



Office of the City Clerk

City Hall
121 N. LaSalle St.
Room 107
Chicago, IL 60602
www.chicityclerk.com

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: O2015-7185
Type: Ordinance **Status:** Passed
File created: 9/24/2015 **In control:** City Council
Final action: 10/14/2015
Title: Multi-Family Program Funds loan to St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership for development of affordable housing at 6100-6114 S Michigan Ave, 51-56 and 63-73 E 61st St, 6101-6111, 6141-6143 and 6145-6147 S Wabash Ave and 48-58 E 57th St
Sponsors: Emanuel, Rahm
Indexes: Loan & Security, Multi-Family Program Funds
Attachments: 1. O2015-7185.pdf

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------------|------|----------------------|---------------------|--------|
| 10/14/2015 | 1 | City Council | Passed | Pass |
| 10/13/2015 | 1 | Committee on Finance | Recommended to Pass | Pass |
| 9/24/2015 | 1 | City Council | Referred | |

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

CITY OF CHICAGO

RAHM EMANUEL
MAYOR

September 24, 2015

TO THE HONORABLE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF CHICAGO

Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the request of the Commissioner of Planning and Development, I transmit herewith an ordinance authorizing the execution of a multi-family loan agreement for St. Edmunds Meadows, LP.

Your favorable consideration of this ordinance will be appreciated.

Mayor

Very truly yours,

/

ORDINANCE

WHEREAS, the City of Chicago (the "City"), a home rule unit of government under Section 6(a), Article VII of the 1970 Constitution of the State of Illinois, has heretofore found and does hereby find that there exists within the City a serious shortage of decent, safe and sanitary rental housing available to persons of low and moderate income; and

WHEREAS, the City has determined that the exacerbation of such a shortage of affordable rental housing is harmful to the health, prosperity, economic stability and general welfare of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City's Department of Planning and Development (the "DPD") was established by ordinance of the City Council of the City; and

WHEREAS, the DPD has the power and authority to act on behalf of the City and has as its primary purpose the revitalization of Chicago neighborhoods by improving the quality of housing through various rehabilitation and housing redevelopment programs; and

WHEREAS, St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership, an Illinois limited partnership (the "Borrower"), of which St. Edmund's Meadows, Inc., an Illinois corporation, is the general partner (the "General Partner") and of which Centerline Corporate Partners XXII, LP, a Delaware limited partnership, is the limited partner (the "Limited Partner"); and

WHEREAS, in 2003, the City conveyed a City owned vacant lot to the Borrower for use as parking for a seven (7) building affordable housing development consisting of fifty-six (56) units (the "Development") being rehabilitated on scattered sites leased by the Borrower from the CHA pursuant to a long-term lease and located in the City generally at 6100-6114 South Michigan Avenue, 51-56 East 61st Street, 63-73 East 61st Street, 6101-6111 South Wabash Avenue, 6141-6143 South Wabash Avenue, 6145-6147 South Wabash Avenue and 48-58 East 57th Street, as legally described on Exhibit A as attached hereto (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, construction of the Development was completed in two phases, with the first phase completed in 2005 and the second phase completed in 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Development is currently financed by (a) a senior loan insured by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") and currently held by PNC Bank, N.A., doing business as PNC Real Estate, in the outstanding aggregate principal amount of \$2,167,437.36 as of September 1, 2015, with an interest rate of five and one quarter percent (5.25%) per annum, and secured by, among other things, a senior leasehold mortgage on the Property recorded in the office of the Cook County Recorder's Office (the "Recorder's Office") on June 4, 2003, as document number 0315532118 (the "Senior Loan"); (b) two separate loans from the CHA, one in the outstanding aggregate principal amount of \$811,281, with an interest rate of four and seventy-nine hundredths percent (4.79%) per annum, and the other in the outstanding aggregate principal amount of \$560,000, with an interest rate of four

and seventy-nine hundredths percent (4.79%) per annum, both of which CHA loans are secured by a leasehold mortgage on the Property recorded with the Recorder's Office on June 4, 2003, as document number 0315532123, that is junior to the mortgage on the Property securing the Senior Loan (the "Second Lien CHA Loan"); (c) an Affordable Housing Program recapturable grant in the outstanding aggregate principal amount of \$300,000 with an interest rate of zero percent (0%) as evidenced by a recapture agreement recorded with the Recorder's Office on June 4, 2003, as document number 0315532125; and (d) a loan from the Limited Partner in the outstanding aggregate principal amount of approximately \$1,500,000, with an interest rate of eight percent (8%) per annum, (the "LP Note"); and

WHEREAS, the LP Note was issued by the Limited Partner in 2006 to mitigate shortfalls in the financing for completion of the Development; and

WHEREAS, the Limited Partner is agreeable to refinancing of the LP Note to have the principal balance paid in full and to write off the accrued interest from the date of issuance of the LP Note to the date of the refinancing (the "Note Retirement"); and

WHEREAS, DPD has funds available to its Multi-Family Loan Program (the "Multi-Program Funds"), which are administered through DPD; and

WHEREAS, DPD has preliminarily reviewed and approved the making of a loan to the Borrower in an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000, to be funded from Multi-Program Funds, for a term not to exceed twenty-nine (29) years at an interest rate of zero percent (0.0%) per annum to effectuate the Note Retirement (the "Loan"); and

WHEREAS, the Loan shall be secured by a mortgage subordinate to mortgages on the Property described above, and the balance of said Loan shall be due in full upon its maturity, upon sale of the Development and upon such other terms and conditions as set forth in the documentation evidencing the Loan; and

WHEREAS, the DPD has reviewed the public benefits conferred by the Development, the ownership and financial structures of the Development, and the need for public assistance, has determined that the Borrower will be unable to retire the LP Note without such assistance, and has determined/within its discretion, that the Note Retirement is in the best interest of the City; now therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO:

SECTION 1. The above recitals are expressly incorporated in and made a part of this ordinance as though fully set forth herein.

SECTION 2. The Commissioner of the DPD (the "Commissioner") and a designee of the Commissioner are each hereby authorized, subject to approval by the Corporation Counsel, to enter into and execute such agreements and instruments, and perform any and all acts as shall be necessary or advisable in connection with the Loan. The Commissioner is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Corporation Counsel, to negotiate any and all terms

and provisions in connection with the Loan. The Commissioner and a designee of the Commissioner are each hereby further authorized, subject to approval by the Corporation Counsel, to enter and execute such agreements and instruments and perform any and all acts as shall be necessary or advisable, and to negotiate any and all terms and provisions in connection with any future restructuring of the Loan which do not substantially modify the terms of the Loan.

SECTION 3. To the extent that any ordinance, resolution, rule, order or provision of the Municipal Code of Chicago, or part thereof, is in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance, the provisions of this ordinance shall control. If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this ordinance shall be held invalid, the invalidity of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect any of the other provisions of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. This ordinance shall be effective as of the date of its passage and approval.

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable:

A. St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☒ the Applicant

OR

2. ☐ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the

2. Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest:

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.I.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

*

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: 6105 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

C. Telephone: 773-752-8893 Fax: 773-752-8067 Email: ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org
<mailto:ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org>

D. Name of contact person: Cecelia Hunt

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one):- _.

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

To authorize new multi-family financing. Meadows is a 56 unit mixed-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st St., 6101-11, 6141-47 S. Wabash and 48-58 E. 57th St. in Chicago, Illinois 60637.

i

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS? Department of Planning & Development

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following:

Specification #

and Contract #

vcr. 01-01-12

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II -- DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing Person

Publicly registered business corporation

Privately held business corporation

Sole proprietorship

General partnership

Limited partnership

Trust

Party:

☐ Limited liability company

☐ Limited liability partnership

☐ Joint venture

☐ Not-for-profit corporation

(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable:

Illinois

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

[x] N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title

St. Edmund's Meadows, Inc.

General Partner

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|---|---|---|
| Centerline Corporate Partners, XXII, LP | 100 Church St. 15th Floor, New York, NY 10007 | 99.98% |

SECTION III » BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV -- DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must

either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|---|--|---|
| Attorney | | v. Albert Whitehead, P.C. | 10 N. Dearborn Suite 600 Chicago, IL 60602 \$ 15,000 |
| PNC Bank | 525 Market St. 28th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 | | Lender / GNMA Fees \$ 10,000 |

(Add sheets if necessary)

☐ Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V -- CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1 -23, Article I ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling

person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B. 1. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- c. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is

controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;

- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below:

None

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). None

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. None

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☒ is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City."

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Pace 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.L, proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.l., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.L, provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

X 1, The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.J. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," answer the three questions

below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

- A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.
- B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N. Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances.
- C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.
- D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.
- E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 1 1 of 13

Department ;fih'^ r
sewerQcharges

; use; nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. f

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that does not provide such certifications or that the At Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications.;

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

I, _____, signing below: (i) warrant that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and (ii) warrant that all information provided in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all information provided in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City. *

- St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership (Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

(Sign here) : Richard L.

Tolliver
(Print or type name of person signing)

President of Gen. Ptnr., St. Edmund's Meadows, Inc. (Print or type title of person signing)

Signed and sworn to before me on (date) 11/14/2015, at Cook County, Illinois (state).

____ Notary Public.

Commission expires:

OFFICIAL SEAL
MARY F. WILLIAMS
Notary Public - State of Illinois
My Commission Expires Aug 3, 2016,
www.illinoisnotary.com
Page 12 of 13

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1 .a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

☒ No

/ '

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

None

Page 13 of 13

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ^ ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT**

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable:

St. Edmund's Meadows, Inc.

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☐ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the

2. Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest:

OR

3. ☒ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control: St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: 6105 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

C. Telephone: 773-752-8893

Fax: 773-752-8067

Email: ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org

[<mailto:ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org>](mailto:ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org)

D. Name of contact person: Cecelia Hunt

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one): _ ~

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

To authorize new multi-family financing. Meadows is a 56 unit mixed-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st St., 6101-11, 6141-47 S. Wabash and 48-58 E. 57th St. in Chicago, Illinois 60637.

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS? Department Planning & Development

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following:

Specification #

and Contract #

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing ☐ Person

☐ Publicly registered business corporation ☒ Privately held business corporation ☐ Sole proprietorship ☐ General partnership ☐ Limited partnership ☐ Trust

Party:

☐ Limited liability company

☐ Limited liability partnership

☐ Joint venture

☐ Not-for-profit corporation

(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable:

Illinois

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☒ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

| Name | Title |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Richard L. Tolliver | President |
| Chester A. Slaughter | Vice-President^ |
| Michael A. Mitchell | Treasurer/Secretary |

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Paec 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably

intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| St. Edmund's Redevelopment Corp. | 6105 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637 | 100% |

SECTION III -- BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| retained or anticipated to be retained) | Address | (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|----------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[x] Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V - CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the
Disclosing Party.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article 1 ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article I applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B.1. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below:
None

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively-presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). None

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. None

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☒ is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City."

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

X 1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section, VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," answer the three questions

below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (Sec 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 11 of 13

, F.I. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois: H"
Department^ in paying any ;

fine, fee, tax or Other charge payable to the City which includes, but is not limited to, mail, water charges, "f
sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. • ■

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use; nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U.S. General Services Administration.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired, in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in E, F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that does not provide such certifications or that the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party Cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS. < : ^» i

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and [Appendix A (if applicable)] on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

St. Edmund's Meadows, Inc. (Print or type name of Disclosing

Party)
By: [Signature] (Sign here)

Richard L. Tolliver [Signature]
(Print or type name of person signing)

President [Signature]
(Print or type title of person signing)

Signed and sworn to before me on (date) w

at [Signature] County, [Signature] [Signature]
3, Mb

____ Notary Public

Commission expires:

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A**

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

None

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND
AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B**

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I -- GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable:

St. Edmund's Redevelopment Corporation

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☐ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the

2. Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest:

OR

3. ☒ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B. 1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control: St. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: 6105 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

C. Telephone: 773-752-8893 Fax: 773-752-8067
<mailto:ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org>

Email: ceceliahunt@stedmundsrc.org

D. Name of contact person: Cecelia Hunt

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one):

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

To authorize new multi-family financing. Meadows is a 56 unit mixed-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st St., 6101-11, 6141-47 S. Wabash and 48-58 E 57th St. in Chicago, Illinois 60637.

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS? Department of Planning & Development

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following:

Specification U

and Contract ft

Pace 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY 1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing Party:

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| Person | - | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Publicly registered business corporation | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Privately held business corporation | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sole proprietorship | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| General partnership | | (Is |
| Limited partnership | | |
| Trust | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Limited liability company Limited liability partnership Joint venture

Not-for-profit corporation

the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable: Illinois

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title

Richard L. Tolliver

President / Director

Chester A. Slaughter

Vice-President / Director

Adele Polk

Secretary / Director

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|------|------------------|---|
| None | | |

SECTION III - BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☐ Yes☒ No

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) | NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|--|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[x] Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V - CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article I ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article I applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B. 1. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");

- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;

- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
 - b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
 - c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
 - d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).
4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.
5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below:

None

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). None

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. None

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☒ is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City."

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455 (b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Pace 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

X 1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

[]Yes []No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

**SECTION VII- ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION,
COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE**

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing

Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-] 54-020 of the Municipal Code.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 1 1 of 13

F. 1 The Disclosing Party warrants that it has not paid, and will not pay, any payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes,

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit any contractors to use any facility listed in the City's System of Public Works maintained by the City of Chicago.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F. 1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications.

NOT: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F. 1 ; F.2. or F.3. above an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS. :

CERTIFICATION, 7,

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate ; and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

St. Edmund's Redevelopment Corporation
(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

(Sign here) Richard L.

Tolliver
(Print or type name of person signing)

President

(Print or type title of person signing)

fore me on (date) /Jti unty, <JL%JU\$*£ui> (state)?

Notary Public.

3, aOKe

OFFICIAL SEAL MARY R WILLIAMS Notary Public - State of Illinois My Commission Expires Aug 3, 2016

Page 12 of 13

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A**

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

None

Page 13 of 13

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND
AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B**

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12

OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I -- GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable: Centerline
Corporate Partners XXII LP

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the
Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest: si. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in
which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: 1225 17th Street, Suite 1400
Denver, CO 80202

C. Telephone: 303-723-5793 Fax: 303-927-5001
<mailto:ie.wideman@huntcornpaniBs.com>

Email: TMie.wideman@huntcornpaniBs.com

D. Name of contact person: Nicole Wideman

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one): _

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS
pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan made to the Applicant by its limited partner. The project is a 56 unit mixed-income development
located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st Street, 6101-11, 6141-47 S. Wabash and 48-58 E. 57th Street in Chicago, IL 60637.

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS? Department of Planning & Development

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following:

Specification # and Contract #

Vcr. 01-01-12

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II -- DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing ☐ Person
☐ Publicly registered business corporation ☐ Privately held business corporation ☐ Sole proprietorship ☐ General partnership ☐ Limited partnership ☐ Trust

☐ Limited liability company
☐ Limited liability partnership
☐ Joint venture
☐ Not-for-profit corporation
(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?
☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable: Delaware

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title

RCC Asset Managers XXII L.L.C.

General Partner

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a director indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|------------------|--|---|
| i | <<-> -v- "> | |
| <i>rOs-Uajp^</i> | <i>kPtU^^ G^,Y ^o£- ^bcc^V W n:/U(XOV,ee tot -*3</i> | <i>13. i8 %</i> |

SECTION III -- BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|--|---|
|--|------------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V -- CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1 -23, Article I ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant

understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article I applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B.I. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
 - any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below:

N/A

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none").

N/A

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient.

N/A

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

L J is W's not a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City."

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary): **N/A**

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a

financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes ^No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.L, proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.L, proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.L, provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

SECTION VI -- CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

SECTION VII - ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other

transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article 1 of Chapter 1 -23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 11 of 13

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes.

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that does not provide such certifications or that the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1, F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

_____. w/ XVC I// L.C,

(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

3 y; Ce/Y^^e. (^afm,5emP ^

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

Page 13 of 13

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes

☐ No

IV5 Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE

SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT**

SECTION I -- GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable: Centerline
Housing Partnership I LP-Series 3

Check ONE of the folio-wing three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest: si. Edmund's Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control: ' ,

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: 1225 17th Street, Suite 1400
Denver, CO 80202 •

C. Telephone: 303-723-5793 Fax: 303-927-5001 Email: nicoie.wideman@huntcompanies.com
<mailto:nicoie.wideman@huntcompanies.com>

D. Name of contact person: Nicole Wideman

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one):'_ -

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable): Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan made to the Applicant by its limited partner. The project is a 56 unit mixed-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st Street, 6101-11, 6141-4/ S. Wabash and 46-58 E. 57th Street in Chicago, IL 60637.

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS? Department of Planning & Development

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following:

Specification //- and Contract #

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing Party ☐ Person .
☐ Publicly registered business corporation ☐ Privately held business corporation ☐ Sole proprietorship ☐ General partnership ☐ Limited partnership ☐ Trust
☐ Limited liability company
☐ Limited liability partnership
☐ Joint venture
☐ Not-for-profit corporation
(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable: Delaware

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY: v

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

| Name | Title |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| RCHP General I L.L.C.-Series 3 | General Partner |

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably

intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Bank of America, N.A. | 10M. Tpyon 5-Wjg4 ChfrJ^MC | 99-99% |

SECTION III - BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☐ Yes • "rfko

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|--|---|
|--|------------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

^fcheck here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V - CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No ^No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article I ("Article P")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article I applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section ILB.I. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or

performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;

- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls (he Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity);
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Pago 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been

prosecuted for such conduct; or

cl. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code,

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below:

N/A

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none").

N/A

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient.

N/A

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one) ☐ is ^{not} a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City."

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary): N/A

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes *if Na*

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter; (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be

conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

SECTION VII - ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofclucago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofclucago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages. ^N

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes.

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that does not provide such certifications or that the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

Uo-Mu n003^3 "vtJhtrAW < L\~ ^">J
(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

By: _<^#22^<-
(Sign here)

^4j ^+^<_ct
B y , c"^k-4_r!^e fOo^O^ '

By. q>,,k. W 4V^*/U.^HmXZs
' H^<w LLC/ ^H s<^

vAfrMX HcJfi^

(Print or type name of person signing)

aXitc^^J LLC/

(.^5 5 i^^U-

4 tUi

(Print or type title of person signing)

Signed and sworn to before me on (date)
al Q-Pyn \J&T County, Co)fiCcxJb (state).

Notary Public.

Comm i ss ion expi res: f~t('y^j '20'.

Page 12 of 13

TAWNEE DAVENPORT
NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF COLORADO NOTARY ID 20144033571 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES AUGUST 26 2018

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND
AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1 .a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

GITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable: Bank of America, N.A.

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☒ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest: Edmunds Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control. (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

, ... 101 N. Tryon St.

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: -
Charlotte, NC 28285

• -, 917-232-2988 646-822-5978 ", michelle.militello@baml.com
<mailto:michelle.militello@baml.com>
C. Telephone: Fax: Email: -
Michelle Militello

D. Name of contact person:

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one): -

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan to the Applicant made by the L P. The project is a 56 unit multi-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st, 6104-47 S. Wabash, and 48-58 E. 57th in Chicago, IL.

Dept. of Planning and Development

EDS?

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following: n/a

Specification # and Contract # "

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A, NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing Party:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Person | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability company |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly registered business corpora | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability partnership |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Privately held business corporation | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint venture |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sole proprietorship | <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit corporation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General partnership | (Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Limited partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trust | Other (please specify) |
| | National Banking Association |

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable: National

Banking Association

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois; Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign-entity?

☐ Yes ☐ No H N/A.

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other, similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership; limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title Please see attached list of executive officers and directors.

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None" NOTE: Pursuant to Section 9-1.54-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure.

| Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|
| BANA Holding Corporation. | 101 N. Tryon St. | 100% Direct Owner |
| | Charlotte, NC 28255 | |

SECTION III -- BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code, with any

City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is-signed?;.,

☒ Yes ; ☐ No See Attached.

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected -officials) and describe such relationship(s): .:

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist-accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total, amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained)

Sidley Austin LLP

| Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.)-NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. Attorney \$5,000 (est.) |
|------------------|--|---|
|------------------|--|---|

One South Dearborn

Chicago, IL 60603

Attn: David R. Hill, Esq.

(Add sheets if necessary)

☐ Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V - CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No No person directly or indirectly owns; 10% or more of the Disclosing Party. See Attached.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS See Attached Additional Information, including Litigation and Regulatory matters.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1.-23, Article I ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B.I. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, "suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal; state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction;- a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud-embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local)

with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section.V;

d., have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and

e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

I certify the above to be true. 3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract of engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion, among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or

- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

I certify the above to be true.

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

I certify the above to be true.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

I certify the above to be true.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55, (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

I certify the above to be true.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below: I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☒ is ☐ is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then, the Disclosing Party pledges:

" We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, We further pledge that none of our affiliates is; and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming, a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City." The Disclosing Party makes the above pledge.

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS.

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2., Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.I., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

1 - The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

I can make the verification (#1)

SECTION VI -- CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying; Disclosure Act of 1995; who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A. 1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontract[^] the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available, to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.-

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," answer the three questions

below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal

regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐Yes ☐No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐Yes ☐No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐Yes ☐No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

SECTION VII -- ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable Ordinances. I acknowledge and consent to the above.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the

Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible: rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

I acknowledge and consent; to the above.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 11 of 13

F.1. I. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. I certify the above to be true.

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. EPA on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. I certify the above to be true.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F. 1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any subcontractor that times not provide such certifications. I certify the above to be true.

NOTE: if the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1., F.2. or F.3 above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this FDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

Bank of America, N.A

(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

~ (Sign here) Michelle L. Militelle (Print or type name of person, signing)

Vj.cc <http://Vj.cc> President >,'■ ;• or type title of

poison Mining)

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND
AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A**

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner, or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010", - is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building, or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS RESPONSE TO SECTION II.B.1

Bank of America, N.A.

Directors

Brian T. Moynihan

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Bank of America Corporation Charles K. Gifford

Former Chairman, Bank of America Corporation Jack O. Bovender, Jr.

Lead Independent Director, Bank of America Corporation Linda P. Hudson

Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Cardea Group, and former President and Chief Executive Officer, BAE Systems, Inc.

Sharon L. Allen

Former Chairman, Deloitte LLP Monica C. Lozano

Chairman of the Board, US Hispanic Media Inc. Susan S. Bies

Former Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System Thomas J. May

Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer, Eversource Energy Frank P. Bramble, Sr.

Former Executive Officer, MBNA Corporation Lionel L. Nowell, III

Former Senior Vice President and Treasurer of PepsiCo, Inc. Pierre J. P. de Week

Former Chairman and Global Head of Private Wealth Management, Deutsche Bank AG R. David Yost

Former Chief Executive Officer, AmerisourceBergen Corporation Arnold W. Donald
President and Chief Executive Officer, Carnival Corporation & pic

Senior Officers

Brian T. Moynihan

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer Terry Laughlin

President of Strategic Initiatives Dean Athanasia

President, Preferred and Small Business Banking Co-head, Consumer Banking Gary G. Lynch
Vice Chairman and Global General Counsel

Catherine P. Bessant
Chief Operations and Technology Officer

Thomas K. Montag Chief Operating Officer

David C. Darnell Vice Chairman

Thong Nguyen

President, Retail Banking Co-head, Consumer Banking Anne M. Finucane

Vice Chairman and Global Chief Strategy and Marketing Officer Andrea B. Smith
Global Head of Human Resources

Geoffrey S. Greener Chief Risk Officer

Bruce R. Thompson Managing Director

Christine P. Katziff Corporate General Auditor

Paul Donofrio
Chief Financial Officer

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SECTION 11(A) Disclosure of Ownership Interests

The disclosing Party operates as a national bank association incorporated under the laws of the United States and subject to examination by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency.

SECTION III -Business Relationships with City Elected Officials

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of Bank of America Corporation ("BAC"). BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities. Attached to this Addendum is a copy of the Litigation and Regulatory Matters from a recent Report.

BAC and, or, its affiliates, have engaged the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the past, which engagement may continue to the date of this Statement, and BAC and, or, its affiliates, may engage the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the future. Alderman Edward M. Burke Principal of Klafter & Burke.

SECTION V. - Certifications

SECTION V(A) Court-Ordered Child Support Compliance

As a public corporation, BAC does not have any "substantial" owners as defined by the provision. No individual or group of individuals owns 10% or more of BAC. In addition, the Disclosing Party complies with all child support orders it receives.

B. Further Clarifications

1. Disclosing Party is not the Applicant.

Neither BAC nor its Executive Officers and Director identified within this EDS is subject to any order, judgment or decree by any court or government authority in which it is barred, suspended or otherwise limited from engaging in any type of business practice.

SECTION V(B)(2) b, c and e:

BAC makes all required disclosures in its Form 10-k as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and its Annual Report as posted on its website. In addition, BAC's registered broker-dealer and investment adviser subsidiaries make all required disclosures on their Form BDs and filed with FINRA and their Form ADVs as filed with the SEC. These filings include disclosures of investigations and litigation as required by the securities regulatory organizations and federal law, and are publicly available.- BAC cannot confirm or deny the existence of

any other non-public investigation conducted by any governmental agency unless required to do so by law. Please let us know if any additional information is needed.

SECTION V(B)(2)d

The Disclosing Party performed due diligence within the Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC to determine whether any Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC employees were aware of any public finance transactions (federal, state or local) having been terminated for cause or default within the last five years, and none of such employees were aware of any such transactions.

SECTION V(B)(3)a, b, c and d

Please note that our responses are on behalf of the Disclosing Party only and not on behalf of any contractors or retained parties disclosed in SECTION IV.

a, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. Additionally, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(4) below.

SECTION V(4): Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. SECTION V(B)(6)

BAC and its affiliates maintain strict policies and procedures to ensure compliance with applicable, local, state and federal law and regulations, including Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code. To the best of the individual signing this EDS, BAC and its affiliates are currently in compliance, and have policies and procedures in place to ensure continued compliance.

SECTION V(B)(7) AND (8)

Please see responses to SECTION VII(C).

SECTION V(E) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

The Disclosing Party verifies that a) the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities for records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies, and (b) the Disclosing Party has found no records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies and no records of any slave or slaveholders.

SECTION VII - Acknowledgments, Contract Incorporation, Compliance, Penalties, Disclosure

SECTION VII(B) and (C). Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

F 1-

Representatives and agents of BAC or its affiliates meet with representatives of the City on a monthly or other regular basis to identify outstanding amounts duly payable by BAC or its affiliates to the City and settle

them accordingly.

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED OFFICIAL AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

Litigation and Regulatory Matters Document Follows This Page

Litigation and Regulatory Matters

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are routinely defendants in or parties to many pending and threatened legal actions and proceedings, including actions brought on behalf of various classes of claimants. These actions and proceedings are generally based on alleged violations of consumer protection, securities, environmental, banking, employment, contract and other laws. In some of these actions and proceedings, claims for substantial monetary damages are asserted against the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are also subject to regulatory and governmental examinations, information gathering requests, inquiries, investigations, and threatened legal actions and proceedings. For example, certain subsidiaries of the Corporation are registered broker-dealers or investment advisors and are subject to regulation by the SEC, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the European Commission, the PRA, the FCA and other international, federal and state securities regulators. In connection with formal and informal inquiries, the Corporation and its subsidiaries receive numerous requests, subpoenas and orders for documents, testimony and information in connection with various aspects of the Corporation's regulated activities.

In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such litigation, regulatory and governmental matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages or where the matters present novel legal theories or involve a large number of parties, the Corporation generally cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the pending matters will be, what the timing of the ultimate resolution of these matters will be, or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be.

In accordance with applicable accounting guidance, the Corporation establishes an accrued liability for litigation, regulatory and governmental matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and estimable. In such cases, there may be an exposure to loss in excess of any amounts accrued. As a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter develops, the Corporation, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, evaluates on an ongoing basis whether such matter presents a loss contingency that is probable and estimable. When a loss contingency is not both probable and estimable, the Corporation does not establish an accrued liability. If, at the time of evaluation, the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is not both probable and estimable, the matter will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and estimable. Once the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is deemed to be both probable and

estimable, the Corporation will establish an accrued liability with respect to such loss contingency and record a corresponding amount of litigation-related expense. The Corporation continues to monitor the matter for further developments that could affect the amount of the accrued liability that has been previously established. Excluding expenses of internal or external legal service providers, litigation-related expense of \$16.4 billion was recognized for 2014 compared to \$6.1 billion for 2013.

