

Information Supplement

Insured Municipals Income Trust Investors' Quality Tax-Exempt Trust Van Kampen Focus Portfolios, Municipal Series Van Kampen Unit Trusts, Municipal Series Invesco Unit Trusts, Municipal Series

This Information Supplement provides additional information concerning the risks and operations of the Trusts which is not described in the prospectus for the Trusts. This Information Supplement should be read in conjunction with the Trust's prospectus. This Information Supplement is not a prospectus (but is incorporated into the prospectus by reference), does not include all of the information that an investor should consider before investing in a Trust and may not be used to offer or sell Units without the prospectus. Copies of the prospectus can be obtained by contacting the Sponsor's unit investment trust division at 3500 Lacey Road, Suite 700, Downers Grove, Illinois 60515-5456 or by contacting your broker. This Information Supplement is dated as of the date of Prospectus Part I and all capitalized terms have been defined in the prospectus.

Table of Contents

	Page
Municipal Bond Risk Factors	2
Insurance on the Bonds	6
Portfolio Administration	12
Sponsor Information	13
Trustee Information	13
Termination of the Trust Agreement	14
Description of Ratings	15
State Trust Risk Factors	17



Municipal Bond Risk Factors

The Trusts include certain types of bonds described below. Accordingly, an investment in a Trust should be made with an understanding of the characteristics of and risks associated with such bonds. The types of bonds included in each Trust are described under "Portfolio" in the related Prospectus Part I. Neither the Sponsor nor the Trustee shall be liable in any way for any default, failure or defect in any of the bonds.

General Obligation Bonds and Revenue Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be general obligations of a governmental entity that are backed by the taxing power of such entity. All other bonds in the Trusts are revenue bonds payable from the income of a specific project or authority and are not supported by the issuer's power to levy taxes. General obligation bonds are secured by the issuer's pledge of its faith, credit and taxing power for the payment of principal and interest. However, the taxing power of any governmental entity may be limited by provisions of state constitutions or laws and an entity's credit will depend on many factors. Some such factors are the entity's tax base, the extent to which the entity relies on federal or state aid, and other factors which are beyond the entity's control. Revenue bonds, on the other hand, are payable only from the revenues derived from a particular facility or class of facilities or, in some cases, from the proceeds of a special excise tax or other specific revenue source. There are, of course, variations in the security of the different bonds in a Trust, both within a particular classification and between classifications, depending on numerous factors.

Housing Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations which derive their payments from mortgage loans. Certain of such housing bonds may be FHA insured. Multi-family housing revenue bonds are payable primarily from mortgage loans to housing projects for low to moderate income families. Single family mortgage revenue bonds are issued for the purpose of acquiring from originating financial institutions notes secured by mortgages on residences located within the issuer's boundaries and owned by persons of low or moderate income. The ability of housing issuers to make debt service payments on their obligations may be affected by various economic and non-economic factors. Such factors include: occupancy levels, adequate rental income in multi-family projects, the rate of default on mortgage loans underlying single family issuers and the ability of mortgage insurers to pay claims. Mortgage loans are generally partially or completely prepaid prior to their final maturities as a result of events such as sale of the mortgaged premises, default, condemnation or casualty loss. Because these bonds are subject to extraordinary mandatory redemption in whole or in part from such prepayments of mortgage loans, a substantial portion of such bonds will probably be redeemed prior to their scheduled maturities or even prior to their ordinary call dates. Extraordinary mandatory redemption without premium could also result from the failure of the originating financial institutions to make mortgage loans in sufficient amounts within a specified time period. Additionally, unusually high rates of default on the underlying mortgage loans may reduce revenues available for the payment of principal of or interest on such mortgage revenue bonds. In each case the issuer of the bonds has covenanted to comply with applicable requirements and bond counsel to such issuer has issued an opinion that the interest on the bonds is exempt from federal income tax under existing laws and regulations. Certain issuers of housing bonds have considered various ways to redeem bonds they have issued prior to the stated first redemption dates for such bonds. In connection with the housing bonds held by a Trust, the Sponsor at the Date of Deposit is not aware that any of the respective issuers of such bonds are actively considering the redemption of such bonds prior to their respective stated initial call dates.

