upon the delivery of the Bonds, the District will furnish a certificate to the effect that there is no litigation pending or threatened to restrain or enjoin the issuance, sale or delivery of the Bonds, or in any way contesting the validity or enforceability of the Bonds or the pledge of the District's full faith, credit and taxing power for their payment.

Litigation involving the District and entitled: *Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago v. Terra Foundation for American Art, et al.* is pending in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois (the "Circuit Court"). On July 12, 2006, the District filed in the Circuit Court a Complaint For Declaratory Judgment, now as amended, naming Terra Foundation for American Art ("*Terra*"), 664 N. Michigan LLC, NM Project Company, LLC (the latter two defendants referred to collectively as the "*Project Company*") and others, as defendants, seeking a declaration of rights with respect to three easements encumbering a District-owned alley physically located between the District's main office building and certain property (the "*Parcels*") previously owned by Terra and now owned by the Project Company. Terra and the Project Company have entered into certain agreements to develop the Parcels into a luxury residential, office and retail building. The District alleges that the planned development improperly expands the scope and use of the District's alley in violation of the easements. Terra and the Project Company, in addition to denying the District's claims, each filed a counterclaim. Terra's counterclaim, filed on September 28, 2006, seeks to quiet title and a declaratory judgment. The Project Company's counterclaim, filed on July 2, 2008, seeks injunctive and declaratory relief and damages. The Project Company's damage claims range from approximately \$43.1 million to \$66.5 million based on the District's purported delay of the development. The District submitted its expert's report refuting the analysis of the Project Company's expert's report. On June 16, 2009, the Project Company filed a motion to amend its pleadings to add a claim for tortious interference with prospective economic advantage. The District filed its opposition to this motion, and the Project Company's motion was denied on August 17, 2009. The trial on the Project Company's damage claim began on August 24, 2009 and the trial is ongoing. While the District cannot assure any outcome, the District believes that its claims and defenses are well-founded. The District will continue to aggressively assert its claims and defenses.

The District has previously been and is presently a party to several proposed class action lawsuits in the Circuit Court of Cook County arising out of local sewer back-ups and basement flooding. The District is also in receipt of a number of flooding claims in which lawsuits have not yet been filed. The lawsuits and claims are premised, in part, on a provision of the Act intended to address property damage claims arising out of the construction of the Sanitary & Ship Canal and the reversal of the Chicago River. As of the date of this Official Statement, the Circuit Court of Cook County has ruled in the District's favor in every fully-adjudicated matter, finding that the particular provision of the Act does not apply to the flooding complained of and that the District is otherwise immune from liability based upon the common law and/or statutes of Illinois. The estimated potential liability in these matters is \$78 million, of which \$42 million

is attributable to a single lawsuit seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief. In this particular lawsuit, all claims have been dismissed in the District's favor at the trial court level. The plaintiffs' counsel has indicated that his clients will appeal the lower court decisions. The District will continue to vigorously contest liability in each of these matters.

The District is also involved in various other litigation matters relating principally to claims arising from construction contracts, enforcing property rights, personal injury and property damage. The majority of any claims and judgments for personal injury and property damage are recovered by insurance or settled and paid from the District's Reserve Claim Fund. Most claims and judgments involving construction contracts are paid by the Capital Projects Funds.

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE

The District will enter into a Continuing Disclosure Undertaking (the "*Undertaking*") for the benefit of the beneficial owners of the Bonds to send certain information annually and to provide notice of certain events to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (the "*MSRB*") pursuant to the requirements of Section (b)(5) of Rule 15c2-12 (the "*Rule*") adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "*Commission*") under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "*Exchange Act*"). The information to be provided on an annual basis, the events which will be noticed on an occurrence basis and a summary of other terms of the Undertaking, including termination, amendment and remedies, are set forth below under "THE UNDERTAKING."

The District represents that it has not failed to comply in all material respects with each and every continuing disclosure undertaking that it has previously entered into pursuant to the Rule. A failure by the District to comply with the Undertaking will not constitute a default under the Bond Ordinance and beneficial owners of the Bonds are limited to remedies described in the Undertaking. See "THE UNDERTAKING – Consequences of Failure of the District to Provide Information." A failure by the District to comply with the Undertaking must be reported in accordance with the Rule and must be considered by any broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer before recommending the purchase or sale of the Bonds in the secondary market. Consequently, such a failure may adversely affect the transferability and liquidity of the Bonds and their market price.

Recent Disclosure

On August 26, 2009, the District issued its \$600,000,000 Taxable General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds Limited Tax Series of August, 2009 (Build America Bond — Direct Payment) (the "*2009 Bonds*").

On April 29, 2010, the District received notice of an inquiry relating to the 2009 Bonds by the Commission. The Commission requested that the District produce documents, including e-mails, related to the issuance and sale of the 2009 Bonds. The District furnished various

documents to the Commission during the summer of 2010. The District will continue to cooperate with the Commission.

By letter dated September 27, 2010, the Tax-Exempt Bond (“TEB”) function of the Internal Revenue Service notified the District that it is conducting an examination of the 2009 Bonds. The District believes that all requirements of the Code relating to Build America Bonds were satisfied.

THE UNDERTAKING

The following is a brief summary of certain provisions of the Undertaking of the District and does not purport to be complete. The statements made under this caption are subject to the detailed provisions of the Undertaking, a copy of which is available upon request from the District.

Annual Financial Information Disclosure

The District covenants that it will disseminate its Annual Financial Information and its Audited Financial Statements (as described below) to the MSRB in such manner and format and accompanied by identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB or the Commission at the time of delivery of such information. Annual Financial Information, exclusive of the Audited Financial Statements, will be provided to the MSRB within 210 days after the last day of the District’s fiscal year (currently December 31). Audited Financial Statements, as described below, should be filed at the same time as the Annual Financial Information. If Audited Financial Statements are not available when the Annual Financial Information is filed, unaudited financial statements shall be included.

“*Annual Financial Information*” means the financial information and operating data of the type contained in the Official Statement under the following captions: “DEBT INFORMATION” (excluding information in the table “Estimated Overlapping Bonded Debt,” and graph and information under the heading “Debt Limits and Borrowing Authority”), “CASH MANAGEMENT – Investment of District Funds” (chart titled “Investments and Interest Income” only), Tables 1 through 7 under “RETIREMENT FUND”, “BUDGETARY PROCEDURES – Comparative Budget Information,” “TAXATION OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT – STATISTICAL INFORMATION,” “APPENDIX B – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM” and “APPENDIX C – REPORT OF THE CONSULTING ACTUARY ON THE DISTRICT RETIREMENT FUND.”

“*Audited Financial Statements*” means the audited financial statements of the District prepared using the accounting standards as follows: Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, as applicable to governmental units (*i.e.*, as subject to the pronouncements of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board) and subject to any express requirements of State law.

Audited Financial Statements shall be provided to the MSRB at the time the Annual Financial Information is provided, or within 30 days after availability to the District, if later.

Reportable Events Disclosure

The District covenants that it will disseminate to the MSRB in a timely manner (not in excess of ten business days after the occurrence of the Reportable Event), the disclosure of the occurrence of a Reportable Event (as described below) with respect to the Bonds, in such manner and format and accompanied by identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB or the Commission at the time of delivery of such information. The “Reportable Events” are:

- Principal and interest payment delinquencies
- Non-payment related defaults, if material
- Unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties
- Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties
- Substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform
- Adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB) or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax status of the security, or other material events affecting the tax status of the security
- Modifications to the rights of security holders, if material
- Bond calls, if material, and tender offers
- Defeasances
- Release, substitution or sale of property securing repayment of the securities, if material
- Rating changes
- Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership or similar event of the District*
- The consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving the District or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the District, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material
- Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee, if material

Some of the foregoing events may be inapplicable to the Bonds.

Consequences of Failure of the District to Provide Information

The District is required to give notice in a timely manner to the MSRB of any failure to provide disclosure of Annual Financial Information and Audited Financial Statements when the same are due under the Undertaking.

* This event is considered to occur when any of the following occur: the appointment of a receiver, fiscal agent or similar officer for the District in a proceeding under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code or in any other proceeding under state or federal law in which a court or governmental authority has assumed jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the District, or if such jurisdiction has been assumed by leaving the existing governing body and officials or officers in possession but subject to the supervision and orders of a court or governmental authority, or the entry of an order confirming a plan of reorganization, arrangement or liquidation by a court or governmental authority having supervision or jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the District.