For a limited number of the matters disclosed in this Note for which a loss, whether in excess of a related accrued liability or where there is no accrued liability, is reasonably possible in future periods, the Corporation is able to estimate a range of possible loss. In determining whether it is possible to estimate a range of possible loss, the Corporation reviews and evaluates its material litigation, regulatory and governmental matters on an ongoing basis, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, in light of potentially relevant factual and legal developments. These may include information learned through the discovery process, rulings on dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and other rulings by courts, arbitrators or others. In cases in which the Corporation possesses sufficient appropriate information to estimate a range of possible loss, that estimate is aggregated and disclosed below. There may be other disclosed matters for which a loss is probable or reasonably possible but such an estimate of the range of possible loss may not be possible. For those matters where an estimate of the range of possible loss is possible, management currently estimates the aggregate range of possible loss is \$0 to \$2.7 billion in excess of the accrued liability (if any) related to those matters. This estimated range of possible loss is based upon currently available information and is subject to significant judgment and a variety of assumptions, and known and unknown uncertainties. The matters underlying the estimated range will change from time to time, and actual results may vary significantly from the current estimate. Those matters for which an estimate is not possible are not included within this estimated range. Therefore, this estimated range of possible loss represents what the Corporation believes to be an estimate of possible loss only for certain matters meeting these criteria. It does not represent the Corporation's maximum loss exposure.

Information is provided below regarding the nature of all of these contingencies and, where specified, the amount of the claim associated with these loss contingencies. Based on current knowledge, management does not believe that loss contingencies arising from pending matters, including the matters described herein, will have a material adverse effect on the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Corporation. However, in light of the inherent uncertainties involved in these matters, some of which are beyond the Corporation's control, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some of these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to the Corporation's results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period.

Bond Insurance Litigation Ambac Countrywide Litigation

The Corporation, Countrywide and other Countrywide entities are named as defendants in an action filed on September 29, 2010 and as amended on May 28, 2013, by Ambac Assurance Corporation and the Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation (together, Ambac), entitled Ambac Assurance Corporation and The Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. This action, currently pending in New York Supreme Court, New York County, relates to bond insurance policies provided by Ambac on certain securitized pools of second-lien (and in one pool, first-lien) HELOCs, first-lien subprime home equity loans and fixed-rate second-lien mortgage loans. Plaintiffs allege that they have paid claims as a result of defaults in the underlying loans and assert that the Countrywide defendants misrepresented the characteristics of the underlying loans and breached certain contractual representations and warranties regarding the underwriting and servicing of the loans. Plaintiffs also allege that the Corporation is liable based on successor liability theories. Damages claimed by Ambac are in excess of \$2.2 billion and include the amount of payments for current and future claims it has paid or claims it will be obligated to pay under the policies, increasing over time as it pays claims under relevant policies, plus unspecified punitive damages.

On December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a second complaint in the same court against the same defendants, claiming fraudulent inducement against Countrywide and successor and vicarious liability against the Corporation relating to eight partially Ambac-insured RMBS transactions that closed between 2005 and 2007, all backed by negative amortization pay option adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) loans that were originated in whole or in part by Countrywide. Seven of the eight securitizations were issued and underwritten by non-parties to the litigation. Ambac claims damages in excess of \$600 million consisting of all alleged past and future claims against its policies, plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Also on December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a third action in Wisconsin Circuit Court, Dane County, against Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., claiming that it was fraudulently induced to insure portions of five securitizations issued and underwritten in 2005 by a non-party that included Countrywide originated first-lien negative amortization pay option ARM loans. The complaint claims damages in excess of \$350 million for all alleged past and future Ambac insured claims payment obligations plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Ambac First Franklin Litigation

On April 16, 2012, Ambac sued First Franklin Financial Corp., BAN A, MLPF&S, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc. (MLML), and Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. Plaintiffs' claims relate to guaranty insurance Ambac provided on a First Franklin securitization (Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2007-FFC). The securitization was sponsored by MLML, and certain certificates in the securitization were insured by Ambac. The complaint alleges that defendants breached representations and warranties concerning the origination of the underlying mortgage loans and asserts claims for fraudulent inducement, breach of contract and indemnification. Plaintiffs also assert breach of contract claims against BANA based upon its servicing of the loans in the securitization. The complaint alleges that Ambac has paid hundreds of millions of dollars in claims and has accrued and continues to accrue tens of millions of dollars in additional claims, and Ambac seeks as damages the total claims it has paid and its projected claims payment obligations, as well as specific performance of defendants' contractual repurchase obligations.

Bank of America 2014 216

On July 19, 2013, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's contract and fraud causes of action but granted dismissal of Ambac's indemnification cause of action. In addition, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's claims for attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

European Commission - Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Investigation On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (Commission) announced that it had addressed a Statement of Objections (SO) to the Corporation, BANA and Banc of America Securities LLC (together, the Bank of America Entities), a number of other financial institutions, Markit Group Limited, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (together, the Parties). The SO sets forth the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the Parties infringed European Union competition law by participating in alleged collusion to prevent exchange trading of CDS and futures. According to the SO, the conduct of

the Bank of America Entities took place between August 2007 and April 2009. As part of the Commission's procedures, the Parties have reviewed the evidence in the investigative file, responded to the Commission's preliminary conclusions and attended a hearing before the Commission. If the Commission is satisfied that its preliminary conclusions are proved, the Commission has stated that it intends to impose a fine and require appropriate remedial measures.

Fontainebleau Las Vegas Litigation

On June 9, 2009, Avenue CLO Fund Ltd., et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., Merrill Lynch Capital Corporation, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada by certain Fontainebleau Las Vegas, LLC (FBLV) project lenders. Plaintiffs alleged that, among other things, BANA breached its duties as disbursement agent under the agreement governing the disbursement of loaned funds to FBLV, then a Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages of more than \$700 million, plus interest. This action was subsequently transferred by the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

On March 19, 2012, the district court granted BANA's motion for summary judgment on all causes of action against it in its capacity as disbursement agent and denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on those claims. On July 26, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's dismissal of the disbursement agent claims against BANA, holding that there were factual disputes that could not be resolved on a summary judgment motion, and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

Dismissal of the other claims was affirmed on a separate appeal. On December 13, 2013, the JPML remanded the action to the District of Nevada for trial.

The parties have settled the action for \$300 million, an amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiffs have stipulated to the voluntary dismissal of their remaining claims with prejudice.

In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation

Beginning in January 2009, the Corporation, as well as certain current and former officers and directors, among others, were named as defendants in a variety of actions filed in state and federal courts. The actions generally concern alleged material misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to certain securities filings by the Corporation. The securities filings contained information with respect to events that took place from September 2008 through January 2009 contemporaneous with the Corporation's acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (Merrill Lynch). Certain federal court actions were consolidated and/or coordinated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (the District Court) under the caption In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation.

Plaintiffs in the consolidated securities class action (the Consolidated Securities Class Action) asserted claims under Sections 14(a), 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and asserted damages based on the drop in the stock price upon subsequent disclosures. On April 5, 2013, the District Court granted final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On November 5, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On February 3, 2015, the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court elapsed without any objector filing a petition.

Certain shareholders opted to pursue their claims apart from the Consolidated Securities Class Action. Following settlements in an aggregate amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2013, the District Court dismissed the claims of these plaintiffs with prejudice.

In addition, on January 11, 2013, the District Court approved the settlement of claims filed by plaintiffs in a derivative action in the Consolidated Securities Class Action, which also resolved a consolidated derivative action filed in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

In addition, the District Court dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiffs in the ERISA actions in the Consolidated Securities Class Action on August 27, 2010, and the parties stipulated to the withdrawal of the appeal of that decision on January 14, 2013.

Interchange and Related Litigation

In 2005, a group of merchants filed a series of putative class actions and individual actions directed at interchange fees associated with Visa and MasterCard payment card transactions. These actions, which were consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York under the caption In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Anti-Trust Litigation (Interchange), named Visa, MasterCard and several banks and bank holding companies (BHCs), including the Corporation, as defendants. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix the level of default interchange rates and that certain rules of Visa and MasterCard related to merchant acceptance of payment cards at the point of sale were unreasonable restraints of trade. Plaintiffs sought unspecified damages and injunctive relief.

217 Bank of America 2014

On October 19, 2012, defendants settled the matter. The settlement provides for, among other things, (i) payments by defendants to the class and individual plaintiffs totaling approximately \$6.6 billion, allocated proportionately to each defendant based upon various loss-sharing agreements; (ii) distribution to class merchants of an amount equal to 10 bps of default interchange across all Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions for a period of eight consecutive months, to begin by July 29, 2013, which otherwise would have been paid to issuers and which effectively reduces credit interchange for that period of time; and (iii) modifications to certain Visa and MasterCard rules regarding merchant point of sale practices.

The court granted final approval of the class settlement agreement on December 13, 2013. Several class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In addition, a number of class members opted out of the settlement of their past damages claims. The cash portion of the settlement was adjusted downward as a result of these opt outs.

The Corporation is named in three of the opt-out suits, including one brought by cardholders, and, as a result of various sharing agreements from the main Interchange litigation, the Corporation remains liable for any settlement or judgment in opt-out suits where it is not named as a defendant. All but one of the opt-out suits filed to date have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. On July 18, 2014, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss opt-out complaints filed by merchants, and on November 26, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the Sherman Act claim in the cardholder complaint.

LIBOR, Other Reference Rate and Foreign Exchange (FX) Inquiries and Litigation

The Corporation has received subpoenas and information requests from government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region, including the DoJ, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the FCA, concerning submissions made by panel banks in connection with the setting of LIBOR and other reference rates. The Corporation is cooperating with these inquiries.

In addition, the Corporation and BANA have been named as defendants along with most of the other LIBOR panel banks in a series of individual and class actions in various U.S. federal and state courts relating to defendants' LIBOR contributions. All cases naming the Corporation have been or are in the process of being consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the JPML. The Corporation expects that any future cases naming it will similarly be consolidated for pre-trial purposes. Plaintiffs allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of collusion or manipulation by defendants regarding the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Plaintiffs assert a variety of claims, including antitrust and Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), common law fraud, and breach of contract claims, and seek compensatory, treble and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

In a series of rulings, the court dismissed antitrust, RICO and certain state law claims, while permitting the Commodity Exchange Act and other state law claims to proceed. As a result of a procedural ruling by the Supreme Court, plaintiffs are pursuing an immediate appeal of the dismissal of their antitrust claims. Further, based on the statute of limitations, the court has substantially limited the time period for which manipulation claims under the Commodity Exchange Act may be pursued. As to the Corporation and BANA, the court has also dismissed manipulation claims based on alleged trader conduct, and certain common law claims by plaintiffs who alleged no direct dealings with the Corporation or BANA. Other claims against the Corporation and BANA remain pending, however, and the court is continuing to consider motions regarding them, including the applicability of its prior rulings to subsequently filed actions.

Certain regulatory and government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region are conducting investigations and making inquiries of a significant number of FX market participants, including the Corporation, regarding FX market participants' conduct and systems and controls over multiple years. The Corporation is cooperating with these investigations and inquiries, some of which are likely to lead to regulatory or legal proceedings and expose the Corporation to material penalties, fines or losses, and could adversely affect its reputation.

In particular, in November 2014, the Corporation resolved a matter with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) by agreeing to the imposition of mandatory

remedial measures and payment of \$250 million in civil penalties associated with the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls.

The Corporation is in separate advanced discussions to resolve the regulatory matters of concern to another U.S. banking regulator involving the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls. There can be no assurances that these discussions will lead to a resolution, or of the amount or timing of any such resolution.

In addition, in a consolidated amended complaint filed on March 31, 2014, the Corporation and BANA were named as defendants along with other FX market participants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of plaintiffs and a putative class who allegedly transacted in FX and are domiciled in the U.S. or transacted in FX in the U.S. (the U.S. Action). On April 30, 2014, a substantively similar class action was filed against the Corporation and other FX market participants on behalf of a plaintiff and putative class allegedly located in Norway (the Foreign Action). The complaints allege that class members transacted with defendants at or around the time of the fixing of the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates or entered into transactions that settled in whole or in part based on the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates and that they sustained losses as a result of the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates. Plaintiffs in the U.S. Action assert a single claim for violations of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, and plaintiff in the Foreign Action asserts claims for violations of the Sherman Act, as well as certain claims under New York statutory and common law. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and treble damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

On January 28, 2015, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the U.S. Action, finding that plaintiffs had sufficiently pleaded the elements of an antitrust claim. In the same decision, the court granted with prejudice defendants' motion to dismiss the Foreign Action, finding that the Sherman Act does not apply extraterritorially, except in limited circumstances not present in the case, and that plaintiff had failed to plead an actionable state law claim.

Bank of America 2014 2 IK

Montgomery

The Corporation, several current and former officers and directors, Banc of America Securities LLC (BAS), MLPF&S and other unaffiliated underwriters have been named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Montgomery v. Bank of America, et al.* Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on January 14, 2011. Plaintiff seeks to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired certain series of preferred stock offered by the Corporation pursuant to a shelf registration statement dated May 5, 2006. Plaintiff's claims arise from three offerings dated January 24, 2008, January 28, 2008 and May 20, 2008, from which the Corporation allegedly received proceeds of \$15.8 billion. The amended complaint asserts claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleges that the prospectus supplements associated with the offerings: (i) failed to disclose that the Corporation's loans, leases, CDOs and commercial MBS were impaired to a greater extent than disclosed; (ii) misrepresented the extent of the impaired assets by failing to establish adequate reserves or properly record losses for its impaired assets; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of the Corporation's internal controls in light of the alleged impairment of its assets; (iv) misrepresented the Corporation's capital base and Tier 1 leverage ratio for risk-based capital in light of the allegedly impaired assets; and (v) misrepresented the thoroughness and adequacy of the Corporation's due diligence in connection with its acquisition of Countrywide. The amended complaint seeks rescission, compensatory and other damages. On March 16, 2012, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. On December 3, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion to file a second amended complaint. On February 6, 2014, plaintiffs appealed the denial of their motion to amend to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mortgage-backed Securities Litigation

The Corporation and its affiliates, Countrywide entities and their affiliates, and Merrill Lynch entities and their affiliates have been named as defendants in a number of cases relating to their various roles as issuer, originator, seller, depositor, sponsor, underwriter and/or controlling entity in MBS offerings, pursuant to which the MBS investors were entitled to a portion of the cash flow from the underlying pools of mortgages. These cases generally include purported class action suits and actions by individual MBS purchasers. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the registration statements, prospectuses and prospectus supplements for securities issued by securitization trusts contained material misrepresentations and omissions, in violation of the Securities Act of 1933 and/or state securities laws and other state statutory and common laws.

These cases generally involve allegations of false and misleading statements regarding: (i) the process by which the properties that served as collateral for the mortgage loans underlying the MBS were appraised; (ii) the percentage of equity that mortgage borrowers had in their homes; (iii) the borrowers' ability to repay their mortgage loans; (iv) the underwriting practices by which those mortgage loans were originated; (v) the ratings given to the different tranches of MBS by rating agencies; and (vi) the validity of each issuing trust's title to the mortgage loans comprising the pool for that securitization (collectively, MBS Claims). Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek unspecified compensatory damages, unspecified costs and legal fees and, in some instances, seek rescission.

The Corporation, Countrywide, Merrill Lynch and/or their affiliates may have claims for and/or may be subject to claims for contractual indemnification in connection with their various roles in regard to MBS.

On August 15, 2011, the JPML ordered multiple federal court cases involving Countrywide MBS consolidated for pretrial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in a multi-district litigation entitled *In re Countrywide Financial Corp. Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation* (the Countrywide RMBS MDL).

Federal Home Loan Bank Litigation

On March 15, 2010, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB San Francisco) filed an action in California Superior Court, San Francisco County, entitled *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, et al.* FHLB San Francisco's complaint asserts certain MBS Claims against BAS, Countrywide and several related entities in connection with its alleged purchase of 51 MBS offerings and one private placement issued and/or underwritten by those defendants between 2004 and 2007 and seeks rescission and unspecified damages. FHLB San Francisco dismissed the federal claims with prejudice on August 11, 2011. On September 8, 2011, the court denied defendants' motions to dismiss the state law claims. On December 20, 2013, FHLB San Francisco voluntarily dismissed its negligent misrepresentation claims with prejudice. On October 15, 2014, the court denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to two Countrywide trusts that were to be part of a bellwether trial.

The parties have settled the action and other related actions for \$420 million, as well as with respect to certain claims, additional consideration; all amounts were fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, FHLB San Francisco has voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims with prejudice.

Luther Class Action Litigation and Related Actions Beginning in 2007, a number of pension funds and other investors filed putative class action lawsuits alleging certain MBS Claims against Countrywide, several of its affiliates, MLPF&S, the Corporation, NB Holdings Corporation and certain other defendants. Those class action lawsuits concerned a total of 429 MBS offerings involving over \$350 billion in securities issued by subsidiaries of Countrywide between 2005 and 2007. The actions, entitled *Luther v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Maine State Retirement System v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust Fund v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, and *Putnam Bank v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, were all assigned to the Countrywide RMBS MDL court. On December 6, 2013, the court granted final approval to a settlement of these actions in the amount of \$500 million. Beginning on January 14, 2014, a number of class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Prudential Insurance Litigation

On March 14, 2013, The Prudential Insurance Company of America and certain of its affiliates (collectively Prudential) filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in a case entitled *Prudential Insurance Company of America, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Prudential has named the Corporation, Merrill

21V Bank of America 2014

Lynch and a number of related entities as defendants. Prudential asserts certain MBS Claims pertaining to 54 MBS offerings from which Prudential alleges that it purchased securities between 2004 and 2007. Prudential seeks, among other relief, compensatory damages, rescission or a rescissory measure of damages, punitive damages and other unspecified relief. On April 17, 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint. Prudential thereafter split its claims into two separate complaints, filing an amended complaint in the original action and a complaint in a separate action entitled *Prudential Portfolios 2, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Both cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. On February 5, 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants'

motion to dismiss those complaints, granting plaintiff leave to replead in certain respects.

Mortgage Repurchase Litigation U.S. Bank Litigation

On August 29, 2011, U.S. Bank, National Association (U.S. Bank), as trustee for the HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-10 (the Trust), a mortgage pool backed by loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (CHL), filed a complaint in New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a case entitled U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2005-10 v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (dba Bank of America Home Loans), Bank of America Corporation, Countrywide Financial Corporation, Bank of America, N.A. and NB Holdings Corporation. U.S. Bank asserts that, as a result of alleged misrepresentations by CHL in connection with its sale of the loans, defendants must repurchase all the loans in the pool, or in the alternative that it must repurchase a subset of those loans as to which U.S. Bank alleges that defendants have refused specific repurchase demands. U.S. Bank asserts claims for breach of contract and seeks specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase the entire pool of loans (alleged to have an original aggregate principal balance of \$1.75 billion) or alternatively the aforementioned subset (alleged to have an aggregate principal balance of "over \$100 million"), together with reimbursement of costs and expenses and other unspecified relief. On May 29, 2013, the New York Supreme Court dismissed U.S. Bank's claim for repurchase of all the mortgage loans in the Trust. The court granted U.S. Bank leave to amend this claim. On June 18, 2013, U.S. Bank filed its second amended complaint seeking to replead its claim for repurchase of all loans in the Trust. On February 13, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the repleaded claim seeking repurchase of all mortgage loans in the Trust; plaintiff has appealed that order.

On November 13, 2014, the court granted U.S. Bank's motion for leave to amend the complaint; defendants have appealed that order. The amended complaint alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' failure to repurchase loans that were the subject of specific repurchase demands and also alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' discovery, during origination and servicing, of loans with material breaches of representations and warranties.

U.S. Bank Summonses with Notice

On August 29, 2014, U.S. Bank, solely in its capacity as Trustee for seven securitization trusts (the Trusts), served seven summonses with notice commencing potential actions against First Franklin Financial Corporation, Merrill Lynch Mortgage

Lending, Inc., Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., and Ownit Mortgage Solutions Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. The summonses indicate that defendants may be subject to breach of contract claims alleging that they breached representations and warranties related to loans securitized in the Trusts. The summonses allege that defendants failed to repurchase breaching mortgage loans from the Trusts. The summonses seek specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase breaching loans, declaratory judgment, compensatory, rescissory and other damages, and indemnity. On February 5, 2015, defendants demanded complaints on three of the Trusts. Defendants currently have until March 3, 2015 to demand the complaint with respect to one of the remaining Trusts, and until July 15, 2015 to demand complaints on the final three Trusts.

Ocala Investor Litigation

On November 25, 2009, BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation (BNP) and Deutsche Bank AG each filed claims (the 2009 Actions) against BANA in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation v. Bank of America, N.A. and Deutsche Bank AG v. Bank of America, N.A. Plaintiffs allege that BANA failed to properly perform its duties as indenture trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository for Ocala Funding, LLC (Ocala), a home mortgage warehousing facility, resulting in the loss of plaintiffs' investment in Ocala. Ocala was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Taylor, Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. (TBW), a home mortgage originator and servicer which is alleged to have committed fraud that led to its eventual bankruptcy. Ocala provided funding for TBW's mortgage origination activities by issuing notes, the proceeds of which were to be used by TBW to originate home mortgages. Such mortgages and other Ocala assets in turn were pledged to BANA, as collateral agent, to secure the notes. Plaintiffs lost most or all of their investment in Ocala when, as the result of the alleged fraud committed by TBW, Ocala was unable to repay the notes purchased by plaintiffs and there was insufficient collateral to satisfy Ocala's debt obligations. Plaintiffs allege that BANA breached its contractual, fiduciary and other duties to Ocala, thereby permitting TBW's alleged fraud to go undetected. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and other relief from BANA, including interest and attorneys' fees, in an unspecified amount, but which plaintiffs allege exceeds \$1.6 billion.

On March 23, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part BANA's motions to dismiss the 2009 Actions. Plaintiffs filed amended complaints on October 1, 2012 that included additional contractual, tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the court granted BANA's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims for failure to sue, negligence, negligent misrepresentation and equitable relief.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On February 19, 2015, BANA and BNP reached an agreement in principle to settle the 2009 actions for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to the execution of a final settlement agreement.

O'Donnell Litigation

On February 24, 2012, Edward O'Donnell filed a sealed qui tam complaint under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and the False Claims Act against the Corporation, individually, and as successor to Countrywide,

Bank of America 2014 220

CHL and a Countrywide business division known as Full Spectrum Lending. On October 24, 2012, the DoJ filed a complaint-in-intervention to join the matter, adding BANA, Countrywide and CHL as defendants. The action is entitled United States of America, ex rel, Edward O'Donnell, appearing Qui Tam v. Bank of America Corp., et al., and was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint-in-intervention asserted certain fraud claims in connection with the sale of loans to FNMA and FHLMC by Full Spectrum Lending and by the Corporation and BANA. On January 11, 2013, the government filed an amended complaint which added Countrywide Bank, FSB (CFSB) and a former officer of the Corporation as defendants. The court dismissed False Claims Act counts on May 8, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the government filed a second amended complaint alleging claims under FIRREA concerning allegedly fraudulent loan sales to the GSEs between August 2007 and May 2008. On September 24, 2013, the government dismissed the Corporation as a defendant.

Following a trial, on October 23, 2013, a verdict of liability was returned against CHL, CFSB and BANA. On July 30, 2014, the court imposed a civil penalty of \$1.3 billion on BANA. On February 3, 2015, the court denied the Corporation's motions for judgment as a matter of law, or in the alternative, a new trial. The Corporation will appeal the verdict and judgment.

Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System The Corporation and several current and former officers were named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System v. Bank of America, et al.

Following the filing of a complaint on February 2, 2011, plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 23, 2011 in which plaintiff sought to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired the Corporation's common stock between February 27, 2009 and October 19, 2010 and "Common Equivalent Securities" sold in a December 2009 offering. The amended complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleged that the Corporation's public statements: (i) concealed problems in the Corporation's mortgage servicing business resulting from the widespread use of the Mortgage Electronic Recording System; (ii) failed to disclose the Corporation's exposure to mortgage repurchase claims; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of internal controls; and (iv) violated certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The amended complaint sought unspecified damages.

On July 11, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. All claims under the Securities Act were dismissed against all defendants, with prejudice. The motion to dismiss the claim against the Corporation under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act was denied. All claims under the Exchange Act against the officers were dismissed, with leave to replead. Defendants moved to dismiss a second amended complaint in which plaintiff sought to replead claims against certain current and former officers under Sections 10(b) and 20(a). On April 17, 2013, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss, sustaining Sections 10(b) and 20(a) claims against the current and former officers.

Policemen's Annuity Litigation

On April 11, 2012, the Policemen's Annuity & Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago, on its own behalf and on behalf of a proposed class of purchasers of 41 RMBS trusts collateralized mostly by Washington Mutual-originated (WaMu) mortgages, filed a proposed class action complaint against BANA and other unrelated parties in the U.S.

Takefuji Litigation

On July 19, 2013, the Tokyo District Court issued a judgment in defendants' favor, a decision that Takefuji subsequently appealed to the Tokyo High Court. On August 27, 2014, the Tokyo High Court vacated the decision of the District Court and issued a judgment awarding Takefuji JPY 14.5 billion (approximately \$135 million) in damages, plus interest at a rate of five percent from March 18, 2008. On September 10, 2014, defendants filed an appeal with the Japanese Supreme Court.

OR

OR

powered by Legistar™

Dept. of Planning and Development

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS?

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following: n/a

Specification # _____ and Contract # _____

Page 1 of 13

1

SECTION 11-DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

- ☐ Person
☐ Publicly registered business corporation
☒ Privately-held business corporation
☒ Sole proprietorship
☐ General partnership
☐ Limited partnership
☒ Trust
☐ Limited liability company
☐ Limited liability partnership
☐ Joint venture
☐ Not-for-profit corporation
(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?
☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Other (please specify)

2, For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable.:

Pp.1 awrtrp : : ■ ■ _ ■

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois; as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ WA

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no"

members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title Please see attached list of executive officers and directors.

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust; ■ estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154.030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure.

| ■ Name | Business Address | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| | | • 'BAC North America Holding' Company ' , 100% Direct Owner - ■ |
| 100 N. Tryon Street • | | |
| Charlotte, NC 58255 | | |

SECTION III -- BUSINESS-RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship,"^ defined/in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code; with any City elected official in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed?

☒ Yes ☐ No See Attached.

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such relationship(s):

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity ..whom the Disclosing Party has retained or .expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular-payroll

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|--|---|
|--|------------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[X] Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain- any such persons or entities.

SECTION V CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes

☐ No

No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party. See Attached.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS See Attached Additional Information, including Litigation and Regulatory Matters.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article 1 ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g..."doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2; The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons ;or entities identified in Section II.B.I. of this EDS:

- a. - are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from, any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with:, obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud;; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e: have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other-unit of local government. °

I certify the above to be true.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with, the

Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");,

- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal, or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct, described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

I certify the above to be true.

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

I certify the above to be true.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

I certify the above to be true.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

I certify the above to be true.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below: I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information

Page 6 of 13

If the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☒ is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge

that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City." The Disclosing Party makes the above pledge.

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because if or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?
☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City, officials or employees

having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

Business Address

Nature of Interest

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below, if the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

☐ 1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

☐ 2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies, the Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

I can make the verification (#1)

SECTION VI- CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word: "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A. 1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3; The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraph's A.1. and A.1. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an "organization-described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must Obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded; federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (Sec 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes

- UNO

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

SECTION VII -- ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments, contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all. statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line; at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable Ordinances. I acknowledge and consent to the above.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release, of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes, the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a

contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

I acknowledge and consent to the above.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page II of 13

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. I certify the above to be true.

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. I certify the above to be true.

F.3 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractor/subcontractor that does not provide such certifications or that the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications. I certify the above to be true.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F.1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

BANA Holding Corporation

(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

4

(Sign if/for) Phillip A. Wertz

(Print or type name of person signing)

Associate General Counsel & Senior Vice President

(Print or type title of person signing)

Notary Public

I, David R. Hill, Notary Public, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same was presented to me on (date) _____ at _____, Illinois.