Health Care Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be health care revenue bonds. Ratings of bonds issued for health care facilities are often based on feasibility studies that contain projections of occupancy levels, revenues and expenses. A facility's gross receipts and net income available for debt service may be affected by future events and conditions including, among other things, demand for services and the ability of the facility to provide the services required, physicians' confidence in the facility, management capabilities, competition with other health care facilities, efforts by insurers and governmental agencies to limit rates, legislation establishing state rate-setting agencies, expenses, the cost and possible unavailability of malpractice insurance, the funding of Medicare, Medicaid and other similar third party payor programs, government regulation and the termination or restriction of

governmental financial assistance, including that associated with Medicare, Medicaid and other similar third party payor programs. It also may be necessary for a hospital or other health care facility to incur substantial capital expenditures or increased operating expenses to effect changes in its facilities, equipment, personnel and services. Hospitals and other health care facilities are additionally subject to claims and legal actions by patients and others in the ordinary course of business. There can be no assurance that a claim will not exceed the insurance coverage of a health care facility or that insurance coverage will be available to a facility.

Public Utility and Wholesale Electric Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations of public utility issuers, including those selling wholesale and retail electric power and gas. General problems of such issuers would include the difficulty in financing large construction programs in an inflationary period, the limitations on operations and increased costs and delays attributable to environmental considerations, the difficulty of the capital market in absorbing utility debt, the difficulty in obtaining fuel at reasonable prices and the effect of energy conservation. In addition, federal, state and municipal governmental authorities may from time to time review existing, and impose additional, regulations governing the licensing, construction and operation of nuclear power plants, which may adversely affect the ability of the issuers of certain of the bonds to make payments of principal and/or interest on such bonds.

Water and Sewer Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations of issuers whose revenues are derived from the sale of water and/or sewerage services. Such bonds are generally payable from user fees. The problems of such issuers include the ability to obtain timely and adequate rate increases, population decline resulting in decreased user fees, the difficulty of financing large construction programs, the limitations on operations and increased costs and delays attributable to environmental considerations, the increasing difficulty of obtaining or discovering new supplies of fresh water, the effect of conservation programs and the impact of “no-growth” zoning ordinances.

Industrial Revenue Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be industrial revenue bonds (“IRBs”). IRBs have generally been issued under bond resolutions pursuant to which the revenues and receipts payable under the arrangements with the operator of a particular project have been assigned and pledged to purchasers. In some cases, a mortgage on the underlying project may have been granted as security for the IRBs. Regardless of the structure, payment of IRBs is solely dependent upon the creditworthiness of the corporate operator of the project or corporate guarantor. Corporate operators or guarantors may be affected by many factors which may have an adverse impact on the credit quality of the particular company or industry. These include cyclicalities of revenues and earnings, regulatory and environmental restrictions, litigation resulting from accidents or environmentally-caused illnesses, extensive competition and financial deterioration resulting from a corporate restructuring pursuant to a leveraged buy-out, takeover or otherwise. Such a restructuring may result in the operator of a project becoming highly leveraged which may impact on such operator’s creditworthiness which in turn would have an adverse impact on the rating and/or market value of such bonds. Further, the possibility of such a restructuring may have an adverse impact on the market for and consequently the value of such bonds, even though no actual takeover or other action is ever contemplated or effected.

Lease Obligation Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations that are secured by lease payments of a governmental entity (hereinafter called “lease obligations”). Lease obligations are often in the form of certificates of participation. Although the lease obligations do not constitute general obligations of the municipality for which the municipality’s taxing power is pledged, a lease obligation is ordinarily backed by the municipality’s covenant to appropriate for and make the payments due under the lease obligation. However, certain lease obligations contain “nonappropriation” clauses which provide that the municipality has no obligation to make lease payments in future years unless money is appropriated for such purpose on a yearly basis. A governmental entity that enters into such a lease agreement cannot obligate future governments to appropriate for and make lease payments but covenants to take such action as is necessary to include any lease payments due in its budgets and to make the appropriations therefore. A governmental entity’s failure to appropriate for and to make payments under its lease obligation could result in insufficient funds available for payment of the obligations secured thereby. Although

“non-appropriation” lease obligations are secured by the leased property, disposition of the property in the event of foreclosure might prove difficult.