In the event of a failure of the District to comply with any provision of the Undertaking, the beneficial owner of any Bond may seek mandamus or specific performance by court order, to cause the District to comply with its obligations under the Undertaking. A default under the Undertaking shall not be deemed a default under the Bond Ordinance, and the sole remedy under the Undertaking in the event of any failure of the District to comply with the Undertaking shall be an action to compel performance.

Amendment; Waiver

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Undertaking, the District by resolution or ordinance authorizing such amendment or waiver, may amend the Undertaking, and any provision of the Undertaking may be waived, if:

(a) (i) The amendment or the waiver is made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, including, without limitation, pursuant to a “no-action” letter issued by the Commission, a change in law, or a change in the identity, nature, or status of the District, or type of business conducted; or

(ii) The Undertaking, as amended, or the provision, as waived, would have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of the primary offering, after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances; and

(b) The amendment or waiver does not materially impair the interests of the beneficial owners of the Bonds, as determined by a party unaffiliated with the District (such as bond counsel).

In the event that the Commission or the MSRB or other regulatory authority approves or requires Annual Financial Information or notices of a Reportable Event to be filed with a central post office, governmental agency or similar entity other than the MSRB or in lieu of the MSRB, the District shall, if required, make such dissemination to such central post office, governmental agency or similar entity without the necessity of amending the Undertaking.

Termination of Undertaking

The Undertaking shall be terminated if the District shall no longer have any legal liability for any obligation on or relating to repayment of the Bonds under the Bond Ordinance. The District shall give notice to the MSRB in a timely manner if this paragraph is applicable.

Additional Information

Nothing in the Undertaking shall be deemed to prevent the District from disseminating any other information, using the means of dissemination set forth in the Undertaking or any other means of communication, or including any other information in any Annual Financial Information or Audited Financial Statements or notice of occurrence of a Reportable Event, in

addition to that which is required by the Undertaking, provided that the District shall have no obligation under the Undertaking to update such information or include it in any future disclosure or notice of occurrence of a Reportable Event.

Dissemination of Information; Dissemination Agent

When filings are required to be made with the MSRB in accordance with the Undertaking, such filings are required to be made through its Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) system for municipal securities disclosure or through any other electronic format or system prescribed by the MSRB for purposes of the Rule.

The District may, from time to time, appoint or engage a Dissemination Agent to assist it in carrying out its obligations under the Undertaking, and may discharge any such Agent, with or without appointing a successor Dissemination Agent.

CERTAIN LEGAL MATTERS

Certain legal matters incident to the authorization and issuance of the Bonds are subject to the approving opinions of Chapman and Cutler LLP, Chicago, Illinois, and Gonzalez, Saggio and Harlan, L.L.C., Chicago, Illinois, Co-Bond Counsel who have been retained by, and who act as counsel to, the District. Certain legal matters will be passed upon for the District by its General Counsel. Certain legal matters will be passed on for the Underwriters by Pugh, Jones, Johnson & Quandt, P.C., Chicago, Illinois, and Greene and Letts, Chicago, Illinois Co-Underwriters' Counsel. Co-Bond Counsel has not been retained or consulted on disclosure matters and has not undertaken to review or verify the accuracy, completeness or sufficiency of this Official Statement or other offering material relating to the Bonds and assumes no responsibility for the statements or information contained in or incorporated by reference in this Official Statement, except that Co-Bond Counsel has, at the request of the District, reviewed only those portions of the Official Statement involving the description of the Bonds, the security for the Bonds (excluding forecasts, projections, estimates or any other financial or economic information in connection therewith), and the description of the federal tax status of interest on the Bonds. This review was undertaken solely at the request of the District and did not include any obligation to establish or confirm factual matters set forth herein. Chapman and Cutler LLP, Chicago, Illinois is also acting in a separate capacity as Disclosure Counsel to the District.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - APPENDICES

Included in this Official Statement as APPENDIX A are the District's Basic Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2010. A description of the District's Capital Improvements Program is included as APPENDIX B. Information regarding the District's Retirement Fund is included as APPENDIX C. Economic and demographic information with respect to Cook County is presented as APPENDIX D. The forms of the opinions of Co-Bond Counsel are included as APPENDIX E. Information concerning DTC and DTC's book-entry is included as APPENDIX F.

AUTHORIZATION

The District has authorized the distribution of this Official Statement.

At the time of delivery of the Bonds, the District will furnish a certificate executed by the Treasurer stating that to the best of his knowledge the Official Statement does not (as of the date thereof and will not at the date of the delivery of the Bonds) contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made therein, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

/s/ Mary Ann Boyle

Treasurer

Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of

Greater Chicago

100 East Erie Street

Chicago, Illinois 60611

Telephone: (312) 751-5150

APPENDIX A

BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

APPENDIX B

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

APPENDIX B

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

Overview

The District currently serves the City of Chicago and 125 other municipalities encompassing an area of approximately 884 square miles. In carrying out its responsibilities, the District collects and treats wastewater from a population equivalent of about 10.35 million people; this includes domestic wastewater from approximately 5.25 million people, a commercial and industrial equivalent of approximately 4.5 million people, and a combined sewer overflow equivalent of approximately 0.6 million people. Its operating facilities are estimated to have a present day replacement cost of \$32.4 billion.

Treated wastewater, along with runoff from rainfall, enters the rivers and streams of the Cook County area, waterways that serve as headwaters of the Illinois waterway system. Stringent water quality standards imposed by the Federal and State governments require that wastewater treatment result in unpolluted streams for the residents of Cook, DuPage and Will Counties, and other downstream communities. Each of the District's Water Reclamation Plants operates under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the IEPA. All of the District's Water Reclamation Plants are in compliance with their NPDES permit. In order to maintain compliance, the District's facilities are continuously rehabilitated and upgraded to provide cost effective collection and treatment.

The District's Capital Improvements Program consists of those projects identified as necessary to assure safe and uninterrupted operation of its facilities, meet existing and new statutory and regulatory requirements, and increase efficiency through facility upgrades and modernization. The District anticipates constructing its Capital Improvements Program projects with funding from the Illinois EPA State Revolving Fund, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Construction and Storm Water Management Fund tax levy collections, and the District's bonding authority. A description of the major elements in the Capital Improvements Program follows, together with the estimated cost of projects identified to date (based upon current price levels).

Collection System

In order to collect wastewater from local sewer systems for conveyance to its water reclamation plants, the District has constructed or has under construction approximately 22 pump stations and 559 miles of intercepting sewers and force mains ranging in size from 12 inches to 27 feet in diameter.

The District has an ongoing and extensive Interceptor Inspection and Rehabilitation Program with respect to the interceptor sewers and force mains which it owns and operates. The program is designed to identify deterioration and deficiencies and take action to make necessary repairs.

Within the next five years, award of construction projects with a cost of approximately \$196 million is currently anticipated for collection system improvements, with approximately \$238 million total anticipated under the Capital Improvements Program through 2020.

Water Reclamation Plant Expansions and Improvements

The District has a total secondary treatment capacity of approximately 2 billion gallons per day. The Capital Improvements Program includes projects for enhancements at all of the District's Water Reclamation Plants at a cost of approximately \$1.2 billion total anticipated through 2040. Typically studies are conducted to determine future needs when facilities are operating near or at capacity, or when new facilities are anticipated to be required as a result of pending regulations. The Engineering Department has completed its Master Plan studies for the Stickney, Calumet and North Side Water Reclamation Plants and service areas, which identify the capital improvements needed to serve wastewater flows projected through the year 2040. Award of construction projects with a cost of approximately \$798 million is currently anticipated for Water Reclamation Plant expansions and upgrades, within the next five years. This figure includes several projects at the Stickney, Calumet and North Side Water Reclamation Plants that have already been identified and added to the program as a result of the ongoing Master Plan studies. Some major projects are highlighted below.