Official Seal

DAVID R. HILL NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF ILLINOIS MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 1/5/2019

Page 2 of 11

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND
AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive, officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section ILB.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party; if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

[] Yes [x] No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code'scOfflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-4.16 of the Municipal Code?"

[]Yes: [x]No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code? "

[]Yes [x]No^ [] Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code'scOfflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS* AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

BANA HOLDING CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS
MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS RESPONSE TO SECTION II.B.1

BANA Holding Corporation

3/24/2015

Board of Directors

Greener, Geoffrey Laughlin, Terrence P. Moynihan, Brian T. Thompson, Bruce R.

Officers

Moynihan, Brian T. Laughlin, Terrence P. Cotty, Neil A. Thompson, Bruce R. Greener, Geoffrey Jeffries, Ross E. Litsey, Jana J.

Bowman, Charles F. Dominick, Paula Ann Jones, Angela C. McAvoy, Sarah L. F. McNairy, William L. Mogensen, Lauren Sak, Pamela Templeton, William W. Thayu, Radhi Weber, Bradley H. Wertz, Phillip A. Hackworth, Gregory R. Costamagna, Christine Gilliam, Allison L. Johnson, Colleen O. Tai, Nina
Chairman of the Board, President, Chief Executive Officer • President, Strategic Initiatives Chief Accounting Officer Chief Financial Officer Chief Risk Officer

Managing Director, Secretary, Deputy General Counsel Deputy General Counsel Senior Vice President Senior Vice President
Senior Vice President Senior Vice President Senior Vice President-Tax Senior Vice President
Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel Senior Vice
President, Assistant General Counsel Senior Vice President
Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel
Treasurer
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary

**BANA HOLDING CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SECTION III -Business Relationships with City Elected Officials

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of Bank of America Corporation ("BAC"). BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities. Attached to this Addendum is a copy of the Litigation and Regulatory Matters from a recent Report.

BAC and, or, its affiliates, have engaged the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the past, which engagement may continue to the date of this Statement, and BAC and, or, its affiliates, may engage the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the future. Alderman Edward M. Burke Principal of Klafter & Burke.

SECTION V. - Certifications

SECTION V(A) Court-Ordered Child Support Compliance

As a public corporation, BAC does not have any "substantial" owners as defined by the provision. No individual or group of individuals owns 10% or more of BAC. In addition, the Disclosing Party complies with all child support orders it receives.

B. Further Clarifications

1. Disclosing Party is not the Applicant.

Neither BAC nor its Executive Officers and Director identified within this EDS is subject to any order, judgment or decree by any court or government authority in which it is barred, suspended or otherwise limited from engaging in any type of business practice.

SECTION V(B)(2) b, c and e:

BAC makes all required disclosures in its Form 10-k as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and its Annual Report as posted on its website. In addition, BAC's registered broker-dealer and investment adviser subsidiaries make all required disclosures on their Form BDs and filed with FINRA and their Form ADVs as filed with the SEC. These filings include disclosures of investigations and litigation as required by the securities regulatory organizations and federal law, and are publicly available. BAC cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other non-public investigation conducted by any governmental agency unless required to do so by law.

Please let us know if any additional information is needed.

SECTION V(B)(2)d

The Disclosing Party performed due diligence within the Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC to

determine whether any Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC employees were aware of any public finance transactions (federal, state or local) having been terminated for cause or default within the last five years, and none of such employees were aware of any such transactions.

SECTION V(B)(3)a, b, c and d

Please note that our responses are on behalf of the Disclosing Party only and not on behalf of any contractors or retained parties disclosed in SECTION IV.

a, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. Additionally, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(4) below.

SECTION V(4): Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. SECTION V(B)(6)

BAC and its affiliates maintain strict policies and procedures to ensure compliance with applicable, local, state and federal law and regulations, including Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code. To the best of the individual signing this EDS, BAC and its affiliates are currently in compliance, and have policies and procedures in place to ensure continued compliance.

SECTION V(B)(7) AND (8)

Please see responses to SECTION VII(C).

SECTION V(E) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

The Disclosing Party verifies that a) the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities for records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies, and (b) the Disclosing Party has found no records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies and no records of any slave or slaveholders.

SECTION VII - Acknowledgments, Contract Incorporation, Compliance, Penalties, Disclosure

SECTION VII(B) and (C). Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

F.1.

Representatives and agents of BAC or its affiliates meet with representatives of the City on a monthly or other regular basis to identify outstanding amounts duly payable by BAC or its affiliates to the City and settle them accordingly.

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED OFFICIAL AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence

of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

Litigation and Regulatory Matters Document Follows This Page

Litigation and Regulatory Matters

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are routinely defendants in or parties to many pending and threatened legal actions and proceedings, including actions brought on behalf of various classes of claimants. These actions and proceedings are generally based on alleged violations of consumer protection, securities, environmental, banking, employment, contract and other laws. In some of these actions and proceedings, claims for substantial monetary damages are asserted against the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are also subject to regulatory and governmental examinations, information gathering requests, inquiries, investigations, and threatened legal actions and proceedings. For example, certain subsidiaries of the Corporation are registered broker-dealers or investment advisors and are subject to regulation by the SEC, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the European Commission, the PFIA, the FCA and other international, federal and state securities regulators. In connection with formal and informal inquiries, the Corporation and its subsidiaries receive numerous requests, subpoenas and orders for documents, testimony and information in connection with various aspects of the Corporation's regulated activities.

In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such litigation, regulatory and governmental matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages or where the matters present novel legal theories or involve a large number of parties, the Corporation generally cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the pending matters will be, what the timing of the ultimate resolution of these matters will be, or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be.

In accordance with applicable accounting guidance, the Corporation establishes an accrued liability for litigation, regulatory and governmental matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and estimable. In such cases, there may be an exposure to loss in excess of any amounts accrued. As a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter develops, the Corporation, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, evaluates on an ongoing basis whether such matter presents a loss contingency that is probable and estimable. When a loss contingency is not both probable and estimable, the Corporation does not establish an accrued liability. If, at the time of evaluation, the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is not both probable and estimable, the matter will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and estimable. Once the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is deemed to be both probable and estimable, the Corporation will establish an accrued liability with respect to such loss contingency and record a corresponding amount of litigation-related expense. The Corporation continues to monitor the matter for further developments that could affect the amount of the accrued liability that has been previously established. Excluding expenses of internal or external legal service providers, litigation-related expense of \$16.4 billion was recognized for 2014 compared to \$6.1 billion for 2013.

For a limited number of the matters disclosed in this Note for which a loss, whether in excess of a related accrued liability or where there is no accrued liability, is reasonably possible in future periods, the Corporation is able to estimate a range of possible loss. In determining whether it is possible to estimate a range of possible loss, the Corporation reviews and evaluates its material litigation, regulatory and governmental matters on an ongoing basis, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, in light of potentially relevant factual and legal developments. These may include information learned through the discovery process, rulings on dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and other rulings by courts, arbitrators or others. In cases in which the Corporation possesses sufficient appropriate information to estimate a range of possible loss, that estimate is aggregated and disclosed below. There may be other disclosed matters for which a loss is probable or reasonably possible but such an estimate of the range of possible loss may not be possible. For those matters where an estimate of the range of possible loss is possible, management currently estimates the aggregate range of possible loss is \$0 to \$2.7 billion in excess of the accrued liability (if any) related to those matters. This estimated range of possible loss is based upon currently available information and is subject to significant judgment and a variety of assumptions, and known and unknown uncertainties. The matters underlying the estimated range will change from time to time, and actual results may vary significantly from the current estimate. Those matters for which an estimate is not possible are not included within this estimated range. Therefore, this estimated range of possible loss represents what the Corporation believes to be an estimate of possible loss only for certain matters meeting these criteria. It does not represent the Corporation's maximum loss exposure.

Information is provided below regarding the nature of all of these contingencies and, where specified, the amount of the claim associated with these loss contingencies. Based on current knowledge, management does not believe that loss contingencies arising from pending matters, including the matters described herein, will have a material adverse effect on the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Corporation. However, in light of the inherent uncertainties involved in these matters, some of which are beyond the Corporation's control, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some of these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to the Corporation's results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period.

Bond Insurance Litigation Ambac Countrywide Litigation

The Corporation, Countrywide and other Countrywide entities are named as defendants in an action filed on September 29, 2010 and as amended on May 28, 2013, by Ambac Assurance Corporation and the Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation (together, Ambac), entitled Ambac Assurance Corporation and The Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. This action, currently pending in New York Supreme Court, New York County, relates to bond insurance policies provided by Ambac on certain securitized pools of second-lien (and in one pool, first-lien) HELOCs, first-lien subprime home equity loans and fixed-rate second-lien mortgage loans. Plaintiffs allege that they have paid claims as a result of defaults in the underlying loans and assert that the Countrywide defendants misrepresented the characteristics of the underlying loans and breached certain contractual representations and warranties regarding the underwriting and servicing of the loans. Plaintiffs also allege that the Corporation is liable based on successor liability theories. Damages claimed by Ambac are in excess of \$2.2 billion and include the amount of payments for current and future claims it has paid or claims it will be obligated to pay under the policies, increasing over time as it pays claims under relevant policies, plus unspecified punitive damages.

On December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a second complaint in the same court against the same defendants, claiming fraudulent inducement against Countrywide and successor and vicarious liability against the Corporation relating to eight partially Ambac-insured RMBS transactions that closed between 2005 and 2007, all backed by negative amortization pay option adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) loans that were originated in whole or in part by Countrywide. Seven of the eight securitizations were issued and underwritten by non-parties to the litigation. Ambac claims damages in excess of \$600 million consisting of all alleged past and future claims against its policies, plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Also on December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a third action in Wisconsin Circuit Court, Dane County, against Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., claiming that it was fraudulently induced to insure portions of five securitizations issued and underwritten in 2005 by a non-party that included Countrywide originated first-lien negative amortization pay option ARM loans. The complaint claims damages in excess of \$350 million for all alleged past and future Ambac insured claims payment obligations plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Ambac First Franklin Litigation

On April 16, 2012, Ambac sued First Franklin Financial Corp., BANA, MLPF&S, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc. (MLML), and Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. Plaintiffs' claims relate to guaranty insurance Ambac provided on a First Franklin securitization (Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2007-FFC). The securitization was sponsored by MLML, and certain certificates in the securitization were insured by Ambac. The complaint alleges that defendants breached representations and warranties concerning the origination of the underlying mortgage loans and asserts claims for fraudulent inducement, breach of contract and indemnification. Plaintiffs also assert breach of contract claims against BANA based upon its servicing of the loans in the securitization. The complaint alleges that Ambac has paid hundreds of millions of dollars in claims and has accrued and continues to accrue tens of millions of dollars in additional claims, and Ambac seeks as damages the total claims it has paid and its projected claims payment obligations, as well as specific performance of defendants' contractual repurchase obligations.

On July 19, 2013, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's contract and fraud causes of action but granted dismissal of Ambac's indemnification cause of action. In addition, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's claims for attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

European Commission - Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Investigation On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (Commission) announced that it had addressed a Statement of Objections (SO) to the Corporation, BANA and Banc of America Securities LLC (together, the Bank of America Entities), a number of other financial institutions, Markit Group Limited, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (together, the Parties). The SO sets forth the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the Parties infringed European Union competition law by participating in alleged collusion to prevent exchange trading of CDS and futures. According to the SO, the conduct of the Bank of America Entities took place between August 2007 and April 2009. As part of the Commission's procedures, the Parties have reviewed the evidence in the investigative file, responded to the Commission's preliminary conclusions and attended a hearing before the Commission. If the Commission is satisfied that its preliminary conclusions are proved, the Commission has stated that it intends to impose a fine and require appropriate remedial measures.

Fontainebleau Las Vegas Litigation

On June 9, 2009, Avenue CIO Fund Ltd., et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., Merrill Lynch Capital Corporation, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada by certain Fontainebleau Las Vegas, LLC (FBLV) project lenders. Plaintiffs alleged that, among other things, BANA breached its duties as disbursement agent under the agreement governing the disbursement of loaned funds to FBLV, then a Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages of more than \$700 million, plus interest. This action was subsequently transferred by the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

On March 19, 2012, the district court granted BANA's motion for summary judgment on all causes of action against it in its capacity as disbursement agent and denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on those claims. On July 26, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's dismissal of the disbursement agent claims against BANA, holding that there were factual disputes that could not be resolved on a summary judgment motion, and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

Dismissal of the other claims was affirmed on a separate appeal. On December 13, 2013, the JPML remanded the action to the District of Nevada for trial.

The parties have settled the action for \$300 million, an amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiffs have stipulated to the voluntary dismissal of their remaining claims with prejudice.

In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation

Beginning in January 2009, the Corporation, as well as certain current and former officers and directors, among others, were named as defendants in a variety of actions filed in state and federal courts. The actions generally concern alleged material misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to certain securities filings by the Corporation. The securities filings contained information with respect to events that took place from September 2008 through January 2009 contemporaneous with the Corporation's acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (Merrill Lynch). Certain federal court actions were consolidated and/or coordinated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (the District Court) under the caption In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation.

Plaintiffs in the consolidated securities class action (the Consolidated Securities Class Action) asserted claims under Sections 14(a), 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and asserted damages based on the drop in the stock price upon subsequent disclosures. On April 5, 2013, the District Court granted final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On November 5, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On February 3, 2015, the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court elapsed without any objector filing a petition.

Certain shareholders opted to pursue their claims apart from the Consolidated Securities Class Action. Following settlements in an aggregate amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2013, the District Court dismissed the claims of these plaintiffs with prejudice.

In addition, on January 11, 2013, the District Court approved the settlement of claims filed by plaintiffs in a derivative action in the Consolidated Securities Class Action, which also resolved a consolidated derivative action filed in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

In addition, the District Court dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiffs in the ERISA actions in the Consolidated Securities Class Action on August 27, 2010, and the parties stipulated to the withdrawal of the appeal of that decision on January 14, 2013.

Interchange and Related Litigation

In 2005, a group of merchants filed a series of putative class actions and individual actions directed at interchange fees associated with Visa and MasterCard payment card transactions. These actions, which were consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York under the caption In Re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Anti-Trust Litigation (Interchange), named Visa, MasterCard and several banks and bank holding companies (BHCs), including the Corporation, as defendants. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix the level of default interchange rates and that certain rules of Visa and MasterCard related to merchant acceptance of payment cards at the point of sale were unreasonable restraints of trade. Plaintiffs sought unspecified damages and injunctive relief.

217 Bank of America 2014

On October 19, 2012, defendants settled the matter. The settlement provides for, among other things, (i) payments by defendants to the class and individual plaintiffs totaling approximately \$6.6 billion, allocated proportionately to each defendant based upon various loss-sharing agreements; (ii) distribution to class merchants of an amount equal to 10 bps of default interchange across all Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions for a period of eight consecutive months, to begin by July 29, 2013, which otherwise would have been paid to issuers and which effectively reduces credit interchange for that period of time; and (iii) modifications to certain Visa and MasterCard rules regarding merchant point of sale practices.

The court granted final approval of the class settlement agreement on December 13, 2013. Several class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In addition, a number of class members opted out of the settlement of their past damages claims. The cash portion of the settlement was adjusted downward as a result of these opt outs.

The Corporation is named in three of the opt-out suits, including one brought by cardholders, and, as a result of various sharing agreements from the main Interchange litigation, the Corporation remains liable for any settlement or judgment in opt-out suits where it is not named as a defendant. All but one of the opt-out suits filed to date have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. On July 18, 2014, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss opt-out complaints filed by merchants, and on November 26, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the Sherman Act claim in the cardholder complaint.

LIBOR, Other Reference Rate and Foreign Exchange (FX) Inquiries and Litigation

The Corporation has received subpoenas and information requests from government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region, including the DoJ, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the FCA, concerning submissions made by panel banks in connection with the setting of LIBOR and other reference rates. The Corporation is cooperating with these inquiries.

In addition, the Corporation and BANA have been named as defendants along with most of the other LIBOR panel banks in a series of individual and class actions in various U.S. federal and state courts relating to defendants' LIBOR contributions. All cases naming the Corporation have been or are in the process of being consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the JPML. The Corporation expects that any future cases naming it will similarly be consolidated for pre-trial purposes. Plaintiffs allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of collusion or manipulation by defendants regarding the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Plaintiffs assert a variety of claims, including antitrust and Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), common law fraud, and breach of contract claims, and seek compensatory, treble and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

In a series of rulings, the court dismissed antitrust, RICO and certain state law claims, while permitting the Commodity Exchange Act and other state law claims to

proceed. As a result of a procedural ruling by the Supreme Court, plaintiffs are pursuing an immediate appeal of the dismissal of their antitrust claims. Further, based on the statute of limitations, the court has substantially limited the time period for which manipulation claims under the Commodity Exchange Act may be pursued. As to the Corporation and BANA, the court has also dismissed manipulation claims based on alleged trader conduct, and certain common law claims by plaintiffs who alleged no direct dealings with the Corporation or BANA. Other claims against the Corporation and BANA remain pending, however, and the court is continuing to consider motions regarding them, including the applicability of its prior rulings to subsequently filed actions.

Certain regulatory and government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region are conducting investigations and making inquiries of a significant number of FX market participants, including the Corporation, regarding FX market participants' conduct and systems and controls over multiple years. The Corporation is cooperating with these investigations and inquiries, some of which are likely to lead to regulatory or legal proceedings and expose the Corporation to material penalties, fines or losses, and could adversely affect its reputation.

In particular, in November 2014, the Corporation resolved a matter with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) by agreeing to the imposition of mandatory remedial measures and payment of \$250 million in civil penalties associated with the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls.

The Corporation is in separate advanced discussions to resolve the regulatory matters of concern to another U.S. banking regulator involving the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls. There can be no assurances that these discussions will lead to a resolution, or of the amount or timing of any such resolution.

In addition, in a consolidated amended complaint filed on March 31, 2014, the Corporation and BANA were named as defendants along with other FX market participants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of plaintiffs and a putative class who allegedly transacted in FX and are domiciled in the U.S. or transacted in FX in the U.S. (the U.S. Action). On April 30, 2014, a substantively similar class action was filed against the Corporation and other FX market participants on behalf of a plaintiff and putative class allegedly located in Norway (the Foreign Action). The complaints allege that class members transacted with defendants at or around the time of the fixing of the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates or entered into transactions that settled in whole or in part based on the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates and that they sustained losses as a result of the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates. Plaintiffs in the U.S. Action assert a single claim for violations of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, and plaintiff in the Foreign Action asserts claims for violations of the Sherman Act, as well as certain claims under New York statutory and common law. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and treble damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

On January 28, 2015, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the U.S. Action, finding that plaintiffs had sufficiently pleaded the elements of an antitrust claim. In the same decision, the court granted with prejudice defendants' motion to dismiss the Foreign Action, finding that the Sherman Act does not apply extraterritorially, except in limited circumstances not present in the case, and that plaintiff had failed to plead an actionable state law claim.

Bank of America 2014 218

Montgomery

The Corporation, several current and former officers and directors, Banc of America Securities LLC (BAS), MLPF&S and other unaffiliated underwriters have been named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Montgomery v. Bank of America, et al.* Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on January 14, 2011. Plaintiff seeks to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired certain series of preferred stock offered by the Corporation pursuant to a shelf registration statement dated May 5, 2006. Plaintiff's claims arise from three offerings dated January 24, 2008, January 28, 2008 and May 20, 2008, from which the Corporation allegedly received proceeds of \$15.8 billion. The amended complaint asserts claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleges that the prospectus supplements associated with the offerings: (i) failed to disclose that the Corporation's loans, leases, CDOs and commercial MBS were impaired to a greater extent than disclosed; (ii) misrepresented the extent of the impaired assets by failing to establish adequate reserves or properly record losses for its impaired assets; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of the Corporation's internal controls in light of the alleged impairment of its assets; (iv) misrepresented the Corporation's capital base and Tier 1 leverage ratio for risk-based capital in light of the allegedly impaired assets; and (v) misrepresented the thoroughness and adequacy of the Corporation's due diligence in connection with its acquisition of Countrywide. The amended complaint seeks rescission, compensatory and other damages. On March 16, 2012, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. On December 3, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion to file a second amended complaint. On February 6, 2014, plaintiffs appealed the denial of their motion to amend to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mortgage-backed Securities Litigation

The Corporation and its affiliates, Countrywide entities and their affiliates, and Merrill Lynch entities and their affiliates have been named as defendants in a number of cases relating to their various roles as issuer, originator, seller, depositor, sponsor, underwriter and/or controlling entity in MBS offerings, pursuant to which the MBS investors were entitled to a portion of the cash flow from the underlying pools of mortgages. These cases generally include purported class action suits and actions by individual MBS purchasers. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the registration statements, prospectuses and prospectus supplements for securities issued by securitization trusts contained material misrepresentations and omissions, in violation of the Securities Act of 1933 and/or state securities laws and other state statutory and common laws.

These cases generally involve allegations of false and misleading statements regarding: (i) the process by which the properties that served as collateral for the mortgage loans underlying the MBS were appraised; (ii) the percentage of equity that mortgage borrowers had in their homes; (iii) the borrowers' ability to repay their mortgage loans; (iv) the underwriting practices by which those mortgage loans were originated; (v) the ratings given to the different tranches of MBS by rating agencies; and (vi) the validity of each issuing trust's title to the mortgage loans comprising the pool for that securitization (collectively, MBS Claims). Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek unspecified compensatory damages, unspecified costs and legal fees and, in some instances, seek rescission.

The Corporation, Countrywide, Merrill Lynch and/or their affiliates may have claims for and/or may be subject to claims for contractual indemnification in connection with their various roles in regard to MBS.

On August 15, 2011, the JPML ordered multiple federal court cases involving Countrywide MBS consolidated for pretrial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in a multi-district litigation entitled *In re Countrywide Financial Corp. Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation* (the Countrywide RMBS MDL).

Federal Home Loan Bank Litigation

On March 15, 2010, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB San Francisco) filed an action in California Superior Court, San Francisco County, entitled *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, et al.* FHLB San Francisco's complaint asserts certain MBS Claims against BAS, Countrywide and several related entities in connection with its alleged purchase of 51 MBS offerings and one private placement issued and/or underwritten by those defendants between 2004 and 2007 and seeks rescission and unspecified damages. FHLB San Francisco dismissed the federal claims with prejudice on August 11, 2011. On September 8, 2011, the court denied defendants' motions to dismiss the state law claims. On December 20, 2013, FHLB San Francisco voluntarily dismissed its negligent misrepresentation claims with prejudice. On October 15, 2014, the court denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to two Countrywide trusts that were to be part of a bellwether trial.

The parties have settled the action and other related actions for \$420 million, as well as with respect to certain claims, additional consideration; all amounts were fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, FHLB San Francisco has voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims with prejudice.

Luther Class Action Litigation and Related Actions Beginning in 2007, a number of pension funds and other investors filed putative class action lawsuits alleging certain MBS Claims against Countrywide, several of its affiliates, MLPF&S, the Corporation, NB Holdings Corporation and certain other defendants. Those class action lawsuits concerned a total of 429 MBS offerings involving over \$350 billion in securities issued by subsidiaries of Countrywide between 2005 and 2007. The actions, entitled *Luther v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Maine State Retirement System v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust Fund v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, and *Putnam Bank v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, were all assigned to the Countrywide RMBS MDL court. On December 6, 2013, the court granted final approval to a settlement of these actions in the amount of \$500 million. Beginning on January 14, 2014, a number of class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Prudential Insurance Litigation

On March 14, 2013, The Prudential Insurance Company of America and certain of its affiliates (collectively Prudential) filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in a case entitled Prudential Insurance Company of America, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al. Prudential has named the Corporation, Merrill

21V Bank of America 2014

Lynch and a number of related entities as defendants. Prudential asserts certain MBS Claims pertaining to 54 MBS offerings from which Prudential alleges that it purchased securities between 2004 and 2007. Prudential seeks, among other relief, compensatory damages, rescission or a rescissory measure of damages, punitive damages and other unspecified relief. On April 17, 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint. Prudential thereafter split its claims into two separate complaints, filing an amended complaint in the original action and a complaint in a separate action entitled Prudential Portfolios 2, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al. Both cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. On February 5, 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss those complaints, granting plaintiff leave to plead in certain respects.

Mortgage Repurchase Litigation U.S. Bank Litigation

On August 29, 2011, U.S. Bank, National Association (U.S. Bank), as trustee for the HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-10 (the Trust), a mortgage pool backed by loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (CHL), filed a complaint in New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a case entitled U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2005-10 v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (dba Bank of America Home Loans), Bank of America Corporation, Countrywide Financial Corporation, Bank of America, N.A. and NB Holdings Corporation. U.S. Bank asserts that, as a result of alleged misrepresentations by CHL in connection with its sale of the loans, defendants must repurchase all the loans in the pool, or in the alternative that it must repurchase a subset of those loans as to which U.S. Bank alleges that defendants have refused specific repurchase demands. U.S. Bank asserts claims for breach of contract and seeks specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase the entire pool of loans (alleged to have an original aggregate principal balance of \$1.75 billion) or alternatively the aforementioned subset (alleged to have an aggregate principal balance of "over \$100 million"), together with reimbursement of costs and expenses and other unspecified relief. On May 29, 2013, the New York Supreme Court dismissed U.S. Bank's claim for repurchase of all the mortgage loans in the Trust. The court granted U.S. Bank leave to amend this claim. On June 18, 2013, U.S. Bank filed its second amended complaint seeking to replead its claim for repurchase of all loans in the Trust. On February 13, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the repleaded claim seeking repurchase of all mortgage loans in the Trust; plaintiff has appealed that order.

On November 13, 2014, the court granted U.S. Bank's motion for leave to amend the complaint; defendants have appealed that order. The amended complaint alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' failure to repurchase loans that were the subject of specific repurchase demands and also alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' discovery, during origination and servicing, of loans with material breaches of representations and warranties.

U.S. Bank Summonses with Notice

On August 29, 2014, U.S. Bank, solely in its capacity as Trustee for seven securitization trusts (the Trusts), served seven summonses with notice commencing potential actions against First Franklin Financial Corporation, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc., Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., and Ownit Mortgage Solutions Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. The summonses indicate that defendants may be subject to breach of contract claims alleging that they breached representations and warranties related to loans securitized in the Trusts. The summonses allege that defendants failed to repurchase breaching mortgage loans from the Trusts. The summonses seek specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase breaching loans, declaratory judgment, compensatory, rescissory and other damages, and indemnity. On February 5, 2015, defendants demanded complaints on three of the Trusts. Defendants currently have until March 3, 2015 to demand the complaint with respect to one of the remaining Trusts, and until July 15, 2015 to demand complaints on the final three Trusts.

Ocala Investor Litigation

On November 25, 2009, BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation (BNP) and Deutsche Bank AG each filed claims (the 2009 Actions) against BANA in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation v. Bank of America, N.A. and Deutsche Bank AG v. Bank of America, N.A. Plaintiffs allege that BANA failed to properly perform its duties as indenture trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository for Ocala Funding, LLC (Ocala), a home mortgage warehousing facility, resulting in the loss of plaintiffs' investment in Ocala. Ocala was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Taylor, Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. (TBW), a home mortgage originator and servicer which is alleged to have committed fraud that led to its eventual bankruptcy. Ocala provided funding for TBW's mortgage origination activities by issuing notes, the proceeds of which were to be used by TBW to originate home mortgages. Such mortgages and other Ocala assets in turn were pledged to BANA, as collateral agent, to secure the notes. Plaintiffs lost most or all of their investment in Ocala when, as the result of the alleged fraud committed by TBW, Ocala was unable to repay the notes purchased by plaintiffs and there was insufficient collateral to satisfy Ocala's debt obligations. Plaintiffs allege that BANA breached its contractual, fiduciary and other duties to Ocala, thereby permitting TBW's alleged fraud to go undetected. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and, other relief from BANA, including interest and attorneys' fees, in an unspecified amount, but which plaintiffs allege exceeds \$1.6 billion.