Higher Educations and Public Education Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations of issuers which are, or which govern the operation of, schools, colleges and universities and whose revenues are derived mainly from ad valorem taxes or for higher education systems, from tuition, dormitory revenues, grants and endowments. General problems relating to school bonds include litigation contesting the state constitutionality of financing public education in part from ad valorem taxes, thereby creating a disparity in educational funds available to schools in wealthy areas and schools in poor areas. Litigation or legislation on this issue may affect the sources of funds available for the payment of school bonds in the Trusts. General problems relating to college and university obligations include the prospect of a declining percentage of the population consisting of “college” age individuals, possible inability to raise tuitions and fees sufficiently to cover increased operating costs, the availability and restrictions on the use of endowments and other funds, the uncertainty of continued receipt of federal grants and state funding, and government legislation or regulations which may adversely affect the revenues or costs of such issuers.

Airport and Transportation Bonds. Certain of the bonds in certain of the Trusts may be obligations which are payable from and secured by revenues derived from the ownership and operation of facilities such as airports, bridges, turnpikes, port authorities, convention centers and arenas. The major portion of an airport’s gross operating income is generally derived from fees received from signatory airlines pursuant to use agreements which consist of annual payments for leases, occupancy of certain terminal space and service fees. Airport operating income may therefore be affected by the ability of the airlines to meet their obligations under the use agreements. From time to time the air transport industry has experienced significant variations in earnings and traffic, due to increased competition, excess capacity, increased costs, deregulation, traffic constraints, acts of terrorism and other factors, and several airlines have experienced severe financial difficulties. Similarly, payment on bonds related to other facilities is dependent on revenues from the projects, such as user fees from ports, tolls on turnpikes and bridges and rents from buildings. Therefore, payment may be adversely affected by reduction in revenues due to such factors as increased cost of maintenance, decreased use of a facility, lower cost of alternative modes of transportation, scarcity of fuel and reduction or loss of rents.

Waste Disposal Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be obligations which are payable from and secured by revenues derived from the operation of resource recovery facilities. Resource recovery facilities are designed to process solid waste, generate steam and convert steam to electricity. Resource recovery bonds may be subject to extraordinary optional redemption at par upon the occurrence of certain circumstances, including but not limited to: destruction or condemnation of a project; contracts relating to a project becoming void, unenforceable or impossible to perform; changes in the economic availability of raw materials, operating supplies or facilities necessary for the operation of a project or technological or other unavoidable changes adversely affecting the operation of a project; and administrative or judicial actions which render contracts relating to the projects void, unenforceable or impossible to perform or impose unreasonable burdens or excessive liabilities. The Sponsor cannot predict the causes or likelihood of the redemption of resource recovery bonds in a Trust prior to the stated maturity of the bonds.

Original Issue Discount Bonds. Certain of the bonds may have been acquired at a market discount from par value at maturity. The coupon interest rates on discount bonds at the time they were purchased and deposited in a Trust were lower than the current market interest rates for newly issued bonds of comparable rating and type. If such interest rates for newly issued comparable bonds increase, the market discount of previously issued bonds will become greater, and if such interest rates for newly issued comparable bonds decline, the market discount of previously issued bonds will be reduced, other things being equal. Investors should also note that the value of bonds purchased at a market discount will increase in value faster than bonds purchased at a market premium if interest rates decrease. Conversely, if interest rates increase, the value of bonds purchased at a market discount will decrease faster than bonds purchased at a market premium. In addition, if interest rates rise, the prepayment risk of higher yielding, premium Securities and the prepayment benefit for lower yielding, discount bonds will be

reduced. A bond purchased at a market discount and held to maturity will have a larger portion of its total return in the form of taxable income and capital gain and less in the form of tax-exempt interest income than a comparable bond newly issued at current market rates. See “Federal Tax Status” in Prospectus Part II. Market discount attributable to interest changes does not indicate a lack of market confidence in the issue.