04-128-3P, West Side Circular Primary Settling Tanks 1-9 and Aerated Grit Facility, at the Stickney Water Reclamation Plant, is scheduled to be awarded late 2012, at an estimated value of \$250 million. This project will provide conventional primary treatment to flows through the Westside Plant by replacing the existing Imhoff tanks to circular primary tanks. Nine 160 foot diameter tanks will be constructed in existing Battery A of the Imhoff tank area. The new primary settling tanks will improve sludge capture, improve effluent quality to secondary treatment, and significantly reduce maintenance costs over the current facilities. The improved solids capture will increase the amount of digester gas produced at the plant, providing opportunities to utilize this free energy source and thus reduce the District's reliance on natural gas. This project will also provide new aerated grit tanks, replacing the existing skimming tanks, at the Westside Plant, and includes odor control facilities, service tunnels and other modifications to site support services. These improvements will increase the capture of inorganic material, thus reducing wear on downstream equipment.

10-046-3P, Battery D – Aeration Tank No. 8, at the North Side Water Reclamation Plant, is scheduled to be awarded late 2012, at an estimated value of \$20 million. This project will provide one additional aeration tank to Battery D to increase the biological treatment capacity of this battery during peak loadings.

The Lemont Water Reclamation Plant is scheduled to be decommissioned and a pumping station and wet weather treatment facility constructed in its place. The new pumping station will convey flow from the drainage basin through two, eleven mile-long force mains to the Stickney Service Area collection system, and is being designed under project 08-714-3P. Project 05-711-3P is under design to construct a 5 million gallon reservoir to store wet weather flows, and buffer the hydraulic loading on the pumping station. To complete the work at the Lemont site, a new wet weather treatment facility will be constructed under 10-716-3P to

provide treatment to combined sewer overflows before discharge to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. The estimated total construction cost for the above three projects is \$77 million, and contract awards are planned for the 2013 through 2015 time period.

Biosolids Management

Improved wastewater treatment and greater plant efficiency will result in the District's collection of increased quantities of biosolids. The effective handling of biosolids is a major program of the District. Efficiencies can be gained by improved dewatering facilities. Projected costs of approximately \$369 million are currently anticipated for biosolids management within the next five years, with approximately \$502 million total anticipated through 2030.

Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP)

The District's Board of Commissioners adopted the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) in 1972 as a comprehensive pollution and flood control program for its 375 square mile combined sewer area. This area includes part or all of 52 communities including the City of Chicago. The primary goals of TARP are as follows: protect Lake Michigan – the area's primary source of drinking water – from polluted backflows; clean up the area's waterways; and provide an outlet for floodwaters in order to reduce basement sewage flooding. TARP was adopted after years of studies conducted through the Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC). The members of the FCCC represented the State of Illinois, Cook County, the City of Chicago, and the District.

Prior to the startup of TARP, combined sewer overflow (CSO), a mix of raw sewage and stormwater runoff, discharged to the waterways approximately 100 times a year. During periods of heavy rain, the pollution effect of the CSO was equivalent to a polluted wastewater load from a population of about 4.5 million people. The discharge exceeded the capacity of local sewers and waterways and resulted in basement and street flooding in the area and, during the heaviest rains, backflows to Lake Michigan.

TARP Tunnel System. The TARP Tunnel System is comprised of the Upper Des Plaines, Des Plaines, Mainstream and Calumet tunnel systems and the Mainstream and Calumet TARP pumping stations. The TARP tunnel system eliminates about 85% of the pollution load attributable to CSOs by capturing and storing the most polluted fractions until they can be treated in the District's Water Reclamation Plants.

TARP Reservoirs. Three reservoirs will provide storage for additional sewage and stormwater runoff flows captured by the TARP tunnel system. The three Chicago Underflow Plan reservoirs – Gloria Alitto Majewski, Thornton and McCook – will provide 18.3 billion gallons of flood control storage when completed. Currently the Majewski Reservoir is on-line. Work on the Thornton and McCook reservoirs is underway. The combined total costs for all three reservoirs is estimated at \$1.235 billion, with the Corps and the District providing approximately \$718 million and \$517 million, respectively. Continuing design and construction projects with a cost to the District of approximately \$295 million is currently anticipated for TARP reservoir construction, over the next five years and \$338 million through 2029.

Stormwater Management

The District began developing Detailed Watershed Plans (DWPs) in 2007. The DWPs provide comprehensive evaluations of existing conditions and stormwater management concerns in each of Cook County's six major watersheds, and include recommendations for potential capital improvement projects to address the identified concerns. DWPs for the Calumet-Sag Channel, Upper Salt Creek, Little Calumet River, and Poplar Creek watersheds were completed in 2009 and 2010. Work on the Lower Des Plaines River and North Branch of the Chicago River DWPs was completed in early 2011. The projects recommended under completed DWPs are prioritized annually by the District's Board for funding under the Stormwater Management Fund. In 2010, the District initiated preliminary engineering for nine flood control and nine streambank stabilization projects. Preliminary engineering for these projects concluded in late spring 2011. Negotiations for final design of projects determined to be feasible through preliminary engineering and subsequently approved by the Board will commence in summer 2011. In 2011, the District's Board granted approval to initiate preliminary engineering for eight flood control projects and design of ten streambank stabilization projects. Negotiations are currently underway to begin feasibility studies for these projects. Prior to completion of the initial DWPs, the District looked to fund flood control projects that were approved for funding by agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources/Office of Water Resources. Final design for one such project, the Heritage Park Flood Control Facility, began after the District entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the Wheeling Park District and Village of Wheeling. The Heritage Park Flood Control Facility will provide the required compensatory storage to allow for Levee 37, a Corps project proposed in their 1999 Des Plaines River Phase I Study, to become operational. Award of construction projects with a cost of approximately \$33 million is currently anticipated for Stormwater Management over the next five years.

Replacement of Facilities


Many of the District's plants and interceptors were placed in service over 50 years ago. In order to maintain continuous operations, the District has initiated a master plan to replace physically deteriorating facilities through major rehabilitation, alteration or expansion. The cost for master plan improvements is estimated to average \$49 million per year over the course of the next five years. Costs for all projects identified for replacement facilities are approximately \$269 million through 2020.

Means of Financing

The only USEPA grant funding available to the District in recent years has been limited to Congressional earmarks for District TARP projects. Most of the funding of the District's planned improvements of its plants and continued construction of TARP facilities is expected to be accomplished through State Revolving Fund Loans ("*SRF Loans*") and the issuance of bonds by the District. The District funding needed to complete the components of the Capital Improvements Program being funded over the course of the next five years is approximately \$1.94 billion.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEAR PERIOD*	DISTRICT BONDS & CONSTRUCTION FUND, AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FUND (MILLIONS)
Intercepting Sewers	\$ 196
Water Reclamation Plant Expansions & Improvements	798
Biosolids Management	369
Tunnel & Reservoir Plan CUP (District Portion)	295
Stormwater Management	33
Replacement of Facilities	<u>246</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$1,937</u>

* Approximate total costs of Capital Improvements Program (including the next five year period) are \$2,580 (millions).



TUNNEL and RESERVOIR PLAN PROJECT STATUS

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE CONSULTING ACTUARY ON THE DISTRICT RETIREMENT FUND

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE CONSULTING ACTUARY ON THE DISTRICT RETIREMENT FUND

The Metropolitan Water Reclamation District has a contributory pension fund which provides coverage for all Water Reclamation District employees and Commissioners. The total number of covered employees in active service at the end of 2010 was 2,024. The total number of beneficiaries was 2,248.

The pension fund is financed by employee contributions and Water Reclamation District contributions. Both are fixed by State Statute. The employee rate is a fixed percentage of salary. The Water Reclamation District contribution is a multiple of the employee contributions made two years prior. The employee rate of contribution was eight and one-half percent of salary until January 1, 1988. Beginning January 1, 1988, the rate was raised to nine percent of salary. The Water Reclamation District multiple was 2.19 for 1988 and each year thereafter. An exception was made to this 2.19 multiplier for all employee contributions made to the Optional Plan beginning in 2003 through 2007 for which the tax levy was made on dollar-for-dollar basis.

The actuarial funding method used is the Entry Age Normal Method. The Entry Age Normal Method is an immediate gain valuation method. This means that any deviation of plan experience from the actuarial assumptions is reflected immediately in the Unfunded Liability.

This Entry Age Normal Method assigns to each year of employment a constant percentage of an employee's salary, called the Current Service Cost, sufficient to accumulate the necessary funds to provide for the full prospective costs of the employee's projected retirement pension. The amount of pension must be estimated using various assumptions as to future compensation levels, employee turnover, mortality, and pension fund investment earnings, since the actual pension can only be known at the time of retirement. These are called actuarial assumptions and reflect long range expectations of the plan on an ongoing or permanent basis. An annual review of these assumptions is made and appropriate changes are made when required.