On March 23, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part BANA's motions to dismiss the 2009 Actions. Plaintiffs filed amended complaints on October 1, 2012 that included additional contractual, tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the court granted BANA's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims for failure to sue, negligence, negligent misrepresentation and equitable relief.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On February 19, 2015, BANA and BNP reached an agreement in principle to settle the 2009 actions for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to the execution of a final settlement agreement.

O'Donnell Litigation

On February 24, 2012, Edward O'Donnell filed a sealed qui tam complaint under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and the False Claims Act against the Corporation, individually, and as successor to Countrywide,

Bank of America 2014 2211

CHL and a Countrywide business division known as Full Spectrum Lending. On October 24, 2012, the DoJ filed a complaint-in-intervention to join the matter, adding BANA, Countrywide and CHL as defendants. The action is entitled United States of America, ex rel, Edward O'Donnell, appearing Qui Tam v. Bank of America Corp., et al, and was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint-in-intervention asserted certain fraud claims in connection with the sale of loans to FNMA and FHLMC by Full Spectrum Lending and by the Corporation and BANA On January 11, 2013, the government filed an amended complaint which added Countrywide Bank, FSB (CFSB) and a former officer of the Corporation as defendants. The court dismissed False Claims Act counts on May 8, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the government filed a second amended complaint alleging claims under FIRREA concerning allegedly fraudulent loan sales to the GSEs between August 2007 and May 2008. On September 24, 2013, the government dismissed the Corporation as a defendant.

Following a trial, on October 23, 2013, a verdict of liability was returned against CHL, CFSB and BANA On July 30, 2014, the court imposed a civil penalty of \$1.3 billion on BANA On February 3, 2015, the court denied the Corporation's motions for judgment as a matter of law, or in the alternative, a new trial. The Corporation will appeal the verdict and judgment.

Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System The Corporation and several current and former officers were named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System v. Bank of America, et al.

Following the filing of a complaint on February 2, 2011, plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 23, 2011 in which plaintiff sought to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired the Corporation's common stock between February 27, 2009 and October 19, 2010 and "Common Equivalent Securities" sold in a December

2009 offering. The amended complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleged that the Corporation's public statements: (i) concealed problems in the Corporation's mortgage servicing business resulting from the widespread use of the Mortgage Electronic Recording System; (ii) failed to disclose the Corporation's exposure to mortgage repurchase claims; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of internal controls; and (iv) violated certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The amended complaint sought unspecified damages.

On July 11, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. All claims under the Securities Act were dismissed against all defendants, with prejudice. The motion to dismiss the claim against the Corporation under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act was denied. All claims under the Exchange Act against the officers were dismissed, with leave to replead. Defendants moved to dismiss a second amended complaint in which plaintiff sought to replead claims against certain current and former officers under Sections 10(b) and 20(a). On April 17, 2013, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss, sustaining Sections 10(b) and 20(a) claims against the current and former officers.

Policemen's Annuity Litigation

On April 11, 2012, the Policemen's Annuity & Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago, on its own behalf and on behalf of a proposed class of purchasers of 41 RMBS trusts collateralized mostly by Washington Mutual-originated (WaMu) mortgages, filed a proposed class action complaint against BANA and other unrelated parties in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, entitled Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association. BANA and U.S. Bank are named as defendants in their capacities as trustees, with BANA (formerly LaSalle Bank National Association) having served as the original trustee and U.S. Bank having replaced BANA as trustee. Plaintiff asserted claims under the federal Trust Indenture Act as well as state common law claims. Plaintiff alleged that, in light of the performance of the RMBS at issue, and in the wake of publicly-available information about the quality of loans originated by WaMu, the trustees were required to take certain steps to protect plaintiff's interest in the value of the securities, and that plaintiff was damaged by defendants' failures to notify it of deficiencies in the loans and of defaults under the relevant agreements, to ensure that the underlying mortgages could properly be foreclosed, and to enforce remedies available for loans that contained breaches of representations and warranties. Plaintiff sought unspecified compensatory damages and/or equitable relief, and costs and expenses. The court dismissed some of the common law claims, but allowed the Trust Indenture Act claim and a claim for breach of contract to proceed. After the filing of two amended complaints and the consolidation of the case with a related matter filed on August 23, 2013, entitled Vermont Pension Investment Committee and the Washington State Investment Board v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association, 10 named plaintiffs filed a third amended complaint on October 31, 2013, on behalf of two proposed classes of purchasers of 35 trusts collateralized mostly by WaMu-originated mortgages (later reduced to 34 trusts).

On June 5, 2014, the parties informed the court that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle the case for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to approval of plaintiffs' boards. The settlement remains subject to final court approval and various conditions. On November 10, 2014, the court preliminarily approved the proposed settlement, and scheduled a final approval hearing for March 12, 2015.

Takefuji Litigation

In April 2010, Takefuji Corporation (Takefuji) filed a claim against Merrill Lynch International and Merrill Lynch Japan Securities (MUS) in Tokyo District Court. The claim concerns Takefuji's purchase in 2007 of credit-linked notes structured and sold by defendants that resulted in a loss to Takefuji of approximately JPY29.0 billion (approximately \$270 million) following an event of default. Takefuji alleges that defendants failed to meet certain disclosure obligations concerning the notes.

On July 19, 2013, the Tokyo District Court issued a judgment in defendants' favor, a decision that Takefuji subsequently appealed to the Tokyo High Court. On August 27, 2014, the Tokyo High Court vacated the decision of the District Court and issued a judgment awarding Takefuji JPY14.5 billion (approximately \$135 million) in damages, plus interest at a rate of five percent from March 18, 2008. On September 10, 2014, defendants filed an appeal with the Japanese Supreme Court.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable: BAC North America Holding Company

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

. Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☒ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest: Edmunds Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

101 N. Tryon St.

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party:

Charlotte, NC 28285

917-232-2988

646-822-5978

., michelle.militello@baml.com
<mailto:michelle.militello@baml.com>

C. Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

Michelle Militello

D. Name of contact person:

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one):

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan to Applicant made by the L P. The project is a 56 unit multi-income development located at 6100-14 S. Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st, 6104-47 S. Wabash, and 48-58 E 57th in Chicago, IL.

Dept. of Planning and Development

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS?

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please • complete the following: n/a

Specification #

and Contract #

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS A. NATURE OF THE

DISCLOSING PARTY

1. indicate the nature of the Disclosing Party:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Person | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability company |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly registered business corporation | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability partnership |
| Privately held business corporation | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint venture. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sole proprietorship | <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit corporation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General partnership | (Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Limited partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trust | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |

2. For legal entities; the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable:

3.. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business: iii the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE:, For not-for-

profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members" For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title Please see attached list of executive officers and directors

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

| estate or other similar entity | City of | Percentage Interest in the |
|----------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Municipal Code or Charter | City of | Disclosing Party |
| from any applicant which, unless | full | |

See Attached, CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

See Attached, . .

relationship(s) - , <:

HU- " OTHER RETAINED PARTIES
SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER R
ACTION IV -DISCLOSURE 01- SL
subcontractor, attorney

another includes imdutAm* mis Secuon, ,,,<<. . , ,Hosi,,,, Panv ,, ^J^CS- . - - - ~ U the DisJomu. CUy wbelh^ uslll Disclosing Pnvty must cuhe -

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor,attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not ah acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|---|---|
|--|------------------|---|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[*] Check here if the Disclosing'Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V-- CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No O'N.o person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party.see Attached.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS ^{^ee} Attached Additional Information, including Litigation and Regulatory Matters.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article 1 ("Article I")(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B. 1. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

I certify the above to be true.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to, all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly: controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family

members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;

- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years before the: date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted, or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
- c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
- d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

I certify the above to be true.

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating. ■

I certify the above to be true.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

I certify the above to be true.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-5.5. (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

I certify the above to be true.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B. (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below: I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, Of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

☐ is. ☐ (*) is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become, a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code: We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City." The Disclosing Party makes the above pledge.

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b)

of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same meanings When used in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ J Yes ☐ H No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1...proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☒ J Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding, records of investments or profits from: slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records;

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

I can make the verification (#1)

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A; CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A.1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.1. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5; If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in-writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have-on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable

federal regulations? (Sec 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

[J]Yes [J]No

2.- Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

[J]Yes []No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

[J]Yes [J]No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

SECTION VII - ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications', disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become: part of any .contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, .whether procurement, City assistance, or other City' action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B. The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing - Ordinances JChapjters 2-1S6.,and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-966(1. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable Ordinances. I acknowledge and consent to the above.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is-subnmitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to^allow' the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions-with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include, incarceration: and an award to the City of treble damages.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the;information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing'this EDS, the.Disclosing Party waives and. releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release .pf information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the: City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The. information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplenient this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 ofthe Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

I acknowledge and consent to the above.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. I certify the above to be true.

F.2. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. I certify the above to be true.

F.3. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contractors or subcontractors who have not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications. I certify the above to be true.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F. 1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

BAC North America Holding Company
(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

By: **fl. 44/-**

(Sign here) ^ Phillip A. Wertz
(Print or type name of person signing)

Associate General Counsel & Senior Vice President (Print or type title of person signing)

OFFICIAL SEAL" DAVID R. HILL NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF ILLINOIS MY COMMISSION EXPIRE 8/1/2010

Signed and sworn to before me on (date) _____ at _____ County,
Illinois.

' CUT ; ■

" 7 ij 'fy.'Mj' Aj i^k-'^-- Notary Public.

■ j V)\ U- l?
Commission expires _____ J_ •_ .

Page 12 of 13

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT APPENDIX A

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party Or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section ILB.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

Page 13 of 13

GITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant,

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010; is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address: of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**BAC NORTH AMERICA HOLDING COMPANY ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS RESPONSE TO SECTION II.B.I

BAC North America Holding Company

3/24/2015

Board of Directors

Greener, Geoffrey Laughlin, Terence P. Moynihan, Brian T. Thompson, Bruce R.

Officers

Moynihan, Brian T. Laughlin, Terrence P. Cotty, Neil A. Thompson, Bruce R. Greener, Geoffrey Jeffries, Ross E. Litsey, Jana J. Bowman, Charles F. Dominick, Paula Ann Jones, Angela C. McAvoy, Sarah L. F. McNairy, William L. Mogensen, Lauren Sak, Pamela Templeton, William W. Thayu, Radhi Weber, Bradley H. Wertz, Phillip A. Hackworth, Gregory R. Gilliam, Allison L. Johnson, Colleen O. Tai, Nina

Chairman of the Board. President. Chief Executive Officer President. Strategic Initiatives Chief Accounting Officer Chief Financial

Officer Chief Risk Officer

Managing Director, Secretary, Deputy General Counsel Deputy General Counsel Senior Vice President Senior Vice President
Senior Vice President Senior Vice President Senior Vice President-Tax Senior Vice President

Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel Senior Vice
President, Assistant General Counsel Senior Vice President

Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel

Treasurer

Assistant Secretary

Assistant Secretary

Assistant Secretary

**BAC NORTH AMERICA HOLDING COMPANY ECONOMIC
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SECTION III --Business Relationships with City Elected Officials

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of Bank of America Corporation ("BAC"). BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities. Attached to this Addendum is a copy of the Litigation and Regulatory Matters from a recent Report.

BAC and, or, its affiliates, have engaged the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the past, which engagement may continue to the date of this Statement, and BAC and, or, its affiliates, may engage the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the future. Alderman Edward M. Burke Principal of Klafter & Burke.

SECTION V. - Certifications

SECTION V(A) Court-Ordered Child Support Compliance

As a public corporation, BAC does not have any "substantial" owners as defined by the provision. No individual or group of individuals owns 10% or more of BAC. In addition, the Disclosing Party complies with all child support orders it receives.

B. Further Clarifications

1. Disclosing Party is not the Applicant.

Neither BAC nor its Executive Officers and Director identified within this EDS is subject to any order, judgment or decree by any court or government authority in which it is barred, suspended or otherwise limited from engaging in any type of business practice.

SECTION V(B)(2) b, c and e: SECTION V(B)(2)

b, c and e:

BAC makes all required disclosures in its Form 10-k as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and its Annual Report as posted on its website. In addition, BAC's registered broker-dealer and investment adviser subsidiaries make all required disclosures on their Form BDs and filed with FINRA and their Form ADVs as filed with the SEC. These filings include disclosures of investigations and litigation as required by the securities regulatory organizations and federal law, and are publicly available. BAC cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other non-public investigation conducted by any governmental agency unless required to do so by law.

Please let us know if any additional information is needed.

SECTION V(B)(2)d

The Disclosing Party performed due diligence within the Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC to determine whether any Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC employees were aware of any public finance transactions (federal, state or local) having been terminated for cause or default within the last five years, and none of such employees were aware of any such transactions.

SECTION V(B)(3)a, b, c and d

Please note that our responses are on behalf of the Disclosing Party only and not on behalf of any contractors or retained parties disclosed in SECTION IV.

a, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. Additionally, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(4) below.

SECTION V(4): Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. SECTION V(B)(6)

BAC and its affiliates maintain strict policies and procedures to ensure compliance with applicable, local, state and federal law and regulations, including Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code. To the best of the individual signing this EDS, BAC and its affiliates are currently in compliance, and have policies and procedures in place to ensure continued compliance.

SECTION V(B)(7) AND (8)

Please see responses to SECTION VII(C).

SECTION V(E) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

The Disclosing Party verifies that a) the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities for records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies, and (b) the Disclosing Party has found no records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies and no records of any slave or slaveholders.

SECTION VII - Acknowledgments, Contract Incorporation, Compliance, Penalties, Disclosure

SECTION VII(B) and (C). Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

F.1.

Representatives and agents of BAC or its affiliates meet with representatives of the City on a monthly or other regular basis to identify outstanding amounts duly payable by BAC or its affiliates to the City and settle them accordingly.

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED OFFICIAL AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing

Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the

Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

Litigation and Regulatory Matters Document Follows This Page

Litigation and Regulatory Matters

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are routinely defendants in or parties to many pending and threatened legal actions and proceedings, including actions brought on behalf of various classes of claimants. These actions and proceedings are generally based on alleged violations of consumer protection, securities, environmental, banking, employment, contract and other laws. In some of these actions and proceedings, claims for substantial monetary damages are asserted against the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are also subject to regulatory and governmental examinations, information gathering requests, inquiries, investigations, and threatened legal actions and proceedings. For example, certain subsidiaries of the Corporation are registered broker-dealers or investment advisors and are subject to regulation by the SEC, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the European Commission, the PRA, the FCA and other international, federal and state securities regulators. In connection with formal and informal inquiries, the Corporation and its subsidiaries receive numerous requests, subpoenas and orders for documents, testimony and information in connection with various aspects of the Corporation's regulated activities.

In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such litigation, regulatory and governmental matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages or where the matters present novel legal theories or involve a large number of parties, the Corporation generally cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the pending matters will be, what the timing of the ultimate resolution of these matters will be, or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be.

In accordance with applicable accounting guidance, the Corporation establishes an accrued liability for litigation, regulatory and governmental matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and estimable. In such cases, there may be an exposure to loss in excess of any amounts accrued. As a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter develops, the Corporation, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, evaluates on an ongoing basis whether such matter presents a loss contingency that is probable and estimable. When a loss contingency is not both probable and estimable, the Corporation does not establish an accrued liability. If, at the time of evaluation, the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is not both probable and estimable, the matter will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and estimable. Once the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is deemed to be both probable and estimable, the Corporation will establish an accrued liability with respect to such loss contingency and record a corresponding amount of litigation-related expense. The Corporation continues to monitor the matter for further developments that could affect the amount of the accrued liability that has been previously established. Excluding expenses of internal or external legal service providers, litigation-related expense of \$16.4 billion was recognized for 2014 compared to \$6.1 billion for 2013.

For a limited number of the matters disclosed in this Note for which a loss, whether in excess of a related accrued liability or where there is no accrued liability, is reasonably possible in future periods, the Corporation is able to estimate a range of possible loss. In determining whether it is possible to estimate a range of possible loss, the Corporation reviews and evaluates its material litigation, regulatory and governmental matters on an ongoing basis, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, in light of potentially relevant factual and legal developments. These may include information learned through the discovery process, rulings on dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and other rulings by courts, arbitrators or others. In cases in which the Corporation possesses sufficient appropriate information to estimate a range of possible loss, that estimate is aggregated and disclosed below. There may be other disclosed matters for which a loss is probable or reasonably possible but such an estimate of the range of possible loss may not be possible. For those matters where an estimate of the range of possible loss is possible, management currently estimates the aggregate range of possible loss is \$0 to \$2.7 billion in excess of the accrued liability (if any) related to those matters. This estimated range of possible loss is based upon currently available information and is subject to significant judgment and a variety of assumptions, and known and unknown uncertainties. The matters underlying the estimated range will change from time to time, and actual results may vary significantly from the current estimate. Those matters for which an estimate is not possible are not included within this estimated range. Therefore, this estimated range of possible loss represents what the Corporation believes to be an estimate of possible loss only for certain matters meeting these criteria. It does not represent the Corporation's maximum loss exposure.

Information is provided below regarding the nature of all of these contingencies and, where specified, the amount of the claim associated with these loss contingencies. Based on current knowledge, management does not believe that loss contingencies arising from pending matters, including the matters described herein, will have a material adverse effect on the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Corporation. However, in light of the inherent uncertainties involved in these matters, some of which are beyond the Corporation's control, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some of these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to the Corporation's results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period.

Bond Insurance Litigation Ambac Countrywide Litigation

The Corporation, Countrywide and other Countrywide entities are named as defendants in an action filed on September 29, 2010 and as amended on May 28, 2013, by Ambac Assurance Corporation and the Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation (together, Ambac), entitled Ambac Assurance Corporation and The Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. This action, currently pending in New York Supreme Court, New York County, relates to bond insurance policies provided by Ambac on certain securitized pools of second-lien (and in one pool, first-lien) HELOCs, first-lien subprime home equity loans and fixed-rate second-lien mortgage loans. Plaintiffs allege that they have paid claims as a result of defaults in the underlying loans and assert that the Countrywide defendants misrepresented the characteristics of the underlying loans and breached certain contractual representations and warranties regarding the underwriting and servicing of the loans. Plaintiffs also allege that the Corporation is liable based on successor liability theories. Damages claimed by Ambac are in excess of \$2.2 billion and include the amount of payments for current and future claims it has paid or claims it will be obligated to pay under the policies, increasing over time as it pays claims under relevant policies, plus unspecified punitive damages.

On December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a second complaint in the same court against the same defendants, claiming fraudulent inducement against Countrywide and successor and vicarious liability against the Corporation relating to eight partially Ambac-insured RMBS transactions that closed between 2005 and 2007, all backed by negative amortization pay option adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) loans that were originated in whole or in part by Countrywide. Seven of the eight securitizations were issued and underwritten by non-parties to the litigation. Ambac claims damages in excess of \$600 million consisting of all alleged past and future claims against its policies, plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Also on December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a third action in Wisconsin Circuit Court, Dane County, against Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., claiming that it was fraudulently induced to insure portions of five securitizations issued and underwritten in 2005 by a non-party that included Countrywide originated first-lien negative amortization pay option ARM loans. The complaint claims damages in excess of \$350 million for all alleged past and future Ambac insured claims payment obligations plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Ambac First Franklin Litigation

On April 16, 2012, Ambac sued First Franklin Financial Corp., BANA, MLPF&S, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc. (MLML), and Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. Plaintiffs' claims relate to guaranty insurance Ambac provided on a First Franklin securitization (Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2007-FFC). The securitization was sponsored by MLML, and certain certificates in the securitization were insured by Ambac. The complaint alleges that defendants breached representations and warranties concerning the origination of the underlying mortgage loans and asserts claims for fraudulent inducement, breach of contract and indemnification. Plaintiffs also assert breach of contract claims against BANA based upon its servicing of the loans in the securitization. The complaint alleges that Ambac has

paid hundreds of millions of dollars in claims and has accrued and continues to accrue tens of millions of dollars in additional claims, and Ambac seeks as damages the total claims it has paid and its projected claims payment obligations, as well as specific performance of defendants' contractual repurchase obligations.

Bank of America 2014 216

On July 19, 2013, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's contract and fraud causes of action but granted dismissal of Ambac's indemnification cause of action. In addition, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's claims for attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

European Commission - Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Investigation On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (Commission) announced that it had addressed a Statement of Objections (SO) to the Corporation, BANA and Banc of America Securities LLC (together, the Bank of America Entities), a number of other financial institutions, Markit Group Limited, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (together, the Parties). The SO sets forth the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the Parties infringed European Union competition law by participating in alleged collusion to prevent exchange trading of CDS and futures. According to the SO, the conduct of the Bank of America Entities took place between August 2007 and April 2009. As part of the Commission's procedures, the Parties have reviewed the evidence in the investigative file, responded to the Commission's preliminary conclusions and attended a hearing before the Commission. If the Commission is satisfied that its preliminary conclusions are proved, the Commission has stated that it intends to impose a fine and require appropriate remedial measures.

Fontainebleau Las Vegas Litigation

On June 9, 2009, Avenue CLO Fund Ltd., et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., Merrill Lynch Capital Corporation, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada by certain Fontainebleau Las Vegas, LLC (FBLV) project lenders. Plaintiffs alleged that, among other things, BANA breached its duties as disbursement agent under the agreement governing the disbursement of loaned funds to FBLV, then a Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages of more than \$700 million, plus interest. This action was subsequently transferred by the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

On March 19, 2012, the district court granted BANA's motion for summary judgment on all causes of action against it in its capacity as disbursement agent and denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on those claims. On July 26, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's dismissal of the disbursement agent claims against BANA, holding that there were factual disputes that could not be resolved on a summary judgment motion, and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

Dismissal of the other claims was affirmed on a separate appeal. On December 13, 2013, the JPML remanded the action to the District of Nevada for trial.

The parties have settled the action for \$300 million, an amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiffs have stipulated to the voluntary dismissal of their remaining claims with prejudice.

In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation

Beginning in January 2009, the Corporation, as well as certain current and former officers and directors, among others, were named as defendants in a variety of actions filed in state and federal courts. The actions generally concern alleged material misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to certain securities filings by the Corporation. The securities filings contained information with respect to events that took place from September 2008 through January 2009 contemporaneous with the Corporation's acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (Merrill Lynch). Certain federal court actions were consolidated and/or coordinated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (the District Court) under the caption in re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation.

Plaintiffs in the consolidated securities class action (the Consolidated Securities Class Action) asserted claims under Sections 14(a), 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and asserted damages based on the drop in the stock price upon subsequent disclosures. On April 5, 2013, the District Court granted final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On November 5, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On February 3, 2015, the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court elapsed without any objector filing a petition.

Certain shareholders opted to pursue their claims apart from the Consolidated Securities Class Action. Following settlements in an aggregate amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2013, the District Court dismissed the claims of these plaintiffs with prejudice.

In addition, on January 11, 2013, the District Court approved the settlement of claims filed by plaintiffs in a derivative action in the Consolidated Securities Class Action, which also resolved a consolidated derivative action filed in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

In addition, the District Court dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiffs in the ERISA actions in the Consolidated Securities Class Action on August 27, 2010, and the parties stipulated to the withdrawal of the appeal of that decision on January 14, 2013.

Interchange and Related Litigation

In 2005, a group of merchants filed a series of putative class actions and individual actions directed at interchange fees associated with Visa and MasterCard payment card transactions. These actions, which were consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York under the caption In Re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount, Anti-Trust Litigation (Interchange), named Visa, MasterCard and several banks and bank holding companies (BHCs), including the Corporation, as defendants. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix the level of default interchange rates and that certain rules of Visa and MasterCard related to merchant acceptance of payment cards at the point of sale were unreasonable restraints of trade. Plaintiffs sought unspecified damages and injunctive relief.

217 Bank of America 2014

On October 19, 2012, defendants settled the matter. The settlement provides for, among other things, (i) payments by defendants to the class and individual plaintiffs totaling approximately \$6.6 billion, allocated proportionately to each defendant based upon various loss-sharing agreements; (ii) distribution to class merchants of an amount equal to 10 bps of default interchange across all Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions for a period of eight consecutive months, to begin by July 29, 2013, which otherwise would have been paid to issuers and which effectively reduces credit interchange for that period of time; and (iii) modifications to certain Visa and MasterCard rules regarding merchant point of sale practices.

The court granted final approval of the class settlement agreement on December 13, 2013. Several class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In addition, a number of class members opted out of the settlement of their past damages claims. The cash portion of the settlement was adjusted downward as a result of these opt outs.

The Corporation is named in three of the opt-out suits, including one brought by cardholders, and, as a result of various sharing agreements from the main Interchange litigation, the Corporation remains liable for any settlement or judgment in opt-out suits where it is not named as a defendant. All but one of the opt-out suits filed to date have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. On July 18, 2014, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss opt-out complaints filed by merchants, and on November 26, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the Sherman Act claim in the cardholder complaint.

LIBOR, Other Reference Rate and Foreign Exchange (FX) Inquiries and Litigation

The Corporation has received subpoenas and information requests from government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region, including the DoJ, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the FCA, concerning submissions made by panel banks in connection with the setting of LIBOR and other reference rates. The Corporation is cooperating with these inquiries.

In addition, the Corporation and BANA have been named as defendants along with most of the other LIBOR panel banks in a series of individual and class actions in various U.S. federal and state courts relating to defendants' LIBOR contributions. All cases naming the Corporation have been or are in the process of being consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the JPML. The Corporation expects that any future cases naming it will similarly be consolidated for pre-trial purposes. Plaintiffs allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of collusion or manipulation by defendants regarding the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Plaintiffs assert a variety of claims, including antitrust and Racketeer Influenced

and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), common law fraud, and breach of contract claims, and seek compensatory, treble and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

In a series of rulings, the court dismissed antitrust, RICO and certain state law claims, while permitting the Commodity Exchange Act and other state law claims to proceed. As a result of a procedural ruling by the Supreme Court, plaintiffs are pursuing an immediate appeal of the dismissal of their antitrust claims. Further, based on the statute of limitations, the court has substantially limited the time period for which manipulation claims under the Commodity Exchange Act may be pursued. As to the Corporation and BANA, the court has also dismissed manipulation claims based on alleged trader conduct, and certain common law claims by plaintiffs who alleged no direct dealings with the Corporation or BANA. Other claims against the Corporation and BANA remain pending, however, and the court is continuing to consider motions regarding them, including the applicability of its prior rulings to subsequently filed actions.

Certain regulatory and government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region are conducting investigations and making inquiries of a significant number of FX market participants, including the Corporation, regarding FX market participants' conduct and systems and controls over multiple years. The Corporation is cooperating with these investigations and inquiries, some of which are likely to lead to regulatory or legal proceedings and expose the Corporation to material penalties, fines or losses, and could adversely affect its reputation.

In particular, in November 2014, the Corporation resolved a matter with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) by agreeing to the imposition of mandatory remedial measures and payment of \$250 million in civil penalties associated with the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls.

The Corporation is in separate advanced discussions to resolve the regulatory matters of concern to another U.S. banking regulator involving the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls. There can be no assurances that these discussions will lead to a resolution, or of the amount or timing of any such resolution.

In addition, in a consolidated amended complaint filed on March 31, 2014, the Corporation and BANA were named as defendants along with other FX market participants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of plaintiffs and a putative class who allegedly transacted in FX and are domiciled in the U.S. or transacted in FX in the U.S. (the U.S. Action). On April 30, 2014, a substantively similar class action was filed against the Corporation and other FX market participants on behalf of a plaintiff and putative class allegedly located in Norway (the Foreign Action). The complaints allege that class members transacted with defendants at or around the time of the fixing of the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates or entered into transactions that settled in whole or in part based on the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates and that they sustained losses as a result of the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates. Plaintiffs in the U.S. Action assert a single claim for violations of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, and plaintiff in the Foreign Action asserts claims for violations of the Sherman Act, as well as certain claims under New York statutory and common law. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and treble damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

On January 28, 2015, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the U.S. Action, finding that plaintiffs had sufficiently pleaded the elements of an antitrust claim. In the same decision, the court granted with prejudice defendants' motion to dismiss the Foreign Action, finding that the Sherman Act does not apply extraterritorially, except in limited circumstances not present in the case, and that plaintiff had failed to plead an actionable state law claim.