Zero Coupon Bonds. Certain of the bonds may be “zero coupon” bonds. Zero coupon bonds are purchased at a deep discount because the buyer receives only the right to receive a final payment at the maturity of the bond and does not receive any periodic interest payments. The effect of owning deep discount bonds which do not make current interest payments (such as the zero coupon bonds) is that a fixed yield is earned not only on the original investment but also, in effect, on all discount earned during the life of such obligation. This implicit reinvestment of earnings at the same rate eliminates the risk of being unable to reinvest the income on such obligation at a rate as high as the implicit yield on the discount obligation, but at the same time eliminates the holder’s ability to reinvest at higher rates in the future. For this reason, zero coupon bonds are subject to substantially greater price fluctuations during periods of changing market interest rates than are securities of comparable quality which pay interest.

Redemption or Sale Prior to Maturity. Certain of the bonds may be subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity date pursuant to sinking fund provisions, call provisions or extraordinary optional or mandatory redemption provisions or otherwise. A sinking fund is a reserve fund accumulated over a period of time for retirement of debt. A callable debt obligation is one which is subject to redemption or refunding prior to maturity at the option of the issuer. A refunding is a method by which a debt obligation is redeemed, at or before maturity, by the proceeds of a new debt obligation. In general, call provisions are more likely to be exercised when the offering side valuation is at a premium over par than when it is at a discount from par. The exercise of redemption or call provisions will (except to the extent the proceeds of the called bonds are used to pay for Unit redemptions) result in the distribution of principal and may result in a reduction in the amount of subsequent interest distributions; it may also affect the current return on Units of the Trust involved. Each Trust portfolio contains a listing of the sinking fund and call provisions, if any, with respect to each of the debt obligations. Extraordinary optional redemptions and mandatory redemptions result from the happening of certain events. Generally, events that may permit the extraordinary optional redemption of bonds or may require the mandatory redemption of bonds include, among others: a final determination that the interest on the bonds is taxable; the substantial damage or destruction by fire or other casualty of the project for which the proceeds of the bonds were used; an exercise by a local, state or federal governmental unit of its power of eminent domain to take all or substantially all of the project for which the proceeds of the bonds were used; changes in the economic availability of raw materials, operating supplies or facilities or technological or other changes which render the operation of the project for which the proceeds of the bonds were used uneconomic; changes in law or an administrative or judicial decree which renders the performance of the agreement under which the proceeds of the bonds were made available to finance the project impossible or which creates unreasonable burdens or which imposes excessive liabilities, such as taxes, not imposed on the date the bonds are issued on the issuer of the bonds or the user of the proceeds of the bonds; an administrative or judicial decree which requires the cessation of a substantial part of the operations of the project financed with the proceeds of the bonds; an overestimate of the costs of the project to be financed with the proceeds of the bonds resulting in excess proceeds of the bonds which may be applied to redeem bonds; or an underestimate of a source of funds securing the bonds resulting in excess funds which may be applied to redeem bonds. The issuer of certain bonds in a Trust may have sold or reserved the right to sell, upon the satisfaction of certain conditions, to third parties all or any portion of its rights to call bonds in accordance with the stated redemption provisions of such bonds. In such a case the issuer no longer has the right to call the bonds for redemption unless it reacquires the rights from such third party. A third party pursuant to these rights may exercise the redemption provisions with respect to a bond at a time when the issuer of the bond might not have called a bond for redemption had it not sold such rights. The Sponsor is unable to predict all of the circumstances which may result in such redemption of an issue of bonds. See also the discussion of single family mortgage and multi-family revenue bonds above for more information on the call provisions of such bonds.