The Accrued Liability of the fund at any point in time is the accumulated value of all Current Service Costs which should have been paid to that time for active employees plus full prospective cost of pensions for all retired employees. The extent that the actual Plan Assets are less than the Accrued Liability is called the Unfunded Liability.

An amount of money is required each year to amortize the Unfunded Liability over a span of thirty years. This amount is called the 30-Year Amortization of the Unfunded Liability.

The total required Annual Actuarial Contribution to the fund (financed by the employee and employer) is equal to the Current Service Cost plus 30-Year Amortization of the Unfunded Liability as a level percent of payroll. This conforms to GASB No. 25.

In 2010, employer contributions to the Fund amounted to 48.4% of the actuarially determined contribution requirement.

Financial Position

YEAR END	EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS (1)	EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS (2)	INVESTMENT INCOME (3)	TOTAL INCOME		
2001	\$14,986,546	\$28,026,964	\$ (13,511,382)	\$ 29,502,128		
2002	16,308,414	30,066,953	(69,495,489)	(23,120,122)		
2003	14,230,224	28,778,648	172,759,610	215,768,482		
2004	15,150,846	30,982,232	98,899,393	145,032,471		
2005	14,468,188	26,174,492	55,864,422	96,507,102		
2006	14,955,252	34,476,332	108,689,160	158,120,744		
2007	15,627,673	27,947,096	65,234,747	108,809,516		
2008	14,778,404	33,406,819	(296,635,043)	(248,449,820)		
2009	15,690,322	32,153,874	196,652,890	244,497,086		
2010	15,872,560	29,917,793	146,521,908	192,312,261		

YEAR END	BENEFITS	ADMINISTRATIVE AND INVESTMENT EXPENSES	REFUNDS	TOTAL ⁽⁴⁾	INCOME LESS PAYOUTS ⁽⁵⁾	RETURN ON INVESTED ASSETS ⁽⁶⁾
2001	\$ 62,542,156	\$2,733,296	\$ 701,766	\$ 65,977,218	\$ (36,475,090)	(1.4)%
2002	67,574,253	2,701,495	951,614	71,227,362	(94,347,484)	(6.9)
2003	73,231,227	2,885,338	1,041,560	77,158,125	138,610,357	18.9
2004	78,113,259	3,236,471	1,320,740	82,670,470	62,362,001	9.4
2005	83,293,069	3,381,747	1,287,679	87,962,495	8,544,607	4.9
2006	89,079,089	3,646,960	1,410,954	94,137,003	63,983,741	9.6
2007	94,846,021	4,027,657	1,164,218	100,037,896	8,771,620	5.4
2008	100,068,749	3,787,807	964,846	104,821,402	(353,271,222)	(25.5)
2009	103,404,530	3,895,636	1,174,864	108,475,030	136,022,056	23.1
2010	108,219,186	4,883,958	1,380,310	114,483,454	77,828,807	15.9

(1) Includes Deductions in Lieu for Disability, made by the District.

(2) Net Tax Levy and Miscellaneous Income.

(3) Includes realized net gain/loss on sale and exchange of bonds and stocks, securities lending income and other miscellaneous income. Not shown net of fees and expenses.

(4) Includes Pensions, Benefits, Refunds and Administrative Expenses.

(5) Does not include Prior Years Tax Adjustments.

(6) Computed on assets shown, less taxes receivable and cash.

Distribution of Cash and Security Holdings

YEAR	CASH	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SECURITIES	STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECURITIES	CORPORATE STOCKS AND BONDS	SHORT TERM	CONVERTIBLE SECURITIES	OTHER BONDS
2001	0.0%	5.2%	0.1%	93.2%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
2002	0.0	6.0	0.1	92.7	1.2	0.0	0.0
2003	0.0	5.3	0.3	93.3	1.0	0.0	0.1
2004	0.0	5.2	0.3	93.2	1.1	0.0	0.2
2005	0.0	5.1	0.1	92.8	1.8	0.0	0.2
2006	0.0	4.9	0.1	93.8	1.0	0.0	0.2
2007	0.0	4.7	0.1	94.0	1.0	0.0	0.2
2008	0.0	1.8	0.0	96.5	1.7	0.0	0.0
2009	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
2010	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0

Schedule of Funding Progress

YEAR	ACCRUED LIABILITY ⁽¹⁾	ASSETS AT ACTUARIAL VALUE ⁽²⁾	FUNDED RATIO	UNFUNDED ACCRUED LIABILITY	PAYROLL AT YEAR END	UNFUNDED ACCRUED % PAYROLL (SURPLUS)
2001	\$1,346,223,065	\$1,155,825,153	85.9%	\$190,397,912	\$136,382,287	140%
2002 (b)	1,470,938,987	1,136,907,158	77.3	334,031,829	137,679,573	243
2003 (a)	1,517,868,687	1,146,520,634	75.5	371,348,053	142,593,596	260
2004	1,578,366,508	1,161,778,511	73.6	416,587,997	146,360,302	285
2005	1,654,188,382	1,171,844,612	70.8	482,343,770	149,246,356	323
2006 (a)	1,724,705,199	1,209,601,736	70.1	515,103,463	152,767,396	337
2007	1,795,176,667	1,256,889,942	70.0	538,286,725	158,831,772	339
2008 (a)	1,852,279,634	1,211,838,320	65.4	640,441,314	167,865,254	382
2009	1,939,172,047	1,177,810,068	60.7	761,361,979	176,915,399	430
2010 (a)	2,036,679,763	1,151,595,245	56.5	885,084,518	174,485,734	507

(a) Change in actuarial assumptions.

(b) Changes in both benefits and actuarial assumptions.

(1) The 2001 results are based on 8% interest and 5.5% salary scale. The 2002-2005 results are based on 7.75% interest and 5.5% salary scale. The 2006 results are based on 7.75% interest and 5.0% salary scale.

(2) All asset values shown here have been restated to the actuarial asset value 5-year smoothed average ratio of market over book) to comply with GASB No. 25. For information on the fair market value of assets for fiscal years 2001 through 2010 and additional information on asset smoothing, see "RETIREMENT FUND—Actuarial Methods" in the Official Statement.

In the Schedule of Funding Progress, analysis of the dollar amount of net assets available for benefits, actuarial accrued liability, and unfunded actuarial accrued liability in isolation can be misleading. Expressing the net assets available for benefits as a percentage of the actuarial accrued liability provides one indication of funding status on a going-concern basis. Analysis of this percentage over time indicates whether the system is becoming financially stronger or weaker. Generally, the greater this percentage, the stronger the retirement system. Trends in unfunded actuarial accrued liability and annual covered payroll are both affected by inflation. Expressing the unfunded actuarial accrued liability as a percentage of annual covered payroll approximately adjusts for the effects of inflation and aids analysis of progress made in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due. Generally, the smaller this percentage, the stronger the retirement system.

Prioritized Solvency Test

The prioritized solvency test is another means of checking a system's progress under its funding program. In a short-term solvency test, the plan's present assets (cash and investments) are compared with actuarial accrued liabilities classified into the following categories: (1) liability for active member contributions on deposit; (2) liability for future benefits to present retired lives; and (3) liability for the employer financed portion of service already rendered by active members. In a system that has been following the discipline of level percent of payroll financing the obligation for active member contributions on deposit (present value 1) and the present value of future benefits to present retired lives (present value 2) will be fully covered by present assets (except in rare circumstances). In addition, the present value of credited projected benefits for present active members (present value 3) will be partially covered by the remainder of present assets. Generally, if the system has been using a level cost financing, the funded portion of present value 3 will increase over time.

VALUATION DATE 12/31	AGGREGATE ACCRUED LIABILITIES FOR:				PORTION (%) OF ACCRUED LIABILITIES COVERED BY ASSETS		
	(1) ACTIVE MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS	(2) RETIREEES AND BENEFICIARIES	(3) ACTIVE MEMBERS (ER FINANCED PORTION)	ACTUARIAL ASSET VALUES FOR GASB ^(a)	(1)	(2)	(3)
2001	\$146,917,082	\$ 760,159,510	\$439,146,473	\$1,155,825,153	100%	100%	57%
2002 (b), (c)	151,994,419	849,986,869	468,975,699	1,136,907,158	100	100	29
2003 (b)	157,910,357	886,174,665	473,783,665	1,146,520,634	100	100	22
2004	163,674,928	929,904,220	484,787,360	1,161,778,511	100	100	14
2005	170,744,447	988,212,377	495,231,558	1,171,844,612	100	100	3
2006 (b)	176,844,639	1,075,659,908	472,200,652	1,209,601,736	100	96	0
2007	181,077,729	1,139,967,612	474,131,326	1,256,889,942	100	94	0
2008 (b)	190,017,921	1,176,701,786	485,559,927	1,211,838,320	100	87	0
2009	202,119,201	1,200,102,267	536,950,579	1,177,810,068	100	81	0
2010 (b)	206,933,701	1,313,366,530	516,379,532	1,151,595,245	100	72	0

(a) Assets at 5-year smoothed market value.