Bank of America 2014 218

Montgomery

The Corporation, several current and former officers and directors, Banc of America Securities LLC (BAS), MLPF&S and other unaffiliated underwriters have been named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Montgomery v. Bank of America, et al.* Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on January 14, 2011. Plaintiff seeks to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired certain series of preferred stock offered by the Corporation pursuant to a shelf registration statement dated May 5, 2006. Plaintiff's claims arise from three offerings dated January 24, 2008, January 28, 2008 and May 20, 2008, from which the Corporation allegedly received proceeds of \$15.8 billion. The amended complaint asserts claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleges that the prospectus supplements associated with the offerings: (i) failed to disclose that the Corporation's loans, leases, CDOs and commercial MBS were impaired to a greater extent than disclosed; (ii) misrepresented the extent of the impaired assets by failing to establish adequate reserves or properly record losses for its impaired assets; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of the Corporation's internal controls in light of the alleged impairment of its assets; (iv) misrepresented the Corporation's capital base and Tier 1 leverage ratio for risk-based capital in light of the allegedly impaired assets; and (v) misrepresented the thoroughness and adequacy of the Corporation's due diligence in connection with its acquisition of Countrywide. The amended complaint seeks rescission, compensatory and other damages. On March 16, 2012, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. On December 3, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion to file a second amended complaint. On February 6, 2014, plaintiffs appealed the denial of their motion to amend to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mortgage-backed Securities Litigation

The Corporation and its affiliates, Countrywide entities and their affiliates, and Merrill Lynch entities and their affiliates have been named as defendants in a number of cases relating to their various roles as issuer, originator, seller, depositor, sponsor, underwriter and/or controlling entity in MBS offerings, pursuant to which the MBS investors were entitled to a portion of the cash flow from the underlying pools of mortgages. These cases generally include purported class action suits and actions by individual MBS purchasers. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the registration statements, prospectuses and prospectus supplements for securities issued by securitization trusts contained material misrepresentations and omissions, in violation of the Securities Act of 1933 and/or state securities laws and other state statutory and common laws.

These cases generally involve allegations of false and misleading statements regarding: (i) the process by which the properties that served as collateral for the mortgage loans underlying the MBS were appraised; (ii) the percentage of equity that mortgage borrowers had in their homes; (iii) the borrowers' ability to repay their mortgage loans; (iv) the underwriting practices by which those mortgage loans were originated; (v) the ratings given to the different tranches of MBS by rating agencies; and (vi) the validity of each issuing trust's title to the mortgage loans comprising the pool for that securitization (collectively, MBS Claims). Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek unspecified compensatory damages, unspecified costs and legal fees and, in some instances, seek rescission.

The Corporation, Countrywide, Merrill Lynch and/or their affiliates may have claims for and/or may be subject to claims for contractual indemnification in connection with their various roles in regard to MBS.

On August 15, 2011, the JPML ordered multiple federal court cases involving Countrywide MBS consolidated for pretrial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in a multi-district litigation entitled *In re Countrywide Financial Corp. Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation* (the Countrywide RMBS MDL).

Federal Home Loan Bank Litigation

On March 15, 2010, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB San Francisco) filed an action in California Superior Court, San Francisco County, entitled *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, et al.* FHLB San Francisco's complaint asserts certain MBS Claims against BAS, Countrywide and several related entities in connection with its alleged purchase of 51 MBS offerings and one private placement issued and/or underwritten by those defendants between 2004 and 2007 and seeks rescission and unspecified damages. FHLB San Francisco dismissed the federal claims with prejudice on August 11, 2011. On September 8, 2011, the court denied defendants' motions to dismiss the state law claims. On December 20, 2013, FHLB San Francisco voluntarily dismissed its negligent misrepresentation claims with prejudice. On October 15, 2014, the court denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to two Countrywide trusts that were to be part of a bellwether trial.

The parties have settled the action and other related actions for \$420 million, as well as with respect to certain claims, additional consideration; all amounts were fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, FHLB San Francisco has voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims with prejudice.

Luther Class Action Litigation and Related Actions Beginning in 2007, a number of pension funds and other investors filed putative class action lawsuits alleging certain MBS Claims against Countrywide, several of its affiliates, MLPF&S, the Corporation, NB Holdings Corporation and certain other defendants. Those class action lawsuits concerned a total of 429 MBS offerings involving over \$350 billion in securities issued by subsidiaries of Countrywide between 2005 and 2007. The actions, entitled *Luther v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Maine State Retirement System v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust Fund v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, and *Putnam Bank v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, were all assigned to the Countrywide RMBS MDL court. On December 6, 2013, the court granted final approval to a settlement of these actions in the amount of \$500 million. Beginning on January 14, 2014, a number of class

members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Prudential Insurance Litigation

On March 14, 2013, The Prudential Insurance Company of America and certain of its affiliates (collectively Prudential) filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in a case entitled *Prudential Insurance Company of America, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Prudential has named the Corporation, Merrill

21V Bank of America 2014

Lynch and a number of related entities as defendants. Prudential asserts certain MBS Claims pertaining to 54 MBS offerings from which Prudential alleges that it purchased securities between 2004 and 2007. Prudential seeks, among other relief, compensatory damages, rescission or a rescissory measure of damages, punitive damages and other unspecified relief. On April 17, 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint. Prudential thereafter split its claims into two separate complaints, filing an amended complaint in the original action and a complaint in a separate action entitled *Prudential Portfolios 2, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Both cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. On February 5, 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss those complaints, granting plaintiff leave to replead in certain respects.

Mortgage Repurchase Litigation U.S. Bank Litigation

On August 29, 2011, U.S. Bank, National Association (U.S. Bank), as trustee for the HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-10 (the Trust), a mortgage pool backed by loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (CHL), filed a complaint in New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a case entitled *U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2005-10 v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (dba Bank of America Home Loans), Bank of America Corporation, Countrywide Financial Corporation, Bank of America, N.A. and NB Holdings Corporation*. U.S. Bank asserts that, as a result of alleged misrepresentations by CHL in connection with its sale of the loans, defendants must repurchase all the loans in the pool, or in the alternative that it must repurchase a subset of those loans as to which U.S. Bank alleges that defendants have refused specific repurchase demands. U.S. Bank asserts claims for breach of contract and seeks specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase the entire pool of loans (alleged to have an original aggregate principal balance of \$1.75 billion) or alternatively the aforementioned subset (alleged to have an aggregate principal balance of "over \$100 million"), together with reimbursement of costs and expenses and other unspecified relief. On May 29, 2013, the New York Supreme Court dismissed U.S. Bank's claim for repurchase of all the mortgage loans in the Trust. The court granted U.S. Bank leave to amend this claim. On June 18, 2013, U.S. Bank filed its second amended complaint seeking to replead its claim for repurchase of all loans in the Trust. On February 13, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the repleaded claim seeking repurchase of all mortgage loans in the Trust; plaintiff has appealed that order.

On November 13, 2014, the court granted U.S. Bank's motion for leave to amend the complaint; defendants have appealed that order. The amended complaint alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' failure to repurchase loans that were the subject of specific repurchase demands and also alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' discovery, during origination and servicing, of loans with material breaches of representations and warranties.

U.S. Bank Summonses with Notice

On August 29, 2014, U.S. Bank, solely in its capacity as Trustee for seven securitization trusts (the Trusts), served seven summonses with notice commencing potential actions against First Franklin Financial Corporation, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc., Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., and Onit Mortgage Solutions Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. The summonses indicate that defendants may be subject to breach of contract claims alleging that they breached representations and warranties related to loans securitized in the Trusts. The summonses allege that defendants failed to repurchase breaching mortgage loans from the Trusts. The summonses seek specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase breaching loans, declaratory judgment, compensatory, rescissory and other damages, and indemnity. On February 5, 2015, defendants demanded complaints on three of the Trusts. Defendants currently have until March 3, 2015 to demand the complaint with respect to one of the remaining Trusts, and until July 15, 2015 to demand complaints on the final three Trusts.

Ocala Investor Litigation

On November 25, 2009, BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation (BNP) and Deutsche Bank AG each filed claims (the 2009 Actions) against BANA in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation v. Bank of America, N.A. and Deutsche Bank AG v. Bank of America, N.A.* Plaintiffs allege that BANA failed to properly perform its duties as indenture trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository for Ocala Funding, LLC (Ocala), a home mortgage warehousing facility, resulting in the loss of plaintiffs' investment in Ocala. Ocala was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Taylor, Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. (TBW), a home mortgage originator and servicer which is alleged to have committed fraud that led to its eventual bankruptcy. Ocala provided funding for TBW's mortgage origination activities by issuing notes, the proceeds of which were to be used by TBW to originate home mortgages. Such mortgages and other Ocala assets in turn were pledged to BANA, as collateral agent, to secure the notes. Plaintiffs lost most or all of their investment in Ocala when, as the result of the alleged fraud committed by TBW, Ocala was unable to repay the notes purchased by plaintiffs and there was insufficient collateral to satisfy Ocala's debt obligations. Plaintiffs allege that BANA breached its contractual, fiduciary and other duties to Ocala, thereby permitting TBW's alleged fraud to go undetected. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and other relief from BANA, including interest and attorneys' fees, in an unspecified amount, but which plaintiffs allege exceeds \$1.6 billion.

On March 23, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part BANA's motions to dismiss the 2009 Actions. Plaintiffs filed amended complaints on October 1, 2012 that included additional contractual, tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the court granted BANA's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims for failure to sue, negligence, negligent misrepresentation and equitable relief.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On February 19, 2015, BANA and BNP reached an agreement in principle to settle the 2009 actions for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to the execution of a final settlement agreement.

O'Donnell Litigation

On February 24, 2012, Edward O'Donnell filed a sealed qui tam complaint under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and the False Claims Act against the Corporation, individually, and as successor to Countrywide,

Bank of America 2014 220

CHL and a Countrywide business division known as Full Spectrum Lending. On October 24, 2012, the DoJ filed a complaint-in-intervention to join the matter, adding BANA, Countrywide and CHL as defendants. The action is entitled *United States of America, ex rel, Edward O'Donnell, appearing Qui Tam v. Bank of America Corp., et al.*, and was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint-in-intervention asserted certain fraud claims in connection with the sale of loans to FNMA and FHLMC by Full Spectrum Lending and by the Corporation and BANA. On January 11, 2013, the government filed an amended complaint which added Countrywide Bank, FSB (CFSB) and a former officer of the Corporation as defendants. The court dismissed False Claims Act counts on May 8, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the government filed a second amended complaint alleging claims under FIRREA concerning allegedly fraudulent loan sales to the GSEs between August 2007 and May 2008. On September 24, 2013, the government dismissed the Corporation as a defendant.

Following a trial, on October 23, 2013, a verdict of liability was returned against CHL, CFSB and BANA. On July 30, 2014, the court imposed a civil penalty of \$1.3 billion on BANA. On February 3, 2015, the court denied the Corporation's motions for judgment as a matter of law, or in the alternative, a new trial. The Corporation will appeal the verdict and judgment.

Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System The Corporation and several current and former officers were named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System v. Bank of America, et al.*

Following the filing of a complaint on February 2, 2011, plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 23, 2011 in which plaintiff sought to sue on behalf

of all persons who acquired the Corporation's common stock between February 27, 2009 and October 19, 2010 and "Common Equivalent Securities" sold in a December 2009 offering. The amended complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleged that the Corporation's public statements: (i) concealed problems in the Corporation's mortgage servicing business resulting from the widespread use of the Mortgage Electronic Recording System; (ii) failed to disclose the Corporation's exposure to mortgage repurchase claims; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of internal controls; and (iv) violated certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The amended complaint sought unspecified damages.

On July 11, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. All claims under the Securities Act were dismissed against all defendants, with prejudice. The motion to dismiss the claim against the Corporation under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act was denied. All claims under the Exchange Act against the officers were dismissed, with leave to replead. Defendants moved to dismiss a second amended complaint in which plaintiff sought to replead claims against certain current and former officers under Sections 10(b) and 20(a). On April 17, 2013, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss, sustaining Sections 10(b) and 20(a) claims against the current and former officers.

Policemen's Annuity Litigation

On April 11, 2012, the Policemen's Annuity & Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago, on its own behalf and on behalf of a proposed class of purchasers of 41 RMBS trusts collateralized mostly by Washington Mutual-originated (WaMu) mortgages, filed a proposed class action complaint against BANA and other unrelated parties in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, entitled Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association. BANA and U.S. Bank are named as defendants in their capacities as trustees, with BANA (formerly LaSalle Bank National Association) having served as the original trustee and U.S. Bank having replaced BANA as trustee. Plaintiff asserted claims under the federal Trust Indenture Act as well as state common law claims. Plaintiff alleged that, in light of the performance of the RMBS at issue, and in the wake of publicly-available information about the quality of loans originated by WaMu, the trustees were required to take certain steps to protect plaintiff's interest in the value of the securities, and that plaintiff was damaged by defendants' failures to notify it of deficiencies in the loans and of defaults under the relevant agreements, to ensure that the underlying mortgages could properly be foreclosed, and to enforce remedies available for loans that contained breaches of representations and warranties. Plaintiff sought unspecified compensatory damages and/or equitable relief, and costs and expenses. The court dismissed some of the common law claims, but allowed the Trust Indenture Act claim and a claim for breach of contract to proceed. After the filing of two amended complaints and the consolidation of the case with a related matter filed on August 23, 2013, entitled Vermont Pension Investment Committee and the Washington State Investment Board v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association, 10 named plaintiffs filed a third amended complaint on October 31, 2013, on behalf of two proposed classes of purchasers of 35 trusts collateralized mostly by WaMu-originated mortgages (later reduced to 34 trusts).

On June 5, 2014, the parties informed the court that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle the case for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to approval of plaintiffs' boards. The settlement remains subject to final court approval and various conditions. On November 10, 2014, the court preliminarily approved the proposed settlement, and scheduled a final approval hearing for March 12, 2015.

Takefuji Litigation

In April 2010, Takefuji Corporation (Takefuji) filed a claim against Merrill Lynch International and Merrill Lynch Japan Securities (MUS) in Tokyo District Court. The claim concerns Takefuji's purchase in 2007 of credit-linked notes structured and sold by defendants that resulted in a loss to Takefuji of approximately JPY29.0 billion (approximately \$270 million) following an event of default. Takefuji alleges that defendants failed to meet certain disclosure obligations concerning the notes.

On July 19, 2013, the Tokyo District Court issued a judgment in defendants' favor, a decision that Takefuji subsequently appealed to the Tokyo High Court. On August 27, 2014, the Tokyo High Court vacated the decision of the District Court and issued a judgment awarding Takefuji JPY14.5 billion (approximately \$135 million) in damages, plus interest at a rate of five percent from March 18, 2008. On September 10, 2014, defendants filed an appeal with the Japanese Supreme Court.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS. Include d/b/a/ if applicable:

NB Holdings Corporation

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether, the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☒ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the Applicant in which the Disclosing Party holds an interest: - st- Edmunds Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see Section II.B.1.) State the legal name of the entity in which the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

101 N. Tryon St.

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party: \

Charlotte, NC 28285

917-232-2988

646-822-5978 michelle.militello@baml.com <mailto:michelle.militello@baml.com>

C. Telephone:

Fax:

Email;

Michelle Militello

D. Name of contact person:

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one):- . . . _

F. Brief description of contract, transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property, if applicable):

Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan to Applicant made by the L.P. The project is a 56 unit multi-income development located at 6100-14 S Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st. 6104-47 S. Wabash, and 48-58 E. 57th in Chicago. IL.

. Dept. of Planning and Development

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this EDS?

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following: n/a

Specification # and Contract #

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

1. Indicate the nature of the Disclosing Party:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Person | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability company |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly registered business corporation | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited liability partnership |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately held business corporation | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint venture |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sole proprietorship | <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit corporation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General partnership | (Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Limited partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trust | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable:

Dpiawarp

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business, in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no"

members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities,, list-below the'legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, 1 imited -liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title Please see attached list of executive officers and directors.

2.. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% ofthe Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or .manager: in a limited liabilityxompany-or interest ofa beneficiary ofa trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None.,". NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154-030 of the , Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"),jthe. City may require 'any.-.such additionahinformation from any applicant which is reasonab ly ininded toO'achieve full disclosure. ■ '

| Name | Business Address | . Percentage Interest in the |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| Bank of "America Corporation | ' | ' " |
| ■ • 100% Direct'Owner ■ | | |
| 100 N. Tryon Street | | ik-; Y- |
| Charlotte;; NC 28255 " • | , | .. |

SECTION III -- BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS ;

• Hasithec'Disclosing.Party had a "business relationship," as defined inG^ Code, witivany City elected official in:the: 12 months before thedate this EDS is-signed? s?'-:..■

1^ . Yes : [:] No See Attached.

If yes, please identify belo\v. the namc(s). of such ^City- elected official(s.);andides'cribe such-

relationship(s): ' ^■.■.■ ■ ^-?v.:rjo .

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and/business address of each subcontractor, attorney, -, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated.) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|--|---|
|--|------------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[*] Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities,

SECTION V - CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the

Disclosing Party. see Attached.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a court-approved agreement for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS See Attached Additional Information, including Litigation and Regulatory Matters.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article 1. ('Article T')(which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing business")..and legal .requirements), if the Disclosing;Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is doing business with'the-Clty.,,then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft- fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2> The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity,- all of those persons; or entities identified in Section II.B.I. of this EDS:

- a. are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state law;
 - embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving, stolen property;
- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding; or in any criminal or civil action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit of local government.

I certify the above to be true. 3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;
- any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section TV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");
- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;
- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date, this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years; before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
 - b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or
 - c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or
 - d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).
I certify the above to be true.
4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.
I certify the above to be true.
5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce, or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the

Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

I certify the above to be true.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55 (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

I certify the above to be true.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below: I have a disclosure to make Please see additional information.

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above; it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee* or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than \$20 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☐ P9 is not

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code.

2. If the Disclosing Party IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become^ a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate of a predatory lender may result in the loss of the privilege of doing business with the City." The Disclosing Party makes the above pledge.

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32-455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the jettters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed, that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words of terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code have the same, meanings whefocused in this Part D.

1. In accordance with Section 2-156-110 of the Municipal Code: Does any official or employee ofthe City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

[JYes p] No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D. 1., proceed to Items D .2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.1., proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant ;to a process of competitive bidding; oKotberwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or ner;own name or in the name of "any other person or "entity in the purchase of any property thaf(i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at (he suit ofthe City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D,

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

[] Yes []No '

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee:

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with; these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

1. The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments or profits from slavery, or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records;

2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves or slaveholders described in those records:

I can make the verification (#1)

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A. I. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification, at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2. above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an Organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such subcontractors' certifications for "the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes," answer the three questions below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41 CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal

opportunity clause?

[J Yes ■

[J No -

Tf you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

SECTION VII-- ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that:

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and. are material ind^ the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter.' The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

B> The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at www.cityofchicago.gov/Ethics <<http://www.cityofchicago.gov/Ethics>>, and may also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances. I acknowledge and consent to the above.

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract or agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions with the City. Remedies at law for a false statement of material fact may include incarceration; and an award to the City of treble damages,.

D. It is the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all of the information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, or otherwise. By completing and signing this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims which it may have against the City in connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current, in the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter: If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must

update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 of the Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

I acknowledge and consent to the above. The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 11 of 13

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to, all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. I certify the above to be true.

F.2. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. I certify the above to be true.

F.3. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent of the City, use any such contract. If the Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications. I certify the above to be true.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Party cannot certify as to any of the items in F. 1., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this EDS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as of the date furnished to the City.

NE Holdings Corporation

(Print or type name of Disclosing Party)

By: (Signature) A. Uzt/____
(Sign here) <j

Phillip A. Wertz

(Print or type name of person signing)

Associate General Counsel & Senior Vice President (Print or type title of person signing)

' ' <'
at ^ AaVa^C^ -. County, t \D^ _-»(state).
i /#/'... ' / ^ -:-a •; /;
vA--' Notary Public. S DAVID R.HILL \ "offVciTTTeal

Commission e.\piros:_ \,,LIJ;'! ' C^s^~^wmES

**CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A**

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with any elected city official or department head. A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister or half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive, officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section ILB.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director, chief financial officer; treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof, currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, please identify, below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ JYes

☒ J No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ JYes

☒ JNo

☐ J Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) of (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS, AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**NB HOLDINGS CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS
MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS RESPONSE TO SECTION II.B.1

NB Holdings Corporation

3/24/2015

Board of Directors

Greener, Geoffrey Laughlin, Terence P. Moynihan, Brian T. Thompson, Bruce R.

Officers

Moynihan, Brian T. Laughlin, Terrence P. Cotty, Neil A. Thompson, Bruce R. Greener, Geoffrey Jeffries, Ross E. Litsey, Jana J. Billings,

Eric R.

Bowman, Charles F. Chang, Gale K.

Dominick, Paula Ann Fox, William J. Hille, Richard J. Jones, Angela C. McAvoy, Sarah L. F. McNairy, William L. Mogensen, Lauren Sak, Pamela Templeton, William W. Thayu, Radhi Weber, Bradley H Wertz, Phillip A. Hackworth, Gregory R. Gilliam, Allison L. Johnson, Colleen O. Tai, Nina

Chairman of the Board, President, Chief Executive Officer President, Strategic Initiatives Chief Accounting Officer Chief Financial Officer Chief Risk Officer

Managing Director, Secretary, Deputy General Counsel Deputy General Counsel

Senior Vice President, Assistant General Counsel, Assistant Secretary Senior Vice President

Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel, Assistant Secretary Senior Vice President Senior Vice President Senior Vice President

Senior Vice President Senior Vice President Senior Vice President-Tax Senior Vice President

Associate General Counsel Associate General Counsel Assistant General Counsel

Associate General Counsel

**NB HOLDINGS CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST.
EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SECTION III -Business Relationships with City Elected Officials

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of Bank of America Corporation ("BAC"). BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities. Attached to this Addendum is a copy of the Litigation and Regulatory Matters from a recent Report.

BAC and, or, its affiliates, have engaged the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the past, which engagement may continue to the date of this Statement, and BAC and, or, its affiliates, may engage the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the future. Alderman Edward M. Burke Principal of Klafter & Burke.

SECTION V. - Certifications

SECTION V(A) Court-Ordered Child Support Compliance

As a public corporation, BAC does not have any "substantial" owners as defined by the provision. No individual or group of individuals owns 10% or more of BAC. In addition, the Disclosing Party complies with all child support orders it receives.

B. Further Clarifications

1. Disclosing Party is not the Applicant. i

Neither BAC nor its Executive Officers and Director identified within this EDS is subject to any order, judgment or decree by any court or government authority in which it is barred, suspended or otherwise limited from engaging in any type of business practice.

SECTION V(B)(2) b, c and e:

BAC makes all required disclosures in its Form 10-k as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and its Annual Report as posted on its website. In addition, BAC's registered broker-dealer and investment adviser subsidiaries make all required disclosures on their Form BDs and filed with FINRA and their Form ADVs as filed with the SEC. These filings include disclosures of investigations and litigation as required by the securities regulatory organizations and federal law, and are publicly available BAC cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other non-public investigation conducted by any governmental agency unless required to do so by law

Please let us know if any additional information is needed. **SECTION V(B)(2)d**

The Disclosing Party performed due diligence within the Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC to determine whether any Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of BAC employees were aware of any public finance transactions (federal, state or local) having been terminated for cause or default within the last five years, and none of such employees were aware of any such transactions.

SECTION V(B)(3)a, b, c and d

Please note that our responses are on behalf of the Disclosing Party only and not on behalf of any contractors or retained parties disclosed in **SECTION IV**.

a, b and c - Please see response to **SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e** above. Additionally, b and c -Please see response to **SECTION V(4)** below.

SECTION V(4): Please see response to **SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e** above. **SECTION V(B)(6)**

BAC and its affiliates maintain strict policies and procedures to ensure compliance with applicable, local, state and federal law and regulations, including Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code. To the best of the individual signing this EDS, BAC and its affiliates are currently in compliance, and have policies and procedures in place to ensure continued compliance.

SECTION V(B)(7) AND (8)

Please see responses to **SECTION VII(C)**.

SECTION V(E) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

The Disclosing Party verifies that a) the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities for records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies, and (b) the Disclosing Party has found no records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies and no records of any slave or slaveholders.

SECTION VII - Acknowledgments, Contract Incorporation, Compliance, Penalties, Disclosure

SECTION VII(B) and (C). Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

F.1.

Representatives and agents of BAC or its affiliates meet with representatives of the City on a monthly or other regular basis to identify outstanding amounts duly payable by BAC or its affiliates to the City and settle them accordingly.

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED OFFICIAL AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Please note that the Disclosing Party is a subsidiary of BAC. BAC and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of BAC and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with BAC and its activities.

Litigation and Regulatory Matters Document Follows This Page

Litigation and Regulatory Matters

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are routinely defendants in or parties to many pending and threatened legal actions and proceedings, including actions brought on behalf of various classes of claimants. These actions and proceedings are generally based on alleged violations of consumer protection, securities, environmental, banking, employment, contract and other laws. In some of these actions and proceedings, claims for substantial monetary damages are asserted against the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are also subject to regulatory and governmental examinations, information gathering requests, inquiries, investigations, and threatened legal actions and proceedings. For example, certain subsidiaries of the Corporation are registered broker-dealers or investment advisors and are subject to regulation by the SEC, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the European Commission, the PRA, the FCA and other international, federal and state securities regulators. In connection with formal and informal inquiries, the Corporation and its subsidiaries receive numerous requests, subpoenas and orders for documents, testimony and information in connection with various aspects of the Corporation's regulated activities.

In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such litigation, regulatory and governmental matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages or where the matters present novel legal theories or involve a large number of parties, the Corporation generally cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the pending matters will be, what the timing of the ultimate resolution of these matters will be, or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be.

In accordance with applicable accounting guidance, the Corporation establishes an accrued liability for litigation, regulatory and governmental matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and estimable. In such cases, there may be an exposure to loss in excess of any amounts accrued. As a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter develops, the Corporation, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, evaluates on an ongoing basis whether such matter presents a loss contingency that is probable and estimable. When a loss contingency is not both probable and estimable, the Corporation does not establish an accrued liability. If, at the time of evaluation, the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is not both probable and estimable, the matter will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and estimable. Once the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is deemed to be both probable and estimable, the Corporation will establish an accrued liability with respect to such loss contingency and record a corresponding amount of litigation-related expense. The Corporation continues to monitor the matter for further developments that could affect the amount of the accrued liability that has been previously established. Excluding expenses of internal or external legal service providers, litigation-related expense of \$16.4 billion was recognized for 2014 compared to \$6.1 billion for 2013.

For a limited number of the matters disclosed in this Note for which a loss, whether in excess of a related accrued liability or where there is no accrued liability, is reasonably possible in future periods, the Corporation is able to estimate a range of possible loss. In determining whether it is possible to estimate a range of possible loss, the Corporation reviews and evaluates its material litigation, regulatory and governmental matters on an ongoing basis, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, in light of potentially relevant factual and legal developments. These may include information learned through the discovery process, rulings on dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and other rulings by courts, arbitrators or others. In cases in which the Corporation possesses sufficient appropriate information to estimate a range of possible loss, that estimate is aggregated and disclosed below. There may be other disclosed matters for which a loss is probable or reasonably possible but such an estimate of the range of possible loss may not be possible. For those matters where an estimate of the range of possible loss is possible, management currently estimates the aggregate range of possible loss is \$0 to \$2.7 billion in excess of the accrued liability (if any) related to those matters. This estimated range of possible loss is based upon currently available information and is subject to significant judgment and a variety of assumptions, and known and unknown uncertainties. The matters underlying the estimated range will change from time to time, and actual results may vary significantly from the current estimate. Those matters for which an estimate is not possible are not included within this estimated range. Therefore, this estimated range of possible loss represents what the Corporation believes to be an estimate of possible loss only for certain matters meeting these criteria. It does not represent the Corporation's maximum loss exposure.

Information is provided below regarding the nature of all of these contingencies and, where specified, the amount of the claim associated with these loss contingencies. Based on current knowledge, management does not believe that loss contingencies arising from pending matters, including the matters described herein, will have a material adverse effect on the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Corporation. However, in light of the inherent uncertainties involved in these matters, some of which are beyond the Corporation's control, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some of these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to the Corporation's results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period.