To the best knowledge of the Sponsor, there is no litigation pending as of the Date of Deposit in respect of any bonds which might reasonably be expected to have a material adverse effect upon any of the Trusts.

At any time after the Date of Deposit, litigation may be initiated on a variety of grounds with respect to bonds in a Trust. Such litigation, as, for example, suits challenging the issuance of pollution control revenue bonds under environmental protection statutes, may affect the validity of such bonds or the tax-free nature of the interest thereon. While the outcome of litigation of such nature can never be entirely predicted, each Trust has received or will receive opinions of bond counsel to the issuing authorities of each bond on the date of issuance to the effect that such bonds have been validly issued and that the interest thereon is exempt from federal income tax. In addition, other factors may arise from time to time which potentially may impair the ability of issuers to meet obligations undertaken with respect to the bonds.

Insurance on the Bonds

Insurance has been obtained by the issuers of certain bonds in the Trusts prior to the deposit of such bonds in a Trust, guaranteeing prompt payment of interest and principal, when due, in respect of such bonds. See “The Trusts--Objective and Bond Selection” in the prospectus. The premium for any insurance policy or policies obtained by an issuer of bonds has been paid by such issuer, and any such policy or policies are non-cancelable and will continue in force so long as the bonds so insured are outstanding and the Preinsured Bond Insurer remains in business. If the provider of an original issuance insurance policy is unable to meet its obligations under such policy or if the rating assigned to the claims-paying ability of any such insurer deteriorates, the Preinsured Bond Insurers have no obligation to insure any issue adversely affected by either of the above described events.

ACA Financial Guaranty Corporation (“ACA Financial Guaranty”). ACA Financial Guaranty is organized and domiciled in the State of Maryland.

As of December 31, 2016, ACA Financial Guaranty had total admitted assets of \$309.3 million and total liabilities of \$267.2 million, resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$42.1 million.

The information relating to ACA Financial Guaranty contained above has been furnished by ACA Financial Guaranty or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Ambac Assurance Corporation (“Ambac Assurance”). Ambac Financial Group, Inc. (“Ambac”), headquartered in New York City, is a holding company incorporated in the state of Delaware on April 29, 1991. Ambac’s activities are divided into two business segments: (i) financial guarantee and (ii) financial services. Ambac provides financial guarantee insurance for public and structured finance obligations through its principal operating subsidiary, Ambac Assurance. As a holding company, Ambac is largely dependent on dividends from Ambac Assurance to pay principal and interest on its indebtedness and to pay its operating expenses.

On November 8, 2010, Ambac announced that it has filed for a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York. On May 1, 2013, Ambac emerged from Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection when the Second Modified Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization became effective. Upon emergence Ambac had no outstanding debt at the holding company and approximately \$5 billion of net operating loss carry-forwards, of which \$4.0 billion remain at December 31, 2016. The deterioration of the financial condition of Ambac Assurance and Ambac UK has prevented these companies from being able to write new business. An inability to write new business has and will continue to negatively impact Ambac’s future operations and financial results. Ambac Assurance’s ability to pay dividends and, as a result, Ambac’s liquidity, have been significantly restricted by the deterioration of Ambac Assurance’s financial condition, by the rehabilitation of the Segregated Account and by the terms of the Settlement Agreement, dated as of June 7, 2010 (the “Settlement Agreement”), by and among Ambac Assurance, Ambac Credit Products LLC (“ACP”), Ambac and certain counterparties to credit default swaps with ACP that were guaranteed by Ambac Assurance. Ambac Assurance is also restricted in its ability to pay

dividends pursuant to the terms of its Auction Market Preferred Shares. It is highly unlikely that Ambac Assurance will be able to make dividend payments to Ambac for the foreseeable future. Ambac Assurance and its subsidiaries have been working toward reducing uncertainties within its insured portfolio through active monitoring and management of key exposures such as Puerto Rico, asset-backed securities (including residential mortgage-backed (“RMBS”) and student loans) and municipal entities with stressed financial conditions. Additionally, Ambac Assurance and its subsidiaries are actively prosecuting legal claims (including RMBS related lawsuits), managing the regulatory framework and other aspects of the Segregated Account, seeking to optimize capital allocation in a challenging environment that includes long duration obligations and attempting to retain key employees. Ambac Assurance is subject to insurance regulatory requirements of the States of Wisconsin and New York, and the other jurisdictions in which it is licensed to conduct business.