(b) Change in actuarial assumptions.

(c) Change in benefits.

Actuarial Requirements

The total required Annual Actuarial Contribution to the Fund (financed by the employee and the Water Reclamation District) is equal to the Current Service Cost plus an amount to amortize the Unfunded Liability over a period of 30 years as required by GASB No. 25. Prior to the December 31, 1998 valuation, a 40-year amortization period had been used.

For the year 2010 (based on a tax multiple of 2.19) the Water Reclamation District contributed \$29,917,793 or 16.91% of payroll. For 2010, employee contributions were \$15,872,560 or 8.97% of payroll. The total required annual actuarial contribution, consisting of the Current Service Cost plus the amount to amortize the Unfunded Liability over a 30-year period was 43.97% of payroll.

As the Water Reclamation District tax levy is expressed as a multiple of the total salary deductions made two years prior, the Water Reclamation District is effectively contributing a level annual percentage of payroll.

YEAR	TOTAL REQUIRED ACTUAL ACTUARIAL CONTRIBUTION RATE	ACTUAL CONTRIBUTION		DEFICIENCY (EXCESS) IN ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION
		EMPLOYER	EMPLOYEE	
2001	32.55	22.25	11.81	(1.51)
2002	34.51	21.02	11.96	1.53
2003	37.26	20.91	10.34	6.01
2004	37.89	21.73	10.62	5.54
2005	39.21	17.89	9.89	11.43
2006	41.38	23.10	10.02	8.26
2007 (a)	40.53	18.29	10.22	12.02
2008	40.33	21.03	9.31	9.99
2009 (a)	41.64	19.15	9.35	13.14
2010	43.97	16.91	8.97	18.09
2011 (a)	48.77	19.69 Est	9.00 Est	20.08 Est

(a) Change in actuarial assumptions.

Note: The total required annual contribution rate is calculated as the normal cost plus 30-year amortization of the unfunded liability.

GASB Disclosure

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 25, *Financial Reporting for Defined Benefit Pension Plans*, is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 1996. The Purpose of the Statement is to make the pension information more understandable and more useful. In the past, the measures of a plan's funded status and the employer's required contributions have been reported consistent with GASB Statement No. 5.

The Actuarial Asset Value, a smoothed market related value of assets technique, is calculated by smoothing unexpected gains or losses over a period of 5 years.

A level-percent amortization of the unfunded actuarial liability (level-dollar prior to 2003) with an open amortization period of 30 years is the method used for computing the amortization requirements.

Schedule of Employer Contributions

FISCAL YEAR	ANNUAL REQUIRED CONTRIBUTIONS (ARC) (1)	REQUIRED STATUTORY BASIS (2)	ACTUAL	PERCENT OF ARC CONTRIBUTED BY EMPLOYER
2001	\$28,552,646	\$27,128,300	\$28,249,866	98.94%
2002	33,414,603	27,307,600	28,663,736	85.78
2003	38,039,355	28,554,300	28,789,850	75.68
2004	40,146,454	31,072,100	30,986,177	77.18
2005	43,164,572	25,958,000	26,179,018	60.65
2006	47,368,878	27,580,000	34,478,941	72.78
2007	47,090,445	30,312,000	27,947,096	59.35
2008	49,758,238	31,314,000	33,406,819	67.14
2009	54,790,175	32,640,000	32,153,874	58.69
2010	61,872,925	32,307,000	29,917,793	48.35

(1) Normal cost plus 30-year level dollar amortization, less expected employee contributions, restated back for all prior years. Level-percent amortization starting 2003.

(2) Tax levy.

Actuarial Assumptions and Cost Method

The actuarial assumptions used for the December 31, 2010 actuarial valuation were based on our experience analysis of the fund for the three-year period 2006 through 2009.

The major actuarial assumptions used for the December 31, 2010 valuation are summarized below:

- *Investment return:* 7.75% per year, compounded annually.
- *Salary increase:* 5.0% per year, compounded annually.
- *Retirement Rates:* Rates of retirement for each age from 50 to 70, based on the recent experience of the fund.
- *Termination Rates:* Termination rates, varying by age and length of service, based on the recent experience of the fund.
- *Mortality Rates:* The UP-1994 Mortality Table for Males, rated down 2 years, for male participants. The UP-1994 Mortality Table for Females, rated down 1 year, for female participants.

In our opinion, the actuarial assumptions used for the valuation are reasonable, in the aggregate, taking into account Fund experience and future expectations and represent our best estimate of anticipated experience.

The entry age actuarial cost method was used for the December 31, 2010 valuation, with costs allocated on the basis of earnings. This is the same actuarial cost method that was used for the December 31, 2009 valuation.

SANDOR GOLDSTEIN, F.S.A.
Consulting Actuary
Goldstein and Associates

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC INFORMATION

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC INFORMATION

Demographic and economic developments are best understood in a comparative framework. This appendix provides material for analyzing and comparing trends in Cook County with those in other major counties in the nation. To maximize the value of the comparisons, the counties utilized in the tables were selected on the basis of several criteria in addition to size. These include:

(1) Governmental functions similar in magnitude and scope to those of Cook County. This requirement resulted in the exclusion of counties that exist in form but perform no, or only minor, government activities. This group includes, among others, the five counties comprising New York City, Middlesex, Massachusetts; and such city-counties as Philadelphia and Baltimore.

(2) A large central city within the county. This requirement led to the exclusion of such populous counties as Orange, California and Nassau and Suffolk in New York State.

Several tables in this appendix compare economic trends in metropolitan areas rather than in counties, since timely data are available only on a metropolitan area basis.

Extensive revisions have been made to the definitions of U.S. metropolitan areas. These changes have not affected all metropolitan areas equally. For example, "Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas" are now obsolete. Under the 2000 standards, "Metropolitan Statistical Area" ("MSA") is the term used for the basic set of county-based areas defined under this classification. In addition, eleven (11) MSAs were deemed large enough to be subdivided into "Metropolitan Divisions" ("MD"). The MDs are the most comparable in concept to the now obsolete Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Population of Ten Major Counties

County	2010	2000	1990	1980	1970
Los Angeles, CA	9,818,605	9,519,338	8,863,164	7,477,657	7,041,980
Cook, IL	5,194,675	5,376,741	5,105,067	5,253,190	5,493,766
Harris, TX	4,092,459	3,400,578	2,818,199	2,409,544	1,741,912
Maricopa, AZ	3,817,117	3,072,149	2,122,101	1,508,030	971,228
San Diego, CA	3,095,313	2,813,833	2,498,016	1,861,946	1,357,854
Miami-Dade, FL.....	2,496,435	2,253,362	1,937,094	1,625,946	1,267,792
Dallas, TX	2,368,139	2,218,899	1,852,810	1,556,549	1,327,695
Wayne, MI	1,820,584	2,061,162	2,111,687	2,337,240	2,670,368
Cuyahoga, OH.....	1,280,122	1,393,978	1,412,140	1,498,295	1,720,835
Allegheny, PA	1,223,348	1,281,666	1,336,449	1,450,085	1,605,133

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

Per Capita Personal Income⁽¹⁾

County	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Los Angeles, CA.....	\$40,867	\$42,265	\$41,307	\$39,519	\$36,434
Cook, IL.....	46,161	46,475	45,908	43,545	40,553
Harris, TX.....	48,337	47,788	45,987	44,844	41,524
Wayne, MI.....	31,888	32,094	31,125	30,164	29,440
San Diego, CA.....	45,706	46,649	45,911	43,969	41,483
Miami-Dade, FL.....	36,357	35,887	35,368	34,934	32,058
Dallas, TX.....	45,406	44,829	44,386	43,052	40,679
Cuyahoga, OH.....	41,391	42,051	41,133	39,799	37,406
Maricopa, AZ.....	35,319	37,168	37,689	36,829	34,551
Allegheny, PA.....	46,427	46,559	45,188	43,515	39,809
U.S. Average, Metropolitan Counties.....	39,635	40,166	39,392	37,698	35,424