Bond Insurance Litigation Ambac Countrywide Litigation

The Corporation, Countrywide and other Countrywide entities are named as defendants in an action filed on September 29, 2010 and as amended on May 28, 2013, by Ambac Assurance Corporation and the Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation (together, Ambac), entitled Ambac Assurance Corporation and The Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. This action, currently pending in New York Supreme Court, New York County, relates to bond insurance policies provided by Ambac on certain securitized pools of second-lien (and in one pool, first-lien) HELOCs, first-lien subprime home equity loans and fixed-rate second-lien mortgage loans. Plaintiffs allege that they have paid claims as a result of defaults in the underlying loans and assert that the Countrywide defendants misrepresented the characteristics of the underlying loans and breached certain contractual representations and warranties regarding the underwriting and servicing of the loans. Plaintiffs also allege that the Corporation is liable based on successor liability theories. Damages claimed by Ambac are in excess of \$2.2 billion and include the amount of payments for current and future claims it has paid or claims it will be obligated to pay under the policies, increasing over time as it pays claims under relevant policies, plus unspecified punitive damages.

On December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a second complaint in the same court against the same defendants, claiming fraudulent inducement against Countrywide and successor and vicarious liability against the Corporation relating to eight partially Ambac-insured RMBS transactions that closed between 2005 and 2007, all backed by negative amortization pay option adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) loans that were originated in whole or in part by Countrywide. Seven of the eight securitizations were issued and underwritten by non-parties to the litigation. Ambac claims damages in excess of \$600 million consisting of all alleged past and future claims against its policies, plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Also on December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a third action in Wisconsin Circuit Court, Dane County, against Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., claiming that it was fraudulently induced to insure portions of five securitizations issued and underwritten in 2005 by a non-party that included Countrywide originated first-lien negative amortization pay option ARM loans. The complaint claims damages in excess of \$350 million for all alleged past and future Ambac insured claims payment obligations plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Ambac First Franklin Litigation

On April 16, 2012, Ambac sued First Franklin Financial Corp., BANA, MLPF&S, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc. (MLML), and Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. Plaintiffs' claims relate to guaranty insurance Ambac provided on a First Franklin securitization (Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2007-FFC). The securitization was sponsored by MLML, and certain certificates in the securitization were insured by Ambac. The complaint alleges that defendants breached representations and warranties concerning the origination of the underlying mortgage loans and asserts claims for fraudulent inducement, breach of contract and indemnification. Plaintiffs also assert breach of contract claims against BANA based upon its servicing of the loans in the securitization. The complaint alleges that Ambac has paid hundreds of millions of dollars in claims and has accrued and continues to accrue tens of millions of dollars in additional claims, and Ambac seeks as damages the total claims it has paid and its projected claims payment obligations, as well as specific performance of defendants' contractual repurchase obligations.

Bank of America 2014 216

On July 19, 2013, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's contract and fraud causes of action but granted dismissal of Ambac's indemnification cause of action. In addition, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's claims for attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

European Commission - Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Investigation On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (Commission) announced that it had addressed a Statement of Objections (SO) to the Corporation, BANA and Banc of America Securities LLC (together, the Bank of America Entities), a number of other financial institutions, Markit Group Limited, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (together, the Parties). The SO sets forth the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the Parties infringed European Union competition law by participating in alleged collusion to prevent exchange trading of CDS and futures. According to the SO, the conduct of the Bank of America Entities took place between August 2007 and April 2009. As part of the Commission's procedures, the Parties have reviewed the evidence in the investigative file, responded to the Commission's preliminary conclusions and attended a hearing before the Commission. If the Commission is satisfied that its preliminary conclusions are proved, the Commission has stated that it intends to impose a fine and require appropriate remedial measures.

Fontainebleau Las Vegas Litigation

On June 9, 2009, Avenue CLO Fund Ltd., et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., Merrill Lynch Capital Corporation, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada by certain Fontainebleau Las Vegas, LLC (FBLV) project lenders. Plaintiffs alleged that, among other things, BANA breached its duties as disbursement agent under the agreement governing the disbursement of loaned funds to FBLV, then a Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages of more than \$700 million, plus interest. This action was subsequently transferred by the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

On March 19, 2012, the district court granted BANA's motion for summary judgment on all causes of action against it in its capacity as disbursement agent and denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on those claims. On July 26, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's dismissal of the disbursement agent claims against BANA, holding that there were factual disputes that could not be resolved on a summary judgment motion, and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

Dismissal of the other claims was affirmed on a separate appeal. On December 13, 2013, the JPML remanded the action to the District of Nevada for trial.

The parties have settled the action for \$300 million, an amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiffs have stipulated to the voluntary dismissal of their remaining claims with prejudice.

In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation

Beginning in January 2009, the Corporation, as well as certain current and former officers and directors, among others, were named as defendants in a variety of actions filed in state and federal courts. The actions generally concern alleged material misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to certain securities filings by the Corporation. The securities filings contained information with respect to events that took place from September 2008 through January 2009 contemporaneous with the Corporation's acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (Merrill Lynch). Certain federal court actions were consolidated and/or coordinated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (the District Court) under the caption In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation.

Plaintiffs in the consolidated securities class action (the Consolidated Securities Class Action) asserted claims under Sections 14(a), 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and asserted damages based on the drop in the stock price upon subsequent disclosures. On April 5, 2013, the District Court granted final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On November 5, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On February 3, 2015, the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court elapsed without any objector filing a petition.

Certain shareholders opted to pursue their claims apart from the Consolidated Securities Class Action. Following settlements in an aggregate amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2013, the District Court dismissed the claims of these plaintiffs with prejudice.

In addition, on January 11, 2013, the District Court approved the settlement of claims filed by plaintiffs in a derivative action in the Consolidated Securities Class Action, which also resolved a consolidated derivative action filed in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

In addition, the District Court dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiffs in the ERISA actions in the Consolidated Securities Class Action on August 27, 2010, and the parties stipulated to the withdrawal of the appeal of that decision on January 14, 2013.

Interchange and Related Litigation

In 2005, a group of merchants filed a series of putative class actions and individual actions directed at interchange fees associated with Visa and MasterCard payment card transactions. These actions, which were consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York under the caption In Re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Anti-Trust Litigation (Interchange), named Visa, MasterCard and several banks and bank holding companies (BHCs), including the Corporation, as defendants. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix the level of default interchange rates and that certain rules of Visa and MasterCard related to merchant acceptance of payment cards at the point of sale were unreasonable restraints of trade. Plaintiffs sought unspecified damages and injunctive relief.

217 Bank of America 2014

On October 19, 2012, defendants settled the matter. The settlement provides for, among other things, (i) payments by defendants to the class and individual plaintiffs totaling approximately \$6.6 billion, allocated proportionately to each defendant based upon various loss-sharing agreements; (ii) distribution to class merchants of an amount equal to 10 bps of default interchange across all Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions for a period of eight consecutive months, to begin by July 29, 2013, which otherwise would have been paid to issuers and which effectively reduces credit interchange for that period of time; and (iii) modifications to certain Visa and MasterCard rules regarding merchant point of sale practices.

The court granted final approval of the class settlement agreement on December 13, 2013. Several class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In addition, a number of class members opted out of the settlement of their past damages claims. The cash portion of the settlement was adjusted downward as a result of these opt outs.

The Corporation is named in three of the opt-out suits, including one brought by cardholders, and, as a result of various sharing agreements from the main Interchange litigation, the Corporation remains liable for any settlement or judgment in opt-out suits where it is not named as a defendant. All but one of the opt-out suits filed to date have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. On July 18, 2014, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss opt-out complaints filed by

merchants, and on November 26, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the Sherman Act claim in the cardholder complaint.

LIBOR, Other Reference Rate and Foreign Exchange (FX) Inquiries and Litigation

The Corporation has received subpoenas and information requests from government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region, including the DoJ, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the FCA, concerning submissions made by panel banks in connection with the setting of LIBOR and other reference rates. The Corporation is cooperating with these inquiries.

In addition, the Corporation and BANA have been named as defendants along with most of the other LIBOR panel banks in a series of individual and class actions in various U.S. federal and state courts relating to defendants' LIBOR contributions. All cases naming the Corporation have been or are in the process of being consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the JPML. The Corporation expects that any future cases naming it will similarly be consolidated for pre-trial purposes. Plaintiffs allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of collusion or manipulation by defendants regarding the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Plaintiffs assert a variety of claims, including antitrust and Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), common law fraud, and breach of contract claims, and seek compensatory, treble and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

In a series of rulings, the court dismissed antitrust, RICO and certain state law claims, while permitting the Commodity Exchange Act and other state law claims to proceed. As a result of a procedural ruling by the Supreme Court, plaintiffs are pursuing an immediate appeal of the dismissal of their antitrust claims. Further, based on the statute of limitations, the court has substantially limited the time period for which manipulation claims under the Commodity Exchange Act may be pursued. As to the Corporation and BANA, the court has also dismissed manipulation claims based on alleged trader conduct, and certain common law claims by plaintiffs who alleged no direct dealings with the Corporation or BANA. Other claims against the Corporation and BANA remain pending, however, and the court is continuing to consider motions regarding them, including the applicability of its prior rulings to subsequently filed actions.

Certain regulatory and government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region are conducting investigations and making inquiries of a significant number of FX market participants, including the Corporation, regarding FX market participants' conduct and systems and controls over multiple years. The Corporation is cooperating with these investigations and inquiries, some of which are likely to lead to regulatory or legal proceedings and expose the Corporation to material penalties, fines or losses, and could adversely affect its reputation.

In particular, in November 2014, the Corporation resolved a matter with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) by agreeing to the imposition of mandatory remedial measures and payment of \$250 million in civil penalties associated with the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls.

The Corporation is in separate advanced discussions to resolve the regulatory matters of concern to another U.S. banking regulator involving the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls. There can be no assurances that these discussions will lead to a resolution, or of the amount or timing of any such resolution.

In addition, in a consolidated amended complaint filed on March 31, 2014, the Corporation and BANA were named as defendants along with other FX market participants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of plaintiffs and a putative class who allegedly transacted in FX and are domiciled in the U.S. or transacted in FX in the U.S. (the U.S. Action). On April 30, 2014, a substantively similar class action was filed against the Corporation and other FX market participants on behalf of a plaintiff and putative class allegedly located in Norway (the Foreign Action). The complaints allege that class members transacted with defendants at or around the time of the fixing of the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates or entered into transactions that settled in whole or in part based on the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates and that they sustained losses as a result of the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates. Plaintiffs in the U.S. Action assert a single claim for violations of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, and plaintiff in the Foreign Action asserts claims for violations of the Sherman Act, as well as certain claims under New York statutory and common law. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and treble damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

On January 28, 2015, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the U.S. Action, finding that plaintiffs had sufficiently pleaded the elements of an antitrust claim. In the same decision, the court granted with prejudice defendants' motion to dismiss the Foreign Action, finding that the Sherman Act does not apply extraterritorially, except in limited circumstances not present in the case, and that plaintiff had failed to plead an actionable state law claim.

Bank of America 2014 218

Montgomery

The Corporation, several current and former officers and directors, Banc of America Securities LLC (BAS), MLPF&S and other unaffiliated underwriters have been named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Montgomery v. Bank of America, et al.* Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on January 14, 2011. Plaintiff seeks to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired certain series of preferred stock offered by the Corporation pursuant to a shelf registration statement dated May 5, 2006. Plaintiff's claims arise from three offerings dated January 24, 2008, January 28, 2008 and May 20, 2008, from which the Corporation allegedly received proceeds of \$15.8 billion. The amended complaint asserts claims under Sections 11,12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleges that the prospectus supplements associated with the offerings: (i) failed to disclose that the Corporation's loans, leases, CDOs and commercial MBS were impaired to a greater extent than disclosed; (ii) misrepresented the extent of the impaired assets by failing to establish adequate reserves or properly record losses for its impaired assets; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of the Corporation's internal controls in light of the alleged impairment of its assets; (iv) misrepresented the Corporation's capital base and Tier 1 leverage ratio for risk-based capital in light of the allegedly impaired assets; and (v) misrepresented the thoroughness and adequacy of the Corporation's due diligence in connection with its acquisition of Countrywide. The amended complaint seeks rescission, compensatory and other damages. On March 16, 2012, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. On December 3, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion to file a second amended complaint. On February 6, 2014, plaintiffs appealed the denial of their motion to amend to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mortgage-backed Securities Litigation

The Corporation and its affiliates, Countrywide entities and their affiliates, and Merrill Lynch entities and their affiliates have been named as defendants in a number of cases relating to their various roles as issuer, originator, seller, depositor, sponsor, underwriter and/or controlling entity in MBS offerings, pursuant to which the MBS investors were entitled to a portion of the cash flow from the underlying pools of mortgages. These cases generally include purported class action suits and actions by individual MBS purchasers. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the registration statements, prospectuses and prospectus supplements for securities issued by securitization trusts contained material misrepresentations and omissions, in violation of the Securities Act of 1933 and/or state securities laws and other state statutory and common laws.

These cases generally involve allegations of false and misleading statements regarding: (i) the process by which the properties that served as collateral for the mortgage loans underlying the MBS were appraised; (ii) the percentage of equity that mortgage borrowers had in their homes; (iii) the borrowers' ability to repay their mortgage loans; (iv) the underwriting practices by which those mortgage loans were originated; (v) the ratings given to the different tranches of MBS by rating agencies; and (vi) the validity of each issuing trust's title to the mortgage loans comprising the pool for that securitization (collectively, MBS Claims). Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek unspecified compensatory damages, unspecified costs and legal fees and, in some instances, seek rescission.

The Corporation, Countrywide, Merrill Lynch and/or their affiliates may have claims for and/or may be subject to claims for contractual indemnification in connection with their various roles in regard to MBS.

On August 15, 2011, the JPML ordered multiple federal court cases involving Countrywide MBS consolidated for pretrial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in a multi-district litigation entitled *In re Countrywide Financial Corp. Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation* (the Countrywide RMBS MDL).

Federal Home Loan Bank Litigation

On March 15, 2010, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB San Francisco) filed an action in California Superior Court, San Francisco County, entitled *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, et al.* FHLB San Francisco's complaint asserts certain MBS Claims against BAS, Countrywide and several related entities in connection with its alleged purchase of 51 MBS offerings and one private placement issued and/or underwritten by those defendants between 2004 and 2007 and seeks rescission and unspecified damages. FHLB San Francisco dismissed the federal claims with prejudice on August 11, 2011. On September 8, 2011, the court denied defendants' motions to dismiss the state law claims. On December 20, 2013, FHLB San Francisco voluntarily dismissed its negligent misrepresentation claims

with prejudice. On October 15, 2014, the court denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to two Countrywide trusts that were to be part of a bellwether trial.

The parties have settled the action and other related actions for \$420 million, as well as with respect to certain claims, additional consideration; all amounts were fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, FHLB San Francisco has voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims with prejudice.

Luther Class Action Litigation and Related Actions Beginning in 2007, a number of pension funds and other investors filed putative class action lawsuits alleging certain MBS Claims against Countrywide, several of its affiliates, MLPF&S, the Corporation, NB Holdings Corporation and certain other defendants. Those class action lawsuits concerned a total of 429 MBS offerings involving over \$350 billion in securities issued by subsidiaries of Countrywide between 2005 and 2007. The actions, entitled *Luther v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Maine State Retirement System v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust Fund v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, and *Putnam Bank v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, were all assigned to the Countrywide RMBS MDL court. On December 6, 2013, the court granted final approval to a settlement of these actions in the amount of \$500 million. Beginning on January 14, 2014, a number of class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Prudential Insurance Litigation

On March 14, 2013, The Prudential Insurance Company of America and certain of its affiliates (collectively Prudential) filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in a case entitled *Prudential Insurance Company of America, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Prudential has named the Corporation, Merrill

IV) Bank of America 2014

Lynch and a number of related entities as defendants. Prudential asserts certain MBS Claims pertaining to 54 MBS offerings from which Prudential alleges that it purchased securities between 2004 and 2007. Prudential seeks, among other relief, compensatory damages, rescission or a rescissory measure of damages, punitive damages and other unspecified relief. On April 17, 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint. Prudential thereafter split its claims into two separate complaints, filing an amended complaint in the original action and a complaint in a separate action entitled *Prudential Portfolios 2, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Both cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. On February 5, 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss those complaints, granting plaintiff leave to replead in certain respects.

Mortgage Repurchase Litigation U.S. Bank Litigation

On August 29, 2011, U.S. Bank, National Association (U.S. Bank), as trustee for the HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-10 (the Trust), a mortgage pool backed by loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (CHL), filed a complaint in New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a case entitled *U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2005-10 v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (dba Bank of America Home Loans), Bank of America Corporation, Countrywide Financial Corporation, Bank of America, N.A. and NB Holdings Corporation*. U.S. Bank asserts that, as a result of alleged misrepresentations by CHL in connection with its sale of the loans, defendants must repurchase all the loans in the pool, or in the alternative that it must repurchase a subset of those loans as to which U.S. Bank alleges that defendants have refused specific repurchase demands. U.S. Bank asserts claims for breach of contract and seeks specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase the entire pool of loans (alleged to have an original aggregate principal balance of \$1.75 billion) or alternatively the aforementioned subset (alleged to have an aggregate principal balance of "over \$100 million"), together with reimbursement of costs and expenses and other unspecified relief. On May 29, 2013, the New York Supreme Court dismissed U.S. Bank's claim for repurchase of all the mortgage loans in the Trust. The court granted U.S. Bank leave to amend this claim. On June 18, 2013, U.S. Bank filed its second amended complaint seeking to replead its claim for repurchase of all loans in the Trust. On February 13, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the repleaded claim seeking repurchase of all mortgage loans in the Trust; plaintiff has appealed that order.

On November 13, 2014, the court granted U.S. Bank's motion for leave to amend the complaint; defendants have appealed that order. The amended complaint alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' failure to repurchase loans that were the subject of specific repurchase demands and also alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' discovery, during origination and servicing, of loans with material breaches of representations and warranties.

U.S. Bank Summonses with Notice

On August 29, 2014, U.S. Bank, solely in its capacity as Trustee for seven securitization trusts (the Trusts), served seven summonses with notice commencing potential actions against First Franklin Financial Corporation, Merrill Lynch Mortgage

Lending, Inc., Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., and Ownit Mortgage Solutions Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. The summonses indicate that defendants may be subject to breach of contract claims alleging that they breached representations and warranties related to loans securitized in the Trusts. The summonses allege that defendants failed to repurchase breaching mortgage loans from the Trusts. The summonses seek specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase breaching loans, declaratory judgment, compensatory, rescissory and other damages, and indemnity. On February 5, 2015, defendants demanded complaints on three of the Trusts. Defendants currently have until March 3, 2015 to demand the complaint with respect to one of the remaining Trusts, and until July 15, 2015 to demand complaints on the final three Trusts.

Ocala Investor Litigation

On November 25, 2009, BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation (BNP) and Deutsche Bank AG each filed claims (the 2009 Actions) against BANA in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation v. Bank of America, N.A. and Deutsche Bank AG v. Bank of America, N.A.* Plaintiffs allege that BANA failed to properly perform its duties as indenture trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository for Ocala Funding, LLC (Ocala), a home mortgage warehousing facility, resulting in the loss of plaintiffs' investment in Ocala. Ocala was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Taylor, Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. (TBW), a home mortgage originator and servicer which is alleged to have committed fraud that led to its eventual bankruptcy. Ocala provided funding for TBW's mortgage origination activities by issuing notes, the proceeds of which were to be used by TBW to originate home mortgages. Such mortgages and other Ocala assets in turn were pledged to BANA as collateral agent, to secure the notes. Plaintiffs lost most or all of their investment in Ocala when, as the result of the alleged fraud committed by TBW, Ocala was unable to repay the notes purchased by plaintiffs and there was insufficient collateral to satisfy Ocala's debt obligations. Plaintiffs allege that BANA breached its contractual, fiduciary and other duties to Ocala, thereby permitting TBW's alleged fraud to go undetected. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and other relief from BANA, including interest and attorneys' fees, in an unspecified amount, but which plaintiffs allege exceeds \$1.6 billion.

On March 23, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part BANA's motions to dismiss the 2009 Actions. Plaintiffs filed amended complaints on October 1, 2012 that included additional contractual, tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the court granted BANA's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims for failure to sue, negligence, negligent misrepresentation and equitable relief.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On February 19, 2015, BANA and BNP reached an agreement in principle to settle the 2009 actions for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to the execution of a final settlement agreement.

O'Donnell Litigation

On February 24, 2012, Edward O'Donnell filed a sealed qui tam complaint under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and the False Claims Act against the Corporation, individually, and as successor to Countrywide,

Bank of America 2014 2211

CHL and a Countrywide business division known as Full Spectrum Lending. On October 24, 2012, the DoJ filed a complaint-in-intervention to join the matter, adding BANA, Countrywide and CHL as defendants. The action is entitled *United States of America, ex rel, Edward O'Donnell, appearing Qui Tam v. Bank of America Corp., et al.*, and was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint-in-intervention asserted certain fraud claims in connection with the sale of loans to FNMA

and FHLMC by Full Spectrum Lending and by the Corporation and BANA. On January 11, 2013, the government filed an amended complaint which added Countrywide Bank, FSB (CFSB) and a former officer of the Corporation as defendants. The court dismissed False Claims Act counts on May 8, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the government filed a second amended complaint alleging claims under FIRREA concerning allegedly fraudulent loan sales to the GSEs between August 2007 and May 2008. On September 24, 2013, the government dismissed the Corporation as a defendant.

Following a trial, on October 23, 2013, a verdict of liability was returned against CHL, CFSB and BANA. On July 30, 2014, the court imposed a civil penalty of \$1.3 billion on BANA. On February 3, 2015, the court denied the Corporation's motions for judgment as a matter of law, or in the alternative, a new trial. The Corporation will appeal the verdict and judgment.

Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System The Corporation and several current and former officers were named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System v. Bank of America, et al.

Following the filing of a complaint on February 2, 2011, plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 23, 2011 in which plaintiff sought to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired the Corporation's common stock between February 27, 2009 and October 19, 2010 and "Common Equivalent Securities" sold in a December 2009 offering. The amended complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleged that the Corporation's public statements: (i) concealed problems in the Corporation's mortgage servicing business resulting from the widespread use of the Mortgage Electronic Recording System; (ii) failed to disclose the Corporation's exposure to mortgage repurchase claims; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of internal controls; and (iv) violated certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The amended complaint sought unspecified damages.

On July 11, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. All claims under the Securities Act were dismissed against all defendants, with prejudice. The motion to dismiss the claim against the Corporation under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act was denied. All claims under the Exchange Act against the officers were dismissed, with leave to replead. Defendants moved to dismiss a second amended complaint in which plaintiff sought to replead claims against certain current and former officers under Sections 10(b) and 20(a). On April 17, 2013, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss, sustaining Sections 10(b) and 20(a) claims against the current and former officers.

Policemen's Annuity Litigation

On April 11, 2012, the Policemen's Annuity & Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago, on its own behalf and on behalf of a proposed class of purchasers of 41 RMBS trusts collateralized mostly by Washington Mutual-originated (WaMu) mortgages, filed a proposed class action complaint against BANA and other unrelated parties in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, entitled Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association. BANA and U.S. Bank are named as defendants in their capacities as trustees, with BANA (formerly LaSalle Bank National Association) having served as the original trustee and U.S. Bank having replaced BANA as trustee. Plaintiff asserted claims under the federal Trust Indenture Act as well as state common law claims. Plaintiff alleged that, in light of the performance of the RMBS at issue, and in the wake of publicly-available information about the quality of loans originated by WaMu, the trustees were required to take certain steps to protect plaintiffs' interest in the value of the securities, and that plaintiff was damaged by defendants' failures to notify it of deficiencies in the loans and of defaults under the relevant agreements, to ensure that the underlying mortgages could properly be foreclosed, and to enforce remedies available for loans that contained breaches of representations and warranties. Plaintiff sought unspecified compensatory damages and/or equitable relief, and costs and expenses. The court dismissed some of the common law claims, but allowed the Trust Indenture Act claim and a claim for breach of contract to proceed. After the filing of two amended complaints and the consolidation of the case with a related matter filed on August 23, 2013, entitled Vermont Pension Investment Committee and the Washington State Investment Board v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association, 10 named plaintiffs filed a third amended complaint on October 31, 2013, on behalf of two proposed classes of purchasers of 35 trusts collateralized mostly by WaMu-originated mortgages (later reduced to 34 trusts).

On June 5, 2014, the parties informed the court that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle the case for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to approval of plaintiffs' boards. The settlement remains subject to final court approval and various conditions. On November 10, 2014, the court preliminarily approved the proposed settlement, and scheduled a final approval hearing for March 12, 2015.

Takefuji Litigation

In April 2010, Takefuji Corporation (Takefuji) filed a claim against Merrill Lynch International and Merrill Lynch Japan Securities (MUS) in Tokyo District Court. The claim concerns Takefuji's purchase in 2007 of credit-linked notes structured and sold by defendants that resulted in a loss to Takefuji of approximately JPY29.0 billion (approximately \$270 million) following an event of default. Takefuji alleges that defendants failed to meet certain disclosure obligations concerning the notes.

On July 19, 2013, the Tokyo District Court issued a judgment in defendants' favor, a decision that Takefuji subsequently appealed to the Tokyo High Court. On August 27, 2014, the Tokyo High Court vacated the decision of the District Court and issued a judgment awarding Takefuji JPY14.5 billion (approximately \$135 million) in damages, plus interest at a rate of five percent from March 18, 2008. On September 10, 2014, defendants filed an appeal with the Japanese Supreme Court.

n

GITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT

SECTION I GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Legal name of the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS., Include d/b/a/ if applicable:

Bank of America Corporation

Check ONE of the following three boxes:

Indicate whether the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is:

1. ☐ the Applicant

OR

2. ☐ a legal entity holding a direct or indirect interest in the Applicant. State the legal name of the Applicant in which

the Disclosing Party holds an interest: st Edmunds Meadows Limited Partnership

OR

3. ☐ a legal entity with a right of control (see-Section II.B.I.) State the legal name of the entity in which-the Disclosing Party holds a right of control:

B. Business address of the Disclosing Party:

Charlotte, NC 28285

. • 917-232-2988 646-822-5978 . ., michelle.militello@baml.com
<mailto:michelle.militello@baml.com>

C. Telephone:

Fax:

Email: ..

Michelle Militello

D. Name of contact person:-

E. Federal Employer Identification No. (if you have one): ^

F. Brief description of contract; transaction or other undertaking (referred to below as the "Matter") to which.this EDS pertains. (Include project number and location of property,,if applicable):

Applicant to obtain a loan from the City so that Applicant may repay a loan to Applicant made by the L.P. The project is a 56 unit multi-income development located at 6100-14 S Michigan, 51-73 E. 61st, 6104-47 S. Wabash, and 48-58 E. 57th in Chicago, IL.

Dept. of Planning and Development

EDS?

G. Which City agency or department is requesting this

If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, please complete the following: n/a

Specification #

and Contract #

Page 1 of 13

SECTION II - DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP INTERESTS

A. NATURE OF THE DISCLOSING PARTY

☐ J Persbri

☐ Publicly registered business, corporation

☐ J Privately held business corporation

☐ Sole proprietorship

☐ •; General partnership

☐ J Limited partnership

☐ Trust

☐ Limited liability company

☐ Limited liability partnership

☐ Joint venture
☐ Not-for-profit corporation
(Is the not-for-profit corporation also a 501(c)(3))?
☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Other (please specify)

2. For legal entities, the state (or foreign country) of incorporation or organization, if applicable: Delaware

3. For legal entities not organized in the State of Illinois: Has the organization registered to do business in the State of Illinois as a foreign entity?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

B. IF THE DISCLOSING PARTY IS A LEGAL ENTITY:

1. List below the full names and titles of all executive officers and all directors of the entity. NOTE: For not-for-profit corporations, also list below all members, if any, which are legal entities. If there are no such members, write "no members." For trusts, estates or other similar entities, list below the legal titleholder(s).

If the entity is a general partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership or joint venture, list below the name and title of each general partner, managing member, manager or any other person or entity that controls the day-to-day management⁵ of the Disclosing Party. NOTE: Each legal entity listed below must submit an EDS on its own behalf.