Following the Company’s emergence from bankruptcy on May 1, 2013, the consolidated financial statements reflect the application of fresh start reporting (“Fresh Start”), incorporating, among other things, the discharge of debt obligations, issuance of new common stock and fair value adjustments.

Ambac Assurance’s statutory policyholder surplus and qualified statutory capital (defined as the sum of policyholders surplus and mandatory contingency reserves) were \$624.8 million and \$1,015.7 million at December 31, 2015, respectively, as compared to \$100.0 million and \$268.4 million at December 31, 2014, respectively. As of December 31, 2016, total stockholders’ equity was \$1.97 billion; at December 31, 2015, total stockholders’ equity was \$1.95 billion.

The information relating to Ambac Assurance contained above has been furnished by Ambac Assurance or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Assured Guaranty Corp. (“Assured Guaranty”) and Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. (“Assured Municipal”) (formerly Financial Security Assurance Inc. (“FSA”)). Assured Guaranty, a subsidiary of Assured Guaranty Ltd. (“Assured”), is organized in the State of Maryland and provides financial guaranty insurance to both the municipal and structured finance sectors. Assured Municipal, also a subsidiary of Assured, is a separately capitalized company organized in the State of New York and provides municipal bond insurance.

In January 2009, Assured Guaranty finalized an agreement with CIFG Assurance North America, Inc. to assume a diversified portfolio of financial guaranty contracts totaling approximately \$13.3 billion of net par outstanding. Assured Guaranty received \$75.6 million, which included \$85.7 million of upfront premiums net of ceding commissions and approximately \$12.2 million of future installments related to this transaction.

On July 1, 2009, Assured completed the purchase of Financial Security Assurance Holdings Ltd., the parent of financial guaranty insurance company, FSA, from Dexia Holdings Inc. Effective November 9, 2009, FSA was renamed Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. In certain states, Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. may operate under its prior name, Financial Security Assurance Inc.

On January 17, 2013, Moody’s downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of Assured Guaranty to A3 from Aa3 and of Assured Municipal to A2 from Aa3, both with a stable outlook. The January 17, 2013 downgrade reflects Moody’s reassessment of the business franchise, expected future profitability and financial flexibility of Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal. These ratings were affirmed on August 8, 2016.

On March 18, 2014, S&P raised the counterparty credit and financial strength ratings of both Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal to AA from AA-, with a stable outlook. The March 18, 2014 upgrade reflects S&P’s view that the competitive position of Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal remains strong relative to its peers’ in the bond insurance industry. On July 26, 2017, S&P affirmed its AA financial strength rating of Assured Guaranty, with a stable outlook. Also on June 26, 2017, S&P affirmed its A long-term counterparty credit rating for the parent company Assured, with a stable outlook.

Assured’s net income for 2016 was \$881 million compared with \$1,056 million in 2015. The decrease was due primarily to lower fair value gains on credit derivatives in 2016 compared with 2015. This was offset in part by

lower losses, loss and loss adjustment expenses, and higher premium accelerations. As of December 31, 2016, Assured Guaranty had total assets of \$5.22 billion and total liabilities of \$2.82 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$2.40 billion. As of December 31, 2016, Assured Municipal had total assets of \$8.45 billion and total liabilities of \$4.43 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$4.02 billion.

On April 1, 2015, Assured Guaranty acquired all issued and outstanding shares of Radian Asset Assurance, Inc. All prior obligations of Radian Asset are now obligations of Assured Guaranty.

The information contained above relating to Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal and their parent company, Assured, is based upon publicly available information, or upon information that has been provided by the ratings agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp (“BHAC”). BHAC is a bond insurance company created by Berkshire Hathaway, Inc. (“Berkshire”) in December 2007 and is licensed to write financial guarantee insurance in 49 states.