(1) Per capita personal income was computed using Census Bureau midyear population estimates. Estimates for 2004-2007 reflect county population estimates available as of April 2008. In 2010, the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis conducted a comprehensive reevaluation of historical data, numbers may differ from prior District official statements.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Nonfarm Payroll Employment in Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Metropolitan Divisions⁽¹⁾

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
New York, NY.....	5,274.5	5,108.9	5,273.7	5,231.6	5,139.9	5,069.9
Los Angeles, CA.....	3,767.7	3,829.4	4,070.1	4,122.1	4,092.5	4,016.5
Chicago, IL.....	3,611.3	3,644.6	3,846.2	3,873.1	3,843.7	3,790.9
Philadelphia, PA.....	1,861.8	1,859.8	1,922.4	1,919.1	1,906.0	1,890.1
Detroit, MI.....	691.7	699.2	758.5	784.2	804.2	821.5
Dallas, TX.....	2,017.0	2,014.2	2,097.0	2,076.1	2,017.3	1,951.5
Houston, TX.....	2,542.6	2,539.0	2,605.5	2,544.6	2,446.1	2,350.2
San Francisco, CA.....	935.2	942.3	996.7	989.1	967.7	943.6
Cleveland, OH.....	1,000.8	1,001.1	1,058.5	1,072.3	1,075.0	1,070.8
Pittsburgh, PA.....	1,129.1	1,120.3	1,148.9	1,146.1	1,137.1	1,136.9

(1) Number of persons, in thousands, not seasonally adjusted.

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

Unemployment Rates in Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Metropolitan Divisions⁽¹⁾

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
New York, NY (t)	8.9	9.2%	5.4%	4.6%	4.8%	5.3%
Los Angeles, CA (t)	11.9	11.6	7.5	5.1	4.8	5.3
Chicago, IL (m).....	10.2	10.0	6.2	4.9	4.5	6.0
Philadelphia, PA (t).....	9.0	8.7	5.3	4.4	4.5	4.9
Detroit, MI (m).....	13.5	16.2	10.0	8.7	8.4	8.7
San Francisco, CA (t).....	10.3	8.7	5.3	4.0	3.9	4.6
Dallas, TX (t)	8.3	7.9	5.1	4.4	4.8	5.3
Houston, TX (t).....	8.5	7.6	4.9	4.3	5.0	5.6
Pittsburgh, PA (t)	8.0	7.4	5.1	4.3	4.7	5.2
Cleveland, OH (m).....	9.2	9.1	6.5	5.9	5.5	5.7

(1) Not seasonally adjusted.

(t) Reflects revised inputs, reestimation, and new statewide controls through 2010.

(m) Reflects revised population controls and model re-estimation through 2010.

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

Unemployment Rates for the Civilian Labor Force

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
United States	9.6%	9.3%	5.8%	4.6%	4.6%	5.1%
State of Illinois (m)	10.3	10.0	6.2	5.1	4.6	5.8
Cook County, IL (t).....	10.5	10.3	6.5	5.2	4.8	6.4
Chicago—MD (t)	10.1	10.0	6.2	4.9	4.5	6.0

(m) Reflects revised population controls and model re-estimation through 2010.

(t) Reflects revised inputs, reestimation, and new statewide controls through 2010.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and Illinois Department of Employment Security.

Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits

Metropolitan Area – MSA/MD	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Chicago, IL	7,267	6,097	16,058	33,933	46,772	53,908
Cleveland, OH.....	1,941	2,069	2,685	4,075	5,194	6,438
Dallas, TX.....	19,558	20,370	36,321	43,568	56,514	59,895
Detroit, MI	3,210	1,333	2,590	4,325	8,920	16,392
Houston, TX.....	27,452	27,326	42,728	63,274	71,719	62,125
Los Angeles, CA	10,394	7,281	15,045	26,616	33,505	30,641
Miami, FL	5,877	3,875	7,821	15,145	35,110	45,562
New York, NY	18,668	16,707	51,590	56,405	60,987	67,207
Philadelphia, PA	7,053	7,093	10,570	13,477	17,212	20,242
Phoenix, AZ	8,300	9,272	18,533	37,373	44,280	62,617
San Diego, CA	3,494	2,946	5,357	7,435	9,191	14,306
San Francisco, CA.....	4,621	3,550	7,555	10,560	14,483	14,883

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Building Permits Branch, Construction Statistics Division.

APPENDIX E

FORMS OF OPINIONS OF CO-BOND COUNSEL

APPENDIX E

2011A BONDS

PROPOSED FORM OF OPINION OF CO-BOND COUNSEL

TO BE DATED THE CLOSING DATE

[LETTERHEAD OF CO-BOND COUNSEL]

We hereby certify that we have examined certified copy of the proceedings (the “*Proceedings*”) of the Board of Commissioners of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois (the “*District*”), passed preliminary to the issue by the District of its fully registered Taxable General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series A of July, 2011 (the “*Bonds*”), to the amount of \$30,000,000, dated the date hereof, initially issued in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof, due and payable serially on December 1 of the years and in the amounts and bearing interest at the rates percent per annum as follows:

YEAR	AMOUNT (\$)	RATE (%)
2013	4,520,000	0.891
2014	15,975,000	1.222
2015	4,175,000	1.729
2016	5,330,000	2.229

The Bonds have been issued to finance construction projects identified in the District’s capital improvements program and to pay the costs of issuance of the Bonds.

Each of the Bonds bears interest from the later of its dated date as stated above or from the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, until the principal amount of each such Bond, respectively, is paid or duly provided for, such interest (computed upon the basis of a 360-day year of twelve 30-day months) being payable on June 1 and December 1 of each year, commencing on June 1, 2012.

We are of the opinion that the Proceedings show lawful authority for the issuance of the Bonds under the laws of the State of Illinois now in force.

We further certify that we have examined the form of Bond prescribed and find the same in due form of law; and in our opinion the Bonds, to the amount named, are valid and legally binding direct and general obligations of the District, the payment for which the full faith and credit of the District has been pledged, and all taxable property in the District is subject to the levy of taxes to pay the same without limitation as to rate, all except that enforcement thereof may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, moratorium, reorganization and other similar laws affecting creditors’ rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion. The amount of said taxes that may be extended to

pay the Bonds is, however, limited as provided by the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law of the State of Illinois, as amended (the “*Law*”). The Law provides that the annual amount of said taxes to be extended to pay the Bonds and all other limited bonds (as defined in the Local Government Debt Reform Act of the State of Illinois, as amended) previously or hereafter issued by the District shall not exceed the debt service extension base (as defined in the Law) of the District less the amount extended to pay certain other non-referendum bonds previously and hereafter issued by the District, as more fully described in the Proceedings.

It is also our opinion that under present law interest on the Bonds is includible in gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes. Ownership of the Bonds may result in other federal income tax consequences to certain taxpayers. Bondholders should consult their own tax advisors concerning tax consequences of ownership of the Bonds.

We express no opinion herein as to the accuracy, adequacy or completeness of the Official Statement relating to the Bonds.

In rendering this opinion, we have relied upon certifications of the District with respect to certain material facts within the District’s knowledge. Our opinion represents our legal judgment based upon our review of the law and the facts that we deem relevant to render such opinion and is not a guarantee of a result. This opinion is given as of the date hereof and we assume no obligation to revise or supplement this opinion to reflect any facts or circumstances that may hereafter come to our attention or any changes in law that may hereafter occur.