Name Title

Please see attached list of executive officers and directors

2. Please provide the following information concerning each person or entity having a direct or indirect beneficial interest (including ownership) in excess of 7.5% of the Disclosing Party. Examples of such an interest include shares in a corporation, partnership interest in a partnership or joint venture,

Page 2 of 13

interest of a member or manager in a limited liability company, or interest of a beneficiary of a trust, estate or other similar entity. If none, state "None." NOTE: Pursuant to Section 2-154.-030, of the Chicago Municipal Code of Chicago ("Municipal Code"), the City may require any such additional information from any applicant which is reasonably intended to achieve full disclosure,

| Name ■; | Business Address ■ | Percentage Interest in the Disclosing Party :. • |
|---------|--------------------------|--|
|---------|--------------------------|--|

•There are no owners with greater than 7.5% ownership in the Disclosing Party.---

SECTION III -- BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Has the Disclosing Party had a "business relationship," as defined in: Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code with any City elected official, in the 12 months before the date this EDS is signed? • '■.•

^ Yes [JNo See Attached. '• :V

If yes, please identify below the name(s) of such City elected official(s) and describe such - ,

relationship(s): - • ■■■■■■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ;>- ^<

SECTION IV - DISCLOSURE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND OTHER RETAINED PARTIES

The Disclosing Party must disclose the name and business address of each subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, accountant, consultant and any other person or entity whom the Disclosing Party has retained or expects to retain in connection with the Matter, as well as the nature of the relationship, and the total amount of the fees paid or estimated to be paid. The Disclosing Party is not required to disclose employees who are paid solely through the Disclosing Party's regular payroll.

"Lobbyist" means any person or entity who undertakes to influence any legislative or administrative action on behalf of any person or entity other than: (1) a not-for-profit entity, on an unpaid basis, or (2) himself. "Lobbyist" also means any person or entity any part of whose duties as an employee of another includes undertaking to influence any legislative or administrative action.

If the Disclosing Party is uncertain whether a disclosure is required under this Section, the Disclosing Party must either ask the City whether disclosure is required or make the disclosure.

Page 3 of 13

| Name (indicate whether retained or anticipated to be retained) | Business Address | Relationship to Disclosing Party (subcontractor, attorney, lobbyist, etc.) | Fees (indicate whether paid or estimated;) NOTE: "hourly rate" or "t.b.d." is not an acceptable response. |
|--|------------------|--|---|
|--|------------------|--|---|

(Add sheets if necessary)

[X] Check here if the Disclosing Party has not retained, nor expects to retain, any such persons or entities.

SECTION V CERTIFICATIONS

A. COURT-ORDERED CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE

Under Municipal Code Section 2-92-415, substantial owners of business entities that contract with the City must remain in compliance with their child support obligations throughout the contract's term.

Has any person who directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party been declared in arrearage on any child support obligations by any Illinois court of competent jurisdiction?—

☐ Yes ☐ No No person directly or indirectly owns 10% or more of the Disclosing Party. see Attached.

If "Yes," has the person entered into a, court-approved agreement, for payment of all support owed and is the person in compliance with that agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

B. FURTHER CERTIFICATIONS See Attached Additional Information, including Litigation and Regulatory Matters.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 1-23, Article 1 ("Article I") (which the Applicant should consult for defined terms (e.g., "doing/business") and legal requirements), if the Disclosing Party submitting this EDS is the Applicant and is, doing business with the City, then the Disclosing Party certifies as follows: (i) neither the Applicant nor any controlling person is currently indicted or charged with, or has admitted guilt of, or has ever been convicted of, or placed under supervision for, any criminal offense involving actual, attempted, or conspiracy to commit bribery, theft, fraud, forgery, perjury, dishonesty or deceit against an officer or employee of the City or any sister agency; and (ii) the Applicant understands and acknowledges that compliance with Article I is a continuing requirement for doing business with the City. NOTE: If Article 1 applies to the Applicant, the permanent compliance timeframe in Article I supersedes some five-year compliance timeframes in certifications 2 and 3 below.

Page 4 of 13

2. The Disclosing Party and, if the Disclosing Party is a legal entity, all of those persons or entities identified in Section II.B.I. of this EDS:

- a. are; not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from any transactions by any federal, state or local unit of government;
- b. have not, within a five-year period preceding, the date of this EDS, been convicted of a criminal offense, adjudged guilty, or had a civil judgment rendered against them in connection with: obtaining, attempting to obtain, or

performing a public (federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; a violation of federal or state antitrust statutes; fraud; embezzlement; theft; forgery; bribery; falsification or destruction of records; making false statements; or receiving stolen property;

- c. are not presently indicted for, or criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state or local) with committing any of the offenses, set forth in clause B.2.b. of this Section.V;
- d. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, had one or more public transactions (federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default; and
- e. have not, within a five-year period preceding the date of this EDS, been convicted, adjudged guilty, or found liable in a civil proceeding, or in any criminal or civil, action, including actions concerning environmental violations, instituted by the City or by the federal government, any state, or any other unit, of local government.

I certify the above to be true.

3. The certifications in subparts 3, 4 and 5 concern:

- the Disclosing Party;

any "Contractor" (meaning any contractor or subcontractor used by the Disclosing Party in connection with the Matter, including but not limited to, all persons or legal entities disclosed under Section IV, "Disclosure of Subcontractors and Other Retained Parties");

- any "Affiliated Entity" (meaning a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, controls the Disclosing Party, is controlled by the Disclosing Party, or is, with the Disclosing Party, under common control of another person or entity. Indicia of control include, without limitation: interlocking management or ownership; identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment; common use of employees; or organization of a business entity following the ineligibility of a business entity to do business with federal or state or local government, including the City, using substantially the same management, ownership, or principals as the ineligible entity); with respect to Contractors, the term Affiliated Entity means a person or entity that directly or indirectly controls the Contractor, is controlled by it, or, with the Contractor, is under common control of another person or entity;

- any responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity or any other official, agent or employee of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity, acting pursuant to the direction or authorization of a responsible official of the Disclosing Party, any Contractor or any Affiliated Entity (collectively "Agents").

Page 5 of 13

Neither the Disclosing Party, nor any Contractor, nor any Affiliated Entity of either the Disclosing Party or any Contractor nor any Agents have, during the five years before the date this EDS is signed, or, with respect to a Contractor, an Affiliated Entity, or an Affiliated Entity of a Contractor during the five years; before the date of such Contractor's or Affiliated Entity's contract or engagement in connection with the Matter:

- a. bribed or attempted to bribe, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of bribery or attempting to bribe, a public officer or employee of the City, the State of Illinois, or any agency of the federal government or of any state or local government in the United States of America, in that officer's or employee's official capacity;
- b. agreed or colluded with other bidders or prospective bidders, or been a party to any such agreement, or been convicted or adjudged guilty of agreement or collusion among bidders or prospective bidders, in restraint of

freedom of competition by agreement to bid a fixed price or otherwise; or

c. made an admission of such conduct described in a. or b. above that is a matter of record, but have not been prosecuted for such conduct; or

d. violated the provisions of Municipal Code Section 2-92-610 (Living Wage Ordinance).

I certify the above to be true.

4. Neither the Disclosing Party, Affiliated Entity or Contractor, or any of their employees, officials, agents or partners, is barred from contracting with any unit of state or local government as a result of engaging in or being convicted of (1) bid-rigging in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-3; (2) bid-rotating in violation of 720 ILCS 5/33E-4; or (3) any similar offense of any state or of the United States of America that contains the same elements as the offense of bid-rigging or bid-rotating.

I certify the above to be true.

5. Neither the Disclosing Party nor any Affiliated Entity is listed on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce or their successors: the Specially Designated Nationals List, the Denied Persons List, the Unverified List, the Entity List and the Debarred List.

I certify the above to be true.

6. The Disclosing Party understands and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapters 2-55: (Legislative Inspector General), 2-56 (Inspector General) and 2-156 (Governmental Ethics) of the Municipal Code.

I certify the above to be true.

7. If the Disclosing Party is unable to certify to any of the above statements in this Part B (Further Certifications), the Disclosing Party must explain below: I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

Page 6 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears on the lines above, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party certified to the above statements.

8. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is- a, complete list of all current employees of the Disclosing Party who were, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

9. To the best of the Disclosing Party's knowledge after reasonable inquiry, the following is a complete list of all gifts that the Disclosing Party has given or caused to be given, at any time during the 12-month period preceding the execution date of this EDS, to an employee, or elected or appointed official, of the City of Chicago. For purposes of this statement, a "gift" does not include: (i) anything

made generally available to City employees or to the general public, or (ii) food or drink provided in the course of official City business and having a retail value of less than 520 per recipient (if none, indicate with "N/A" or "none"). As to any gift listed below, please also list the name of the City recipient. I have a disclosure to make. Please see additional information.

C. CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

1. The Disclosing Party certifies that the Disclosing Party (check one)

1. ☐ is ☐ [*] is riot

a "financial institution" as defined in Section 2-3.2-455(b).of the Municipal Code.

2. Lfthe Disclosing Party.IS a financial institution, then the Disclosing Party pledges:

"We are not and will not become a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We further pledge that none of our affiliates is, and none of them will become^ a predatory lender as defined in Chapter 2-32 of the Municipal Code. We understand that becoming a predatory lender or becoming an affiliate ofa predatory lender may result in the loss ofthe privilege of doing business with the City." The Disclosing Party makes the above pledge.

If the Disclosing Party is unable to make this pledge because, it or any of its affiliates (as defined in Section 2-32,455(b) of the Municipal Code) is a predatory lender within the meaning of Chapter 2-32 ofthe Municipal Code, explain here (attach additional pages if necessary):

Page 7 of 13

If the letters "NA," the word "None," or no response appears.on the lines-above, it will be conclusively presumed, that the-Disclosing Party certified to the above.,statements'.

D. CERTIFICATION REGARDING INTEREST IN CITY BUSINESS

Any words or terms that are defined in Chapter 2-156 ofthe Municipal Code have the same meanings when used in this-Part-D'.

1. In accordance with Section 2^156-110 of the M unicipal Code: Does any official or employee of the City have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the Matter?

☐ Yes No

NOTE: If you checked "Yes" to Item D.L, proceed to Items D.2. and D.3. If you checked "No" to Item D.L, proceed to Part E.

2. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding, or otherwise permitted, no City elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his or her own name or in the name of any other person or entity in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City (collectively, "City Property Sale"). Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power does not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this Part D.

Does the Matter involve a City Property Sale?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If you checked "Yes" to Item D.1., provide the names and business addresses of the City officials or employees having such interest and identify the nature of such interest:

| Name | Business Address | Nature of Interest |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
|------|------------------|--------------------|

4. The Disclosing Party further certifies that no prohibited financial interest in the Matter will be acquired by any City official or employee.

E. CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

• Please check either 1. or 2. below. If the Disclosing Party checks 2., the Disclosing Party must disclose below or in an attachment to this EDS all information required by paragraph 2. Failure to

Page 8 of 13

comply with these disclosure requirements may make any contract entered into with the City in connection with the Matter voidable by the City.

 [^] L The Disclosing Party verifies that the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities regarding records of investments, or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies during the slavery era (including insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or injury or death of their slaves), and the Disclosing Party has found no such records.

 2. The Disclosing Party verifies that, as a result of conducting the search in step 1 above, the Disclosing Party has found records of investments or profits from slavery or slaveholder insurance policies. The Disclosing Party verifies that the following constitutes full disclosure of all such records, including the names of any and all slaves in those records:

I can make the verification (til)

SECTION VI - CERTIFICATIONS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED MATTERS

NOTE: If the Matter is federally funded, complete this Section VI. If the Matter is not federally funded, proceed to Section VII. For purposes of this Section VI, tax credits allocated by the City and proceeds of debt obligations of the City are not federal funding.

A. CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

1. List below the names of all persons or entities registered under the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter: (Add sheets if necessary):

(If no explanation appears or begins on the lines above, or if the letters "NA" or if the word, "None" appear, it will be conclusively presumed that the Disclosing Party means that NO persons or entities registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 have made lobbying contacts on behalf of the Disclosing Party with respect to the Matter.)

2. The Disclosing Party has not spent and will not expend any federally appropriated funds to pay any person or entity listed in Paragraph A. 1. above for his or her lobbying activities or to pay any person or entity to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, as defined by applicable federal law, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress, in connection with the award of any federally funded contract, making any federally funded grant or loan, entering into any cooperative agreement, or to extend, continue, renew, amend, or modify any federally funded contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

Page 9 of 13

3. The Disclosing Party will submit an updated certification at the end of each calendar quarter in which there occurs any event that materially affects the accuracy of the statements and information set forth in paragraphs A.1. and A.2, above.

4. The Disclosing Party certifies that either: (i) it is not an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or (ii) it is an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 but has not engaged and will not engage in "Lobbying Activities".

5. If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party must obtain certifications equal in form and substance to paragraphs A.1. through A.4. above from all subcontractors before it awards any subcontract and the Disclosing Party must maintain all such/subcontractors' certifications for the duration of the Matter and must make such certifications promptly available to the City upon request.

B. CERTIFICATION REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

If the Matter is federally funded, federal regulations require the Applicant and all proposed subcontractors to submit the following information with their bids or in writing at the outset of negotiations.

Is the Disclosing Party the Applicant?

☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," answer the three questions

below:

1. Have you developed and do you have on file affirmative action programs pursuant to applicable federal regulations? (See 41, CFR Part 60-2.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Have you filed with the Joint Reporting Committee, the Director, of the Office, of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission all reports due under the applicable filing requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any previous contracts or subcontracts subject to the equal opportunity clause?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "No" to question 1. or 2. above, please provide an explanation:

Page 10 of 13

SECTION VII -r ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, CONTRACT INCORPORATION, COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, DISCLOSURE

The Disclosing Party understands and agrees that::

A. The certifications, disclosures, and acknowledgments contained in this EDS will become part of any contract or other agreement between the Applicant and the City in connection with the Matter,, whether procurement, City assistance, or other City action, and are material inducements to the City's execution of any contract or taking other action with respect to the Matter. The Disclosing Party understands that it must comply with all statutes, ordinances, and regulations on which this EDS is based.

JB.: The City's Governmental Ethics and Campaign Financing Ordinances, Chapters 2-156 and 2-164 of the Municipal Code, impose certain duties and obligations on persons or entities seeking City contracts, work, business, or transactions.. The full text of these ordinances and a training program is available on line at [w^www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics^andTOay](http://www.cityofchicago.org/Ethics^andTOay) also be obtained from the City's Board of Ethics, 740 N.

Sedgwick St., Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 744-9660. The Disclosing Party must comply fully with the applicable ordinances. I acknowledge and consent to the above .

C. If the City determines that any information provided in this EDS is false, incomplete or inaccurate, any contract or other agreement in connection with which it is submitted may be rescinded or be void or voidable, and the City may pursue any remedies under the contract of agreement (if not rescinded or void), at law, or in equity, including terminating

the Disclosing Party's participation in the Matter and/or declining to allow the Disclosing Party to participate in other transactions-with the City. Remedies at law for a; false'statement of material fact may include incarceration.and an award to the City of treble damages,

D. It is.the City's policy to make this document available to the public on its Internet site and/or upon request. Some or all ofthe information provided on this EDS and any attachments to this EDS may be made available to the public on the Internet, in response" to a Freedom of Information Act request, of otherwise^ By completing and signing'this EDS, the Disclosing Party waives and releases any possible rights or claims wliichit may have against the.City in.connection with the public release of information contained in this EDS and also authorizes the City to verify the accuracy of any information submitted in this EDS.

E. The information provided in this EDS must be kept current. In the event of changes, the Disclosing Party must supplement this EDS up to the time the City takes action on the Matter. If the Matter is a contract being handled by the City's Department of Procurement Services, the Disclosing Party must update this EDS as the contract requires. NOTE: With respect to Matters subject to Article I of Chapter 1-23 ofthe Municipal Code (imposing PERMANENT INELIGIBILITY for certain specified offenses), the information provided herein regarding eligibility must be kept current for a longer period, as required by Chapter 1-23 and Section 2-154-020 of the Municipal Code.

I acknowledge and consent.to the above.

The Disclosing Party represents and warrants that:

Page 11 of 13

F.1. The Disclosing Party is not delinquent in the payment of any tax administered by the Illinois Department of Revenue, nor are the Disclosing Party or its Affiliated Entities delinquent in paying any fine, fee, tax or other charge owed to the City. This includes, but is not limited to. all water charges, sewer charges, license fees, parking tickets, property taxes or sales taxes. I certify the above to be true.

F.2 If the Disclosing Party is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party and its Affiliated Entities will not use, nor permit their subcontractors to use, any facility listed by the U.S. E.P.A. on the federal Excluded Parties List System ("EPLS") maintained by the U. S. General Services Administration. I certify the above to be true.

F.3 If the Disclosing Parly is the Applicant, the Disclosing Party will obtain from any contractors/subcontractors hired or to be hired in connection with the Matter certifications equal in form and substance to those in F.1. and F.2. above and will not, without the prior written consent ofthe -Ci-ty-r-usc-aay-jmch contractoj&ulKontracløfti^

Disclosing Party has reason to believe has not provided or cannot provide truthful certifications. I certify the above to be true.

NOTE: If the Disclosing Parly cannot certify as to any of the items in F. I., F.2. or F.3. above, an explanatory statement must be attached to this F.DS.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, the person signing below: (1) warrants that he/she is authorized to execute this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) on behalf of the Disclosing Party, and (2) warrants that all certifications and statements contained in this EDS and Appendix A (if applicable) are true, accurate and complete as ofthe date furnished to the City.

Bank of America Corporation (Print or ty^c n^lie of
Disclosing Party)

By: (/Jl/° A h/\$t>
(Sign h/crc) Y>

Phillip A. Wertz

(Print or type name of person signing)

Associate General Counsel & Senior Vice President (Pi in; or type

title of person signing)

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX A

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent. It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

Under Municipal Code Section 2-154-015, the Disclosing Party must disclose: whether such Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently has a "familial relationship" with, any elected city official or department head. - A "familial relationship" exists if, as of the date this EDS is signed, the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" thereof is related to the mayor, any alderman, the city clerk, the city treasurer or any city department head as spouse or domestic partner or as any .of the following, whether by blood or adoption: parent, child, brother or sister, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew, grandparent, grandchild, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, stepfather" or stepmother, stepson or stepdaughter, stepbrother or stepsister of half-brother or half-sister.

"Applicable Party" means (1) all executive officers of the Disclosing Party listed in Section II.B.1.a., if the Disclosing Party is a corporation; all partners; of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a general partnership; all general partners and limited partners of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited partnership; all managers, managing members and members of the Disclosing Party, if the Disclosing Party is a limited liability company; (2) all principal officers of the Disclosing Party; and (3) any person having more than a 7.5 percent ownership interest in the Disclosing Party. "Principal officers" means the president, chief operating officer, executive director^ chief financial officer, treasurer or secretary of a legal entity or any person exercising similar authority.

Does the Disclosing Party or any "Applicable Party" or any Spouse or Domestic Partner thereof currently have a "familial relationship" with an elected city official or department head?

[JYes [x]No

If yes, please identify below (1) the name and title of such person, (2) the name of the legal entity to which such person is connected; (3) the name and title of the elected city official or department head to whom such person has a familial relationship, and (4) the precise nature of such familial relationship.

Page 13 of 13

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT
APPENDIX B

BUILDING CODE SCOFFLAW/PROBLEM LANDLORD CERTIFICATION

This Appendix is to be completed only by (a) the Applicant, and (b) any legal entity which has a direct ownership interest in the Applicant exceeding 7.5 percent (an "Owner"). It is not to be completed by any legal entity which has only an indirect ownership interest in the Applicant.

1. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-154-010, is the Applicant or any Owner identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal-Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No

2. If the Applicant is a legal entity publicly traded on any exchange, is any officer or director of the Applicant identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord pursuant to Section 2-92-416 of the Municipal Code?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable

3. If yes to (1) or (2) above, please identify below the name of the person or legal entity identified as a building code scofflaw or problem landlord and the address of the building or buildings to which the pertinent code violations apply.

FILLING OUT THIS APPENDIX B CONSTITUTES ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT THAT THIS APPENDIX B IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO, AND MADE A PART OF, THE ASSOCIATED EDS* AND THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THIS APPENDIX B ARE SUBJECT TO THE CERTIFICATION MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON PAGE 12 OF THE ASSOCIATED EDS.

**BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ST.
EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS RESPONSE TO SECTION II.B.1

Bank of America Corporation

3/24/2015

Board of Directors

Allen, Sharon L. Bies, Susan S. Bovender, Jr., Jack O.
Bramble, Frank P. de Week, Pierre Donald, Arnold W. Gifford,
Charles K. Holliday, Jr., Charles O. Hudson, Linda P. Lozano,
Monica C. May, Thomas J. Moynihan, Brian T. Nowell III,
Lionel L. Rose, Clayton S. Yost, R. David

Executive Officers

Moynihan, Brian T. Chairman of the Board, President, Chief Executive Officer
Athanasia, Dean C. President, Preferred & Small Business Banking, Co-Head
Consumer

Laughlin, Terrence P. Nguyen, Thong Darnell, David C. Montag, Thomas K. Bless, Rudolf Greener, Geoffrey Lynch, Gary G.
Thompson, Bruce R. Hackworth, Gregory R. Jeffries, Ross E. Mogensen, Lauren

Banking

President, Strategic Initiatives

President, Retail Banking, Co-Head Consumer Banking Vice Chairman, Global Wealth & Investment Management Chief

Operating Officer Chief Accounting Officer Chief Risk Officer

Global General Counsel and Head of Compliance and Regulatory

Chief Financial Officer

Treasurer

Deputy

General Counsel, Corporate Secretary Global Compliance Executive, Deputy General Counsel

**BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT ST. EDMUNDS MEADOWS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SECTION 11(A) Disclosure of Ownership Interests The Disclosing Party is a

publically traded corporation. SECTION III -Business Relationships with City

Elected Officials

Disclosing Party and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated In Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of Disclosing Party and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with DISCLOSING PARTY and its activities. Attached to this Addendum is a copy of the Litigation and Regulatory Matters from a recent Report.

BAC and, or, its affiliates, have engaged the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the past, which engagement may continue to the date of this Statement, and BAC and, or, its affiliates, may engage the law firm of Klafter & Burke for legal representation in the future. Alderman Edward M. Burke Principal of Klafter & Burke.

SECTION V. - Certifications

SECTION V(A) Court-Ordered Child Support Compliance

As a public corporation, Disclosing Party does not have any "substantial" owners as defined by the provision. No individual or group of individuals owns 10% or more of BAC. In addition, the Disclosing Party complies with all child support orders it receives.

B. Further Clarifications

1. Disclosing Party is not the Applicant.

Neither Disclosing Party nor its Executive Officers and Director identified within this EDS is subject to any order, judgment or decree by any court or government authority in which it is barred, suspended or otherwise limited from engaging in any type of business practice.

SECTION V(B)(2) b, c and e:

Disclosing Party makes all required disclosures in its Form 10-k as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and its Annual Report as posted on its website. In addition, Disclosing Party's registered broker-dealer and investment adviser subsidiaries make all required disclosures on their Form BDs and filed with FINRA and their Form ADVs as filed with the SEC. These filings include disclosures of investigations and litigation as required by the securities regulatory organizations and federal law, and are publicly available. Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other non-public investigation conducted by any governmental agency unless required to do so by law.

Please let us know if any additional information is needed. SECTION V(B)(2)d

The Disclosing Party performed due diligence within the Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of Disclosing Party to determine whether any Public Sector Banking and Markets Group of Disclosing Party employees were aware of any public finance transactions (federal, state or local) having been terminated for cause or default within the last five years, and none of such employees were aware of any such transactions.

SECTION V(B)(3)a, b, c and d

Please note that our responses are on behalf of the Disclosing Party only and not on behalf of any contractors or retained parties disclosed in SECTION IV.

a, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. Additionally, b and c - Please see response to SECTION V(4) below.

SECTION V(4): Please see response to SECTION V(B)(2)b, c and e above. SECTION V(B)(6)

Disclosing Party and its affiliates maintain strict policies and procedures to ensure compliance with applicable, local, state and federal law and regulations, including Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code. To the best of the individual signing this EDS, Disclosing Party and its affiliates are currently in compliance, and have policies and procedures in place to ensure continued compliance.

SECTION V(B)(7) AND (8)

Please see responses to SECTION VII(C).

SECTION V(E) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SLAVERY ERA BUSINESS

The Disclosing Party verifies that a) the Disclosing Party has searched any and all records of the Disclosing Party and any and all predecessor entities for records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies, and (b) the Disclosing Party has found no records of investments or profits from slavery, the slave industry, or slaveholder insurance policies and no records of any slave or slaveholders.

SECTION VII - Acknowledgments, Contract Incorporation, Compliance, Penalties, Disclosure

SECTION VII(B) and (C). Disclosing Party and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, it is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated in Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing

Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of Disclosing Party and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with DISCLOSING PARTY and its activities.

F.1.

Representatives and agents of Disclosing Party or its affiliates meet with representatives of the City on a monthly or other regular basis to identify outstanding amounts duly payable by DISCLOSING PARTY or its affiliates to the City and settle them accordingly.

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ELECTED OFFICIAL AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

Disclosing Party and its subsidiaries, which include Disclosing Party, had approximately 224,000 full time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, It is not possible for the Disclosing Party to perform due diligence across the full panoply of associates and the Disclosing Party related entities in preparing the Disclosing Party's response. Additionally, the Disclosing Party is routinely involved in litigation in various state and federal courts. The Disclosing Party makes all disclosures required by its regulators, including all required disclosures in its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, which are updated in Reports on Form 8-K (the "Reports"), all of which are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those Reports include disclosures of investigations and other matters as required by federal law and are publicly available. The Disclosing Party cannot confirm or deny the existence of any other, non-public investigation conducted by any government investigator unless required to do so by law. Further, to the knowledge of the individual signing below and without independent inquiry, there are no Officers, Directors, or key employees of the Disclosing Party who are also employed by the City. However, employees of Disclosing Party and its affiliates are subject to a written Code of Ethics (which each employee, on an annual basis, is required to read and acknowledge in writing) that requires all employees to disclose any outside activities and relationships that may pose a conflict of interest with DISCLOSING PARTY and its activities.

Litigation and Regulatory Matters Document Follows This Page

Litigation and Regulatory Matters

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are routinely defendants in or parties to many pending and threatened legal actions and proceedings, including actions brought on behalf of various classes of claimants. These actions and proceedings are generally based on alleged violations of consumer protection, securities, environmental, banking, employment, contract and other laws. In some of these actions and proceedings, claims for substantial monetary damages are asserted against the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the ordinary course of business, the Corporation and its subsidiaries are also subject to regulatory and governmental examinations, information gathering requests, inquiries, investigations, and threatened legal actions and proceedings. For example, certain subsidiaries of the Corporation are registered broker-dealers or investment advisors and are subject to regulation by the SEC, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the European Commission, the PRA, the FCA and other international, federal and state securities regulators. In connection with formal and informal inquiries, the Corporation and its subsidiaries receive numerous requests, subpoenas and orders for documents, testimony and information in connection with various aspects of the Corporation's regulated activities.

In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of such litigation, regulatory and governmental matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages or where the matters present novel legal theories or involve a large number of parties, the Corporation generally cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the pending matters will be, what the timing of the ultimate resolution of these matters will be, or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be.

In accordance with applicable accounting guidance, the Corporation establishes an accrued liability for litigation, regulatory and governmental matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and estimable. In such cases, there may be an exposure to loss in excess of any amounts accrued. As a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter develops, the Corporation, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, evaluates on an ongoing basis whether such matter presents a loss contingency that is probable and estimable. When a loss contingency is not both probable and estimable, the Corporation does not establish an accrued liability. If, at the time of evaluation, the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is not both probable and estimable, the matter will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and estimable. Once the loss contingency related to a litigation, regulatory or governmental matter is deemed to be both probable and

estimable, the Corporation will establish an accrued liability with respect to such loss contingency and record a corresponding amount of litigation-related expense. The Corporation continues to monitor the matter for further developments that could affect the amount of the accrued liability that has been previously established. Excluding expenses of internal or external legal service providers, litigation-related expense of \$16.4 billion was recognized for 2014 compared to \$6.1 billion for 2013.