2011B BONDS

PROPOSED FORM OF OPINION OF CO-BOND COUNSEL

TO BE DATED THE CLOSING DATE

[LETTERHEAD OF CO-BOND COUNSEL]

We hereby certify that we have examined certified copy of the proceedings (the “*Proceedings*”) of the Board of Commissioners of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois (the “*District*”), passed preliminary to the issue by the District of its fully registered General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Limited Tax Series B of July, 2011 (the “*Bonds*”), to the amount of \$270,000,000, dated the date hereof, initially issued in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof, due and payable (subject to right of prior redemption) serially on December 1 of the years and in the amounts and bearing interest at the rates percent per annum as follows:

YEAR	AMOUNT (\$)	RATE (%)
2017	6,115,000	5.000
2018	26,855,000	5.000
2019	16,140,000	5.000
2020	7,335,000	5.000
2021	4,050,000	3.000
2021	5,500,000	5.000
2022	595,000	3.125
2022	6,985,000	5.000
2023	18,300,000	5.000
2024	18,000,000	5.000
2025	14,500,000	5.000
2026	4,775,000	5.000
2029	10,000,000	5.000
2030	45,000,000	5.000
2031	45,850,000	5.000
2032	40,000,000	5.000

The Bonds have been issued to finance construction projects identified in the District’s capital improvements program and to pay the costs of issuance of the Bonds.

Each of the Bonds bears interest from the later of its dated date as stated above or from the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, until the principal amount of each such Bond, respectively, is paid or duly provided for, such interest (computed upon the basis of a 360-day year of twelve 30-day months) being payable on June 1 and December 1 of each year, commencing on June 1, 2012.

The Bonds maturing on or after December 1, 2022 are subject to optional redemption on or after December 1, 2021 at the option of the District, in whole or in part on any date, and if in part, the maturities to be redeemed to be selected by the District, at the redemption price equal to the principal amount of each Bond or portion thereof to be so redeemed, plus accrued interest to the redemption date.

We are of the opinion that the Proceedings show lawful authority for the issuance of the Bonds under the laws of the State of Illinois now in force.

We further certify that we have examined the form of Bond prescribed and find the same in due form of law; and in our opinion the Bonds, to the amount named, are valid and legally binding direct and general obligations of the District, the payment for which the full faith and credit of the District has been pledged, and all taxable property in the District is subject to the levy of taxes to pay the same without limitation as to rate, all except that enforcement thereof may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, moratorium, reorganization and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion. The amount of said taxes that may be extended to pay the Bonds is, however, limited as provided by the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law of the State of Illinois, as amended (the "*Law*"). The Law provides that the annual amount of said taxes to be extended to pay the Bonds and all other limited bonds (as defined in the Local Government Debt Reform Act of the State of Illinois, as amended) previously or hereafter issued by the District shall not exceed the debt service extension base (as defined in the Law) of the District less the amount extended to pay certain other non-referendum bonds previously and hereafter issued by the District, as more fully described in the Proceedings.

It is also our opinion that, subject to the District's compliance with certain covenants, under present law, interest on the Bonds is excludable from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes and is not included as an item of tax preference in computing the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, but is taken into account in computing an adjustment used in determining the federal alternative minimum tax for certain corporations. Failure to comply with certain of such District covenants could cause interest on the Bonds to be includible in gross income for federal income tax purposes retroactively to the date of issuance of the Bonds. Ownership of the Bonds may result in other federal tax consequences to certain taxpayers, and we express no opinion regarding any such collateral consequences arising with respect to the Bonds.

We express no opinion herein as to the accuracy, adequacy or completeness of the Official Statement relating to the Bonds.

In rendering this opinion, we have relied upon certifications of the District with respect to certain material facts within the District's knowledge. Our opinion represents our legal judgment based upon our review of the law and the facts that we deem relevant to render such opinion and is not a guarantee of a result. This opinion is given as of the date hereof and we assume no obligation to revise or supplement this opinion to reflect any facts or circumstances that may hereafter come to our attention or any changes in law that may hereafter occur.

2011C BONDS

PROPOSED FORM OF OPINION OF CO-BOND COUNSEL

TO BE DATED THE CLOSING DATE

[LETTERHEAD OF CO-BOND COUNSEL]

We hereby certify that we have examined certified copy of the proceedings (the “*Proceedings*”) of the Board of Commissioners of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, County of Cook, State of Illinois (the “*District*”), passed preliminary to the issue by the District of its fully registered General Obligation Capital Improvement Bonds, Unlimited Tax Series C of July, 2011 (the “*Bonds*”), to the amount of \$100,000,000, dated the date hereof, initially issued in denominations of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof, due and payable (subject to right of prior redemption) serially on December 1 of the years and in the amounts and bearing interest at the rates percent per annum as follows:

YEAR	AMOUNT (\$)	RATE (%)
2013	16,720,000	3.000
2014	6,200,000	4.000
2015	16,900,000	5.000
2016	9,850,000	5.000
2017	4,955,000	4.000
2018	1,640,000	3.000
2019	1,885,000	4.000
2020	350,000	3.000
2029	10,000,000	5.000
2030	10,000,000	5.000
2031	865,000	4.125
2031	20,635,000	5.000

The Bonds have been issued to finance construction projects identified in the District’s capital improvements program consisting only of those projects initiated before October 1, 1991, and to pay the costs of issuance of the Bonds.

Each of the Bonds bears interest from the later of its dated date as stated above or from the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, until the principal amount of each such Bond, respectively, is paid or duly provided for, such interest (computed upon the basis of a 360-day year of twelve 30-day months) being payable on June 1 and December 1 of each year, commencing on June 1, 2012.

The Bonds maturing on or after December 1, 2029 are subject to optional redemption on or after December 1, 2021 at the option of the District, in whole or in part on any date, and if in part, the maturities to be redeemed to be selected by the District, at the redemption price equal to

the principal amount of each Bond or portion thereof to be so redeemed, plus accrued interest to the redemption date.

We are of the opinion that the Proceedings show lawful authority for the issuance of the Bonds under the laws of the State of Illinois now in force.

We further certify that we have examined the form of Bond prescribed and find the same in due form of law; and in our opinion the Bonds, to the amount named, are valid and legally binding direct and general obligations of the District, the payment for which the full faith and credit of the District has been pledged, and all taxable property in the District is subject to the levy of taxes to pay the same without limitation as to rate or amount, all except that enforcement thereof may be limited by bankruptcy, insolvency, moratorium, reorganization and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights and by equitable principles, whether considered at law or in equity, including the exercise of judicial discretion.

It is also our opinion that, subject to the District's compliance with certain covenants, under present law, interest on the Bonds is excludable from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes and is not included as an item of tax preference in computing the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, but is taken into account in computing an adjustment used in determining the federal alternative minimum tax for certain corporations. Failure to comply with certain of such District covenants could cause interest on the Bonds to be includible in gross income for federal income tax purposes retroactively to the date of issuance of the Bonds. Ownership of the Bonds may result in other federal tax consequences to certain taxpayers, and we express no opinion regarding any such collateral consequences arising with respect to the Bonds.

We express no opinion herein as to the accuracy, adequacy or completeness of the Official Statement relating to the Bonds.

In rendering this opinion, we have relied upon certifications of the District with respect to certain material facts within the District's knowledge. Our opinion represents our legal judgment based upon our review of the law and the facts that we deem relevant to render such opinion and is not a guarantee of a result. This opinion is given as of the date hereof and we assume no obligation to revise or supplement this opinion to reflect any facts or circumstances that may hereafter come to our attention or any changes in law that may hereafter occur.

APPENDIX F

BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM

The information in this section concerning DTC and DTC's book-entry system has been obtained from sources that the District believes to be reliable, but the District takes no responsibility for the accuracy or completeness thereof. The District cannot and does not give any assurances that DTC, DTC Direct Participants or Indirect Participants will distribute to the Beneficial Owners (a) payments of interest, principal or premium, if any, with respect to the Bonds (b) bonds representing ownership interest in or other confirmation or ownership interest in the Bonds, or (c) redemption or other notices sent to DTC or Cede & Co., its nominee, as the registered owner of the Bonds, or that they will so do on a timely basis or that DTC, DTC Direct Participants or DTC Indirect Participants will act in the manner described in this OFFICIAL STATEMENT. The current "Rules" applicable to DTC are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the current "Procedure" of DTC to be followed in dealing with DTC Participants are on file with DTC.

Book-Entry Only System

DTC will act as securities depository for the Bonds. The Bonds will be issued as fully-registered securities registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC's partnership nominee) or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. One fully-registered certificate will be issued for each maturity of the Bonds, in the aggregate principal amount of such maturity and will be deposited with DTC.

DTC, the world's largest depository, is a limited-purpose trust company organized under the New York Banking Law, a "banking organization" within the meaning of the New York Banking Law, a member of the Federal Reserve System, a "clearing corporation" within the meaning of the New York Uniform Commercial Code, and a "clearing agency" registered pursuant to the provisions of Section 17A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. DTC holds and provides asset servicing for over 3.5 million issues of U.S. and non-U.S. equity issues, corporate and municipal debt issues, and money market instruments (from over 100 countries) that DTC's participants ("*Direct Participants*") deposit with DTC. DTC also facilitates the post-trade settlement among Direct Participants of sales and other securities transactions in deposited securities, through electronic computerized book-entry transfers and pledges between Direct Participants' accounts. This eliminates the need for physical movement of securities certificates. Direct Participants include both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, clearing corporations, and certain other organizations. DTC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation ("*DTCC*"). DTCC is the holding company for DTC, National Securities Clearing Corporation and Fixed Income Clearing Corporation, all of which are registered clearing agencies. DTCC is owned by the users of its regulated subsidiaries. Access to the DTC system is also available to others such as both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, and trust companies, and clearing corporations that clear through or maintain a custodial relationship with a Direct Participant, either directly or indirectly ("*Indirect Participants*"). DTC has Standard & Poor's highest rating: AAA. The DTC Rules applicable to its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. More information about DTC can be found at www.dtcc.com and www.dtc.org (such websites are not incorporated herein by such reference).

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

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

Conveyance of notices and other communications by DTC to Direct Participants, by Direct Participants to Indirect Participants, and by Direct Participants and Indirect Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by arrangements among them, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Beneficial Owners of Bonds may wish to take certain steps to augment transmission to them of notices of significant events with respect to the Bonds, such as redemptions, tenders, defaults, and proposed amendments to the Bond documents. For example, Beneficial Owners of Bonds may wish to ascertain that the nominee holding the Bonds for their benefit has agreed to obtain and transmit notices to Beneficial Owners. In the alternative, Beneficial Owners may wish to provide their names and addresses to the Registrar and request that copies of notices be provided directly to them.

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

Neither DTC nor Cede & Co. (nor any other DTC nominee) will consent or vote with respect to Bonds unless authorized by a Direct Participant in accordance with DTC's MMI Procedures. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an Omnibus Proxy to the District as soon as possible after the record date. The Omnibus Proxy assigns Cede & Co.'s consenting or voting rights to those Direct Participants to whose accounts Bonds are credited on the record date (identified in a listing attached to the Omnibus Proxy).

Principal and interest payments on the Bonds will be made to Cede & Co., or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. DTC's practice is to credit Direct Participants' accounts upon DTC's receipt of funds and corresponding detail information from the District or the Bond Registrar, on payable date in accordance with their

respective holdings shown on DTC's records. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name", and will be the responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC, Bond Registrar or the District, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Payment of principal and interest payments to Cede & Co. (or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC) is the responsibility of the District or the Bond Registrar, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners will be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

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

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

The information in this section concerning DTC and DTC's book-entry system has been obtained from DTC, and the District takes no responsibility for the accuracy thereof.

Use of Certain Terms in Other Sections of this Official Statement

In reading this Official Statement it should be understood that, while the Bonds are in the Book-Entry System, references in other sections of this Official Statement to registered owners should be read to include the person for which the Participant acquires an interest in the Bonds; however, all rights of ownership must be exercised through DTC and the book-entry system.

The District cannot and does not give any assurances that DTC, Direct Participants or Indirect Participants of DTC will distribute to the Beneficial Owners of the Bonds (i) payment of principal of or interest on the Bonds (ii) confirmations of their ownership interests in the Bonds or (iii) other notices sent to DTC or Cede & Co., its partnership nominee, as the Registered Owner of the Bonds, or that they will do so on a timely basis, or that DTC, Direct Participants or Indirect Participants will serve and act in the manner described in this Official Statement.

The District does not have any responsibility or obligation to DTC, the Direct Participants or Indirect Participants of DTC or the Beneficial Owners with respect to (1) the accuracy of any records maintain by DTC or any Direct Participants or Indirect Participants of DTC; (2) the payment by DTC or any Direct Participants or Indirect Participants of DTC of any amount due to any Beneficial owner in respect of the principal amount of or interest on Bonds; (3) the delivery by DTC or any Direct Participants or Indirect Participants of DTC of any notice to any Beneficial Owner that is required or permitted to be given to owners under the terms of the Resolution; or (4) any consent given or other action taken by DTC as owner of the Bonds.

Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago

Multi-Year Awards

1975-2009

Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada
Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting/Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

1993-2009

Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada
*Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting Award for Retirement Fund's
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*

1985-2010

Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada
Award for Distinguished Budget Presentation

2007-2009

Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada
*Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting Award for the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund's
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*

Individual Year Awards (partial listing)

2003

American Society of Civil Engineers
Outstanding Civil Engineering Award - Over 5 million Category, for the Thornton Transitional Reservoir

American Public Works Association
Environmental Project of the Year - Over 10 million Category, for the Thornton Transitional Reservoir

Illinois Safety Council and Greater Chicago Safety Council
Health and Safety Award - District-Wide

National Institute of Government Purchasing
Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Public Procurement

United States Department of Defense
Certificate of Appreciation for Excellence in Public Procurement

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Certificate of Recognition as a Clean Water Partner for the 21st century

2004

Illinois Safety Council and Greater Chicago Safety Council
Outstanding Safety Performance Award

United States Environmental Protection Agency
*National Second Place Clean Water Act Recognition Award, Kirie Water Reclamation Plant,
for Outstanding Operations and Maintenance, Large-Advanced Plant*

2005

National Institute of Government Purchasing
Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Public Procurement

National Purchasing Institute
Achievement of Excellence in Procurement

Illinois Safety Council and Greater Chicago Safety Council
Safe Driving Award - District Wide

2006

Illinois Safety Council and Greater Chicago Safety Council
Health and Safety Award

National Institute of Government Purchasing
Outstanding Agency Accreditation Achievement Award

Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago

Individual Year Awards (continued)

2006 (Cont.)

National Purchasing Institute
Achievement of Excellence in Procurement

2007

Chicago Wilderness and United States Environmental Protection Agency
*Conservation and Native Landscape Award for Native Prairie Restoration
At the Lemont and North Side Water Reclamation Plants*

National Association of Clean Water Agencies, formerly known as Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies
*NACWA Award for Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System - Platinum Award
For 16 concurrent years of full compliance for the Calumet Water Reclamation Plant and
For 11 concurrent years of full compliance for the Stickney and Lemont Water Reclamation Plants
NACWA Award for Full Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System-Gold Award
For the John Egan, James Kirie and North Water Reclamation Plants*

2008

Illinois Water Environment Association
*Best Technical Presentation Award: Concerns about Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals in Land Applied Biosolids
Media Hype or Reality?*

National Association of Clean Water Agencies, formerly known as Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies
*National Environmental Achievement Award in Public Information & Education - Education Program category for
"Mission Possible: Educating People to Promote Beneficial Use of Biosolids
NACWA Award for Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Platinum Award for 17 concurrent
years of full compliance for Calumet Water Reclamation Plant and Platinum Award for 12 concurrent years of full compliance
for Stickney and Lemont Water Reclamation Plants
NACWA Award for Full Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Gold Award for John E. Egan,
Hanover Park, James C. Kirie and North Side Water Reclamation Plants
NACWA Award for Full Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Platinum Award for Stickney,
Calumet and Lemont Water Reclamation Plants*

National Biosolids Partnership (Water Environment Federation and National Association of Clean Water Agencies)
*Certificate of Achievement for meeting all the requirements for admittance and certification to the
National Biosolids Partnership Environmental Management System Program*

The Waterfront Center
Excellence on the Waterfront Award for Sidestream Elevated Pool Aeration Project

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Exemplary Biosolids Management Award - First Place in the Public Acceptance Category

2009

Chicago Southland Convention and Visitor Bureau
Hospitality Award of Merit for outstanding work on behalf of the Calumet-Sag Trail

National Association of Government Defined Contribution Administrators
Leadership Recognition Award of Distinction for National Save for Retirement Week Campaign

2010

American Academy of Environmental Engineers
*Excellence in Environmental Engineering Honor Award in Research for the Microbial Risk Assessment
for Recreational Use of the Chicago Area Waterways*

American Council of Engineering Companies of Illinois
Special Achievement Award for the Calumet Isolation Chamber

Illinois Society of Professional Engineers
Chicagoland Excellence in Engineering Project Award, Mechanical Division, for the Calumet Central Boiler Facility

AWARDS & ACHIEVEMENTS RECOGNITION