For a limited number of the matters disclosed in this Note for which a loss, whether in excess of a related accrued liability or where there is no accrued liability, is reasonably possible in future periods, the Corporation is able to estimate a range of possible loss. In determining whether it is possible to estimate a range of possible loss, the Corporation reviews and evaluates its material litigation, regulatory and governmental matters on an ongoing basis, in conjunction with any outside counsel handling the matter, in light of potentially relevant factual and legal developments. These may include information learned through the discovery process, rulings on dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and other rulings by courts, arbitrators or others. In cases in which the Corporation possesses sufficient appropriate information to estimate a range of possible loss, that estimate is aggregated and disclosed below. There may be other disclosed matters for which a loss is probable or reasonably possible but such an estimate of the range of possible loss may not be possible. For those matters where an estimate of the range of possible loss is possible, management currently estimates the aggregate range of possible loss is \$0 to \$2.7 billion in excess of the accrued liability (if any) related to those matters. This estimated range of possible loss is based upon currently available information and is subject to significant judgment and a variety of assumptions, and known and unknown uncertainties. The matters underlying the estimated range will change from time to time, and actual results may vary significantly from the current estimate. Those matters for which an estimate is not possible are not included within this estimated range. Therefore, this estimated range of possible loss represents what the Corporation believes to be an estimate of possible loss only for certain matters meeting these criteria. It does not represent the Corporation's maximum loss exposure.

Information is provided below regarding the nature of all of these contingencies and, where specified, the amount of the claim associated with these loss contingencies. Based on current knowledge, management does not believe that loss contingencies arising from pending matters, including the matters described herein, will have a material adverse effect on the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Corporation. However, in light of the inherent uncertainties involved in these matters, some of which are beyond the Corporation's control, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some of these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to the Corporation's results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period.

Bond Insurance Litigation Ambac Countrywide Litigation

The Corporation, Countrywide and other Countrywide entities are named as defendants in an action filed on September 29, 2010 and as amended on May 28, 2013, by Ambac Assurance Corporation and the Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation (together, Ambac), entitled Ambac Assurance Corporation and The Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corporation v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. This action, currently pending in New York Supreme Court, New York County, relates to bond insurance policies provided by Ambac on certain securitized pools of second-lien (and in one pool, first-lien) HELOCs, first-lien subprime home equity loans and fixed-rate second-lien mortgage loans. Plaintiffs allege that they have paid claims as a result of defaults in the underlying loans and assert that the Countrywide defendants misrepresented the characteristics of the underlying loans and breached certain contractual representations and warranties regarding the underwriting and servicing of the loans. Plaintiffs also allege that the Corporation is liable based on successor liability theories. Damages claimed by Ambac are in excess of \$2.2 billion and include the amount of payments for current and future claims it has paid or claims it will be obligated to pay under the policies, increasing over time as it pays claims under relevant policies, plus unspecified punitive damages.

On December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a second complaint in the same court against the same defendants, claiming fraudulent inducement against Countrywide and successor and vicarious liability against the Corporation relating to eight partially Ambac-insured RMBS transactions that closed between 2005 and 2007, all backed by negative amortization pay option adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) loans that were originated in whole or in part by Countrywide. Seven of the eight securitizations were issued and underwritten by non-parties to the litigation. Ambac claims damages in excess of \$600 million consisting of all alleged past and future claims against its policies, plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Also on December 30, 2014, Ambac filed a third action in Wisconsin Circuit Court, Dane County, against Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., claiming that it was fraudulently induced to insure portions of five securitizations issued and underwritten in 2005 by a non-party that included Countrywide originated first-lien negative amortization pay option ARM loans. The complaint claims damages in excess of \$350 million for all alleged past and future Ambac insured claims payment obligations plus other unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.

Ambac First Franklin Litigation

On April 16, 2012, Ambac sued First Franklin Financial Corp., BANA, MLPF&S, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc. (MLML), and Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. Plaintiffs' claims relate to guaranty insurance Ambac provided on a First Franklin securitization (Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2007-FFC). The securitization was sponsored by MLML, and certain certificates in the securitization were insured by Ambac. The complaint alleges that defendants breached representations and warranties concerning the origination of the underlying mortgage loans and asserts claims for fraudulent inducement, breach of contract and indemnification. Plaintiffs also assert breach of contract claims against BANA based upon its servicing of the loans in the securitization. The complaint alleges that Ambac has paid hundreds of millions of dollars in claims and has accrued and continues to accrue tens of millions of dollars in additional claims, and Ambac seeks as damages the total claims it has paid and its projected claims payment obligations, as well as specific performance of defendants' contractual repurchase obligations.

Bank of America 2014 216

On July 19, 2013, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's contract and fraud causes of action but granted dismissal of Ambac's indemnification cause of action. In addition, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss Ambac's claims for attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

European Commission - Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Investigation On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (Commission) announced that it had addressed a Statement of Objections (SO) to the Corporation, BANA and Banc of America Securities LLC (together, the Bank of America Entities), a number of other financial institutions, Markit Group Limited, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (together, the Parties). The SO sets forth the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the Parties infringed European Union competition law by participating in alleged collusion to prevent exchange trading of CDS and futures. According to the SO, the conduct of the Bank of America Entities took place between August 2007 and April 2009. As part of the Commission's procedures, the Parties have reviewed the evidence in the investigative file, responded to the Commission's preliminary conclusions and attended a hearing before the Commission. If the Commission is satisfied that its preliminary conclusions are proved, the Commission has stated that it intends to impose a fine and require appropriate remedial measures.

Kontainebclau Las Vegas Litigation

On June 9, 2009, Avenue CIO Fund Ltd., et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., Merrill Lynch Capital Corporation, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada by certain Fontaineblcau Las Vegas, LLC (FBLV) project lenders. Plaintiffs alleged that, among other things, BANA breached its duties as disbursement agent under the agreement governing the disbursement of loaned funds to FBLV, then a Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages of more than \$700 million, plus interest. This action was subsequently transferred by the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

On March 19, 2012, the district court granted BANA's motion for summary judgment on all causes of action against it in its capacity as disbursement agent and denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on those claims. On July 26, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's dismissal of the disbursement agent claims against BANA, holding that there were factual disputes that could not be resolved on a summary judgment motion, and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

Dismissal of the other claims was affirmed on a separate appeal. On December 13, 2013, the JPML remanded the action to the District of Nevada for trial.

The parties have settled the action for \$300 million, an amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiffs have stipulated to the voluntary dismissal of their remaining claims with prejudice.

In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation

Beginning in January 2009, the Corporation, as well as certain current and former officers and directors, among others, were named as defendants in a variety of actions filed in state and federal courts. The actions generally concern alleged material misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to certain securities filings by the Corporation. The securities filings contained information with respect to events that took place from September 2008 through January 2009 contemporaneous with the Corporation's acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (Merrill Lynch). Certain federal court actions were consolidated and/or coordinated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (the District Court) under the caption In re Bank of America Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation.

Plaintiffs in the consolidated securities class action (the Consolidated Securities Class Action) asserted claims under Sections 14(a), 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and asserted damages based on the drop in the stock price upon subsequent disclosures. On April 5, 2013, the District Court granted final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On November 5, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the final approval of the settlement of the Consolidated Securities Class Action. On February 3, 2015, the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court elapsed without any objector filing a petition.

Certain shareholders opted to pursue their claims apart from the Consolidated Securities Class Action. Following settlements in an aggregate amount that was fully accrued as of December 31, 2013, the District Court dismissed the claims of these plaintiffs with prejudice.

In addition, on January 11, 2013, the District Court approved the settlement of claims filed by plaintiffs in a derivative action in the Consolidated Securities Class Action, which also resolved a consolidated derivative action filed in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

In addition, the District Court dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiffs in the ERISA actions in the Consolidated Securities Class Action on August 27, 2010, and the parties stipulated to the withdrawal of the appeal of that decision on January 14, 2013.

Interchange and Related Litigation

In 2005, a group of merchants filed a series of putative class actions and individual actions directed at interchange fees associated with Visa and MasterCard payment card transactions. These actions, which were consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York under the caption In Re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Anti-Trust Litigation (Interchange), named Visa, MasterCard and several banks and bank holding companies (BHCs), including the Corporation, as defendants. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix the level of default interchange rates and that certain rules of Visa and MasterCard related to merchant acceptance of payment cards at the point of sale were unreasonable restraints of trade. Plaintiffs sought unspecified damages and injunctive relief.

217 Bank of America 2014

On October 19, 2012, defendants settled the matter. The settlement provides for, among other things, (i) payments by defendants to the class and individual plaintiffs totaling approximately \$6.6 billion, allocated proportionately to each defendant based upon various loss-sharing agreements; (ii) distribution to class merchants of an amount equal to 10 bps of default interchange across all Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions for a period of eight consecutive months, to begin by July 29, 2013, which otherwise would have been paid to issuers and which effectively reduces credit interchange for that period of time; and (iii) modifications to certain Visa and MasterCard rules regarding merchant point of sale practices.

The court granted final approval of the class settlement agreement on December 13, 2013. Several class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In addition, a number of class members opted out of the settlement of their past damages claims. The cash portion of the settlement was adjusted downward as a result of these opt outs.

The Corporation is named in three of the opt-out suits, including one brought by cardholders, and, as a result of various sharing agreements from the main Interchange litigation, the Corporation remains liable for any settlement or judgment in opt-out suits where it is not named as a defendant. All but one of the opt-out suits filed to date have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. On July 18, 2014, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss opt-out complaints filed by merchants, and on November 26, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the Sherman Act claim in the cardholder complaint.

LIBOR, Other Reference Rate and Foreign Exchange (FX) Inquiries and Litigation

The Corporation has received subpoenas and information requests from government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region, including the DoJ, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the FCA, concerning submissions made by panel banks in connection with the setting of LIBOR and other reference rates. The Corporation is cooperating with these inquiries.

In addition, the Corporation and BANA have been named as defendants along with most of the other LIBOR panel banks in a series of individual and class actions in various U.S. federal and state courts relating to defendants' LIBOR contributions. All cases naming the Corporation have been or are in the process of being consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the JPML. The Corporation expects that any future cases naming it will similarly be consolidated for pre-trial purposes. Plaintiffs allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of collusion or manipulation by defendants regarding the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Plaintiffs assert a variety of claims, including antitrust and Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), common law fraud, and breach of contract claims, and seek compensatory, treble and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

In a series of rulings, the court dismissed antitrust, RICO and certain state law claims, while permitting the Commodity Exchange Act and other state law claims to proceed. As a result of a procedural ruling by the Supreme Court, plaintiffs are pursuing an immediate appeal of the dismissal of their antitrust claims. Further, based on the statute of limitations, the court has substantially

limited the time period for which manipulation claims under the Commodity Exchange Act may be pursued. As to the Corporation and BANA, the court has also dismissed manipulation claims based on alleged trader conduct, and certain common law claims by plaintiffs who alleged no direct dealings with the Corporation or BANA. Other claims against the Corporation and BANA remain pending, however, and the court is continuing to consider motions regarding them, including the applicability of its prior rulings to subsequently filed actions.

Certain regulatory and government authorities in North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region are conducting investigations and making inquiries of a significant number of FX market participants, including the Corporation, regarding FX market participants' conduct and systems and controls over multiple years. The Corporation is cooperating with these investigations and inquiries, some of which are likely to lead to regulatory or legal proceedings and expose the Corporation to material penalties, fines or losses, and could adversely affect its reputation.

In particular, in November 2014, the Corporation resolved a matter with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) by agreeing to the imposition of mandatory remedial measures and payment of \$250 million in civil penalties associated with the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls.

The Corporation is in separate advanced discussions to resolve the regulatory matters of concern to another U.S. banking regulator involving the Corporation's FX business and its systems and controls. There can be no assurances that these discussions will lead to a resolution, or of the amount or timing of any such resolution.

In addition, in a consolidated amended complaint filed on March 31, 2014, the Corporation and BANA were named as defendants along with other FX market participants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of plaintiffs and a putative class who allegedly transacted in FX and are domiciled in the U.S. or transacted in FX in the U.S. (the U.S. Action). On April 30, 2014, a substantively similar class action was filed against the Corporation and other FX market participants on behalf of a plaintiff and putative class allegedly located in Norway (the Foreign Action). The complaints allege that class members transacted with defendants at or around the time of the fixing of the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates or entered into transactions that settled in whole or in part based on the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates and that they sustained losses as a result of the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates. Plaintiffs in the U.S. Action assert a single claim for violations of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, and plaintiff in the Foreign Action asserts claims for violations of the Sherman Act, as well as certain claims under New York statutory and common law. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and treble damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

On January 28, 2015, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the U.S. Action, finding that plaintiffs had sufficiently pleaded the elements of an antitrust claim. In the same decision, the court granted with prejudice defendants' motion to dismiss the Foreign Action, finding that the Sherman Act does not apply extraterritorially, except in limited circumstances not present in the case, and that plaintiff had failed to plead an actionable state law claim.

Bank of America 2014 218

Montgomery

The Corporation, several current and former officers and directors, Banc of America Securities LLC (BAS), MLPF&S and other unaffiliated underwriters have been named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Montgomery v. Bank of America, et al.* Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on January 14, 2011. Plaintiff seeks to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired certain series of preferred stock offered by the Corporation pursuant to a shelf registration statement dated May 5, 2006. Plaintiff's claims arise from three offerings dated January 24, 2008, January 28, 2008 and May 20, 2008, from which the Corporation allegedly received proceeds of \$15.8 billion. The amended complaint asserts claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleges that the prospectus supplements associated with the offerings: (i) failed to disclose that the Corporation's loans, leases, CDOs and commercial MBS were impaired to a greater extent than disclosed; (ii) misrepresented the extent of the impaired assets by failing to establish adequate reserves or properly record losses for its impaired assets; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of the Corporation's internal controls in light of the alleged impairment of its assets; (iv) misrepresented the Corporation's capital base and Tier 1 leverage ratio for risk-based capital in light of the allegedly impaired assets; and (v) misrepresented the thoroughness and adequacy of the Corporation's due diligence in connection with its acquisition of Countrywide. The amended complaint seeks rescission, compensatory and other damages. On March 16, 2012, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. On December 3, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion to file a second amended complaint. On February 6, 2014, plaintiffs appealed the denial of their motion to amend to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mortgage-backed Securities Litigation

The Corporation and its affiliates, Countrywide entities and their affiliates, and Merrill Lynch entities and their affiliates have been named as defendants in a number of cases relating to their various roles as issuer, originator, seller, depositor, sponsor, underwriter and/or controlling entity in MBS offerings, pursuant to which the MBS investors were entitled to a portion of the cash flow from the underlying pools of mortgages. These cases generally include purported class action suits and actions by individual MBS purchasers. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the registration statements, prospectuses and prospectus supplements for securities issued by securitization trusts contained material misrepresentations and omissions, in violation of the Securities Act of 1933 and/or state securities laws and other state statutory and common laws.

These cases generally involve allegations of false and misleading statements regarding: (i) the process by which the properties that served as collateral for the mortgage loans underlying the MBS were appraised; (ii) the percentage of equity that mortgage borrowers had in their homes; (iii) the borrowers' ability to repay their mortgage loans; (iv) the underwriting practices by which those mortgage loans were originated; (v) the ratings given to the different tranches of MBS by rating agencies; and (vi) the validity of such ratings. Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek rescission, compensatory and other damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

each issuing trust's title to the mortgage loans comprising the pool for that securitization (collectively, MBS Claims). Plaintiffs in these cases generally seek unspecified compensatory damages, unspecified costs and legal fees and, in some instances, seek rescission.

The Corporation, Countrywide, Merrill Lynch and/or their affiliates may have claims for and/or may be subject to claims for contractual indemnification in connection with their various roles in regard to MBS.

On August 15, 2011, the JPML ordered multiple federal court cases involving Countrywide MBS consolidated for pretrial purposes in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in a multi-district litigation entitled *Countrywide Financial Corp. Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation* (the Countrywide RMBS MDL).

Federal Home Loan Bank Litigation

On March 15, 2010, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB San Francisco) filed an action in California Superior Court, San Francisco County, entitled *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, et al.* FHLB San Francisco's complaint asserts certain MBS Claims against BAS, Countrywide and several related entities in connection with its alleged purchase of 51 MBS offerings and one private placement issued and/or underwritten by those defendants between 2004 and 2007 and seeks rescission and unspecified damages. FHLB San Francisco dismissed the federal claims with prejudice on August 11, 2011. On September 8, 2011, the court denied defendants' motions to dismiss the state law claims. On December 20, 2013, FHLB San Francisco voluntarily dismissed its negligent misrepresentation claims with prejudice. On October 15, 2014, the court denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to two Countrywide trusts that were to be part of a bellwether trial.

The parties have settled the action and other related actions for \$420 million, as well as with respect to certain claims, additional consideration; all amounts were fully accrued as of December 31, 2014. Pursuant to the settlement, FHLB San Francisco has voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims with prejudice.

Luther Class Action Litigation and Related Actions Beginning in 2007, a number of pension funds and other investors filed putative class action lawsuits alleging certain MBS Claims against Countrywide, several of its affiliates, MLPF&S, the Corporation, NB Holdings Corporation and certain other defendants. Those class action lawsuits concerned a total of 429 MBS offerings involving over \$350 billion in securities issued by subsidiaries of Countrywide between 2005 and 2007. The actions, entitled *Luther v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Maine State Retirement System v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, *Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust Fund v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, and *Putnam Bank v. Countrywide Financial Corporation, et al.*, were all assigned to the Countrywide RMBS MDL court. On December 6, 2013, the court granted final approval to a settlement of these actions in the amount of \$500 million. Beginning on January 14, 2014, a number of class members appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Prudential Insurance Litigation

On March 14, 2013, The Prudential Insurance Company of America and certain of its affiliates (collectively Prudential) filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in a case entitled *Prudential Insurance Company of America, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Prudential has named the Corporation, Merrill

21> Bank of America 2014

Lynch and a number of related entities as defendants. Prudential asserts certain MBS Claims pertaining to 54 MBS offerings from which Prudential alleges that it purchased securities between 2004 and 2007. Prudential seeks, among other relief, compensatory damages, rescission or a rescissory measure of damages, punitive damages and other unspecified relief. On April 17, 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint. Prudential thereafter split its claims into two separate complaints, filing an amended complaint in the original action and a complaint in a separate action entitled *Prudential Portfolios 2, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.* Both cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. On February 5, 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss those complaints, granting plaintiff leave to replead in certain respects.

Mortgage Repurchase Litigation U.S. Bank Litigation

On August 29, 2011, U.S. Bank, National Association (U.S. Bank), as trustee for the HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-10 (the Trust), a mortgage pool backed by loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (CHL), filed a complaint in New York Supreme Court, New York County, in a case entitled *U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for HarborView Mortgage Loan Trust, Series 2005-10 v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (dba Bank of America Home Loans), Bank of America Corporation, Countrywide Financial Corporation, Bank of America, N.A. and NB Holdings Corporation*. U.S. Bank asserts that, as a result of alleged misrepresentations by CHL in connection with its sale of the loans, defendants must repurchase all the loans in the pool, or in the alternative that it must repurchase a subset of those loans as to which U.S. Bank alleges that defendants have refused specific repurchase demands. U.S. Bank asserts claims for breach of contract and seeks specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase the entire pool of loans (alleged to have an original aggregate principal balance of \$1.75 billion) or alternatively the aforementioned subset (alleged to have an aggregate principal balance of "over \$100 million"), together with reimbursement of costs and expenses and other unspecified relief. On May 29, 2013, the New York Supreme Court dismissed U.S. Bank's claim for repurchase of all the mortgage loans in the Trust. The court granted U.S. Bank leave to amend this claim. On June 18, 2013, U.S. Bank filed its second amended complaint seeking to replead its claim for repurchase of all loans in the Trust. On February 13, 2014, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the repleaded claim seeking repurchase of all mortgage loans in the Trust; plaintiff has appealed that order.

On November 13, 2014, the court granted U.S. Bank's motion for leave to amend the complaint; defendants have appealed that order. The amended complaint alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' failure to repurchase loans that were the subject of specific repurchase demands and also alleges breach of contract based upon defendants' discovery, during origination and servicing, of loans with material breaches of representations and warranties.

U.S. Bank Summonses with Notice

On August 29, 2014, U.S. Bank, solely in its capacity as Trustee for seven securitization trusts (the Trusts), served seven summonses with notice commencing potential actions against First Franklin Financial Corporation, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Lending, Inc., Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., and Owin Mortgage Solutions Inc. in New York Supreme Court, New York County. The summonses indicate that defendants may be subject to breach of contract claims alleging that they breached representations and warranties related to loans securitized in the Trusts. The summonses allege that defendants failed to repurchase breaching mortgage loans from the Trusts. The summonses seek specific performance of defendants' alleged obligation to repurchase breaching loans, declaratory judgment, compensatory, rescissory and other damages, and indemnity. On February 5, 2015, defendants demanded complaints on three of the Trusts. Defendants currently have until March 3, 2015 to demand the complaint with respect to one of the remaining Trusts, and until July 15, 2015 to demand complaints on the final three Trusts.

Ocala Investor Litigation

On November 25, 2009, BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporation (BNP) and Deutsche Bank AG each filed claims (the 2009 Actions) against BANA in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *BNP Paribas Mortgage Corporations. Bank of America, N.A. and Deutsche Bank AG v. Bank of America, N.A.* Plaintiffs allege that BANA failed to properly perform its duties as indenture trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository for Ocala Funding, LLC (Ocala), a home mortgage warehousing facility, resulting in the loss of plaintiffs' investment in Ocala. Ocala was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Taylor, Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. (TBW), a home mortgage originator and servicer which is alleged to have committed fraud that led to its eventual bankruptcy. Ocala provided funding for TBW's mortgage origination activities by issuing notes, the proceeds of which were to be used by TBW to originate home mortgages. Such mortgages and other Ocala assets in turn were pledged to BANA as collateral agent, to secure the notes. Plaintiffs lost most or all of their investment in Ocala when, as the result of the alleged fraud committed by TBW, Ocala was unable to repay the notes purchased by plaintiffs and there was insufficient collateral to satisfy Ocala's debt obligations. Plaintiffs allege that BANA breached its contractual, fiduciary and other duties to Ocala, thereby permitting TBW's alleged fraud to go undetected. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and other relief from BANA, including interest and attorneys' fees, in an unspecified amount, but which plaintiffs allege exceeds \$1.6 billion.

On March 23, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part BANA's motions to dismiss the 2009 Actions. Plaintiffs filed amended complaints on October 1, 2012 that included additional contractual, tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the court granted BANA's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims for failure to sue, negligence, negligent misrepresentation and equitable relief.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On November 24, 2014, BANA moved for summary judgment and plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

On February 19, 2015, BANA and BNP reached an agreement in principle to settle the 2009 actions for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to the execution of a final settlement agreement.

O'Donnell Litigation

On February 24, 2012, Edward O'Donnell filed a sealed qui tam complaint under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and the False Claims Act against the Corporation, individually, and as successor to Countrywide,

Bank of America 2014 220

CHL and a Countrywide business division known as Full Spectrum Lending. On October 24, 2012, the DoJ filed a complaint-in-intervention to join the matter, adding BANA, Countrywide and CHL as defendants. The action is entitled United States of America, ex rel, Edward O'Donnell, appearing Qui Tam v. Bank of America Corp., et al., and was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint-in-intervention asserted certain fraud claims in connection with the sale of loans to FNMA and FHLMC by Full Spectrum Lending and by the Corporation and BANA. On January 11, 2013, the government filed an amended complaint which added Countrywide Bank, FSB (CFSB) and a former officer of the Corporation as defendants. The court dismissed False Claims Act counts on May 8, 2013. On September 6, 2013, the government filed a second amended complaint alleging claims under FIRREA concerning allegedly fraudulent loan sales to the GSEs between August 2007 and May 2008. On September 24, 2013, the government dismissed the Corporation as a defendant.

Following a trial, on October 23, 2013, a verdict of liability was returned against CHL, CFSB and BANA. On July 30, 2014, the court imposed a civil penalty of \$1.3 billion on BANA. On February 3, 2015, the court denied the Corporation's motions for judgment as a matter of law, or in the alternative, a new trial. The Corporation will appeal the verdict and judgment.

Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System The Corporation and several current and former officers were named as defendants in a putative class action filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York entitled *Pennsylvania Public School Employees' Retirement System v. Bank of America, et al.*

Following the filing of a complaint on February 2, 2011, plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 23, 2011 in which plaintiff sought to sue on behalf of all persons who acquired the Corporation's common stock between February 27, 2009 and October 19, 2010 and "Common Equivalent Securities" sold in a December 2009 offering. The amended complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, and alleged that the Corporation's public statements: (i) concealed problems in the Corporation's mortgage servicing business resulting from the widespread use of the Mortgage Electronic Recording System; (ii) failed to disclose the Corporation's exposure to mortgage repurchase claims; (iii) misrepresented the adequacy of internal controls; and (iv) violated certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The amended complaint sought unspecified damages.

On July 11, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. All claims under the Securities Act were dismissed against all defendants, with prejudice. The motion to dismiss the claim against the Corporation under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act was denied. All claims under the Exchange Act against the officers were dismissed, with leave to replead. Defendants moved to dismiss a second amended complaint in which plaintiff sought to replead claims against certain current and former officers under Sections 10(b) and 20(a). On April 17, 2013, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss, sustaining Sections 10(b) and 20(a) claims against the current and former officers.

Policemen's Annuity Litigation

On April 11, 2012, the Policemen's Annuity & Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago, on its own behalf and on behalf of a proposed class of purchasers of 41 RMBS trusts collateralized mostly by Washington Mutual-originated (WaMu) mortgages, filed a proposed class action complaint against BANA and other unrelated parties in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, entitled *Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association*. BANA and U.S. Bank are named as defendants in their capacities as trustees, with BANA (formerly LaSalle Bank National Association) having served as the original trustee and U.S. Bank having replaced BANA as trustee. Plaintiff asserted claims under the federal Trust Indenture Act as well as state common law claims. Plaintiff alleged that, in light of the performance of the RMBS at issue, and in the wake of publicly-available information about the quality of loans originated by WaMu, the trustees were required to take certain steps to protect plaintiff's interest in the value of the securities, and that plaintiff was damaged by defendants' failures to notify it of deficiencies in the loans and of defaults under the relevant agreements, to ensure that the underlying mortgages could properly be foreclosed, and to enforce remedies available for loans that contained breaches of representations and warranties. Plaintiff sought unspecified compensatory damages and/or equitable relief, and costs and expenses. The court dismissed some of the common law claims, but allowed the Trust Indenture Act claim and a claim for breach of contract to proceed. After the filing of two amended complaints and the consolidation of the case with a related matter filed on August 23, 2013, entitled *Vermont Pension Investment Committee and the Washington State Investment Board v. Bank of America, N.A. and U.S. Bank National Association*, 10 named plaintiffs filed a third amended complaint on October 31, 2013, on behalf of two proposed classes of purchasers of 35 trusts collateralized mostly by WaMu-originated mortgages (later reduced to 34 trusts).

On June 5, 2014, the parties informed the court that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle the case for an amount not material to the Corporation's results of operations, subject to approval of plaintiffs' boards. The settlement remains subject to final court approval and various conditions. On November 10, 2014, the court preliminarily approved the proposed settlement, and scheduled a final approval hearing for March 12, 2015.

Takefuji Litigation

In April 2010, Takefuji Corporation (Takefuji) filed a claim against Merrill Lynch International and Merrill Lynch Japan Securities (MUS) in Tokyo District Court. The claim concerns Takefuji's purchase in 2007 of credit-linked notes structured and sold by defendants that resulted in a loss to Takefuji of approximately JPY29.0 billion (approximately \$270 million) following an event of default. Takefuji alleges that defendants failed to meet certain disclosure obligations concerning the notes.

On July 19, 2013, the Tokyo District Court issued a judgment in defendants' favor, a decision that Takefuji subsequently appealed to the Tokyo High Court. On August 27, 2014, the Tokyo High Court vacated the decision of the District Court and issued a judgment awarding Takefuji JPY14.5 billion (approximately \$135 million) in damages, plus interest at a rate of five percent from March 18, 2008. On September 10, 2014, defendants filed an appeal with the Japanese Supreme Court.