As of January 24, 2016, Moody’s reaffirmed its Aa1 insurance financial strength rating for BHAC with a stable outlook. On August 11, 2015, S&P placed the AA+ financial strength rating of BHAC on CreditWatch Negative. This action follows Berkshire Hathaway’s announcement of an agreement to acquire the debt of Precision Castparts Corp and reflects uncertainty surrounding the funding of the acquisition and its effect on cash resources and leverage at the holding-company level. On September 17, 2016, S&P affirmed its AA+ financial strength rating of BHAC, with a stable outlook.

As of December 31, 2016, Berkshire had total assets of \$620.85 billion and total liabilities of \$334.49 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$286.35 billion.

The information relating to BHAC and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by BHAC or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Build America Mutual Assurance Company (“BAM”). BAM is a New York domiciled mutual insurance company owned by the issuers of municipal bonds who use BAM to insure their debt obligations. BAM officially launched on July 23, 2012 and began writing policies in September of 2012.

On July 23, 2012, S&P assigned an initial rating of AA to BAM’s financial strength and counterparty credit ratings, with a stable outlook. The AA rating was reaffirmed on June 26, 2017, with a stable outlook.

As of December 31, 2016 BAM had total net admitted assets of \$496.6 million and total liabilities of \$65.2 million, resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$431.4 million.

The information relating to BAM contained above has been furnished by BAM or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

CIFG Assurance North America, Inc. (“CIFG”). CIFG Holding, Inc. is the holding company for the CIFG group of financial guaranty insurance and reinsurance companies (“CIFG Group”), including CIFG Assurance North America, Inc., a New York corporation and its subsidiaries. The CIFG Group is actively managing the runoff of a portfolio of insured structured finance, municipal and infrastructure risks. On September 29, 2010, CIFG and CIFG Guaranty entered into a merger agreement which resulted in CIFG Guaranty merging into CIFG (together with related transactions, the “CIFG Merger”).

As of September 30, 2012, CIFG had net admitted assets of \$742.3 million and total liabilities of \$385.5 million. CIFG’s statutory surplus as of September 30, 2012 is approximately \$356.7 million, a decrease of approximately \$227.8 million from approximately \$584.5 million at December 31, 2011. This decrease is primarily attributable to unpaid losses and loss adjustment expense reserves established for student loans of approximately \$252.3 million, which is partially offset by other income statement balances resulting in a net loss of approximately \$227.0 million and an increase in contingency reserves of approximately \$3.5 million.

CIFG was acquired by Assured Guaranty Corp. on July 1, 2016. After the merger was effectuated on or about July 5, 2016, all insurance policies issued by CIFG became direct obligations of Assured Guaranty Corp.

The information relating to CIFG and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by CIFG or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Financial Guaranty Insurance Company ("FGIC"). FGIC, a wholly owned subsidiary of FGIC Corporation, is a New York stock insurance corporation regulated by the New York State Department of Financial Services (the "NYSDFS"). The Company previously issued financial guaranty insurance policies insuring public finance, structured finance and other obligations, but it is no longer engaged in the business of writing new insurance policies. The Company is currently responsible for administering its outstanding policies in accordance with its Rehabilitation Plan, any NYSDFS Guidelines and applicable law.

Due to losses suffered because of deterioration in the U.S. housing and mortgage markets and the global credit markets during the financial crises from late 2007 to early 2009, on August 4, 2010, FGIC Corporation announced that it had filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the Southern District of New York. None of FGIC Corporation's subsidiaries or affiliates, including FGIC, are part of the Chapter 11 filing. On June 28, 2012, the Supreme Court of the State of New York issued an order pursuant to Article 74 of the Insurance Law placing FGIC in rehabilitation. On June 11, 2013, the Rehabilitation Court approved the First Amended Plan of Rehabilitation for FGIC, dated June 4, 2013. The Rehabilitation Plan became effective on August 19, 2013, whereupon FGIC's rehabilitation proceeding terminated.

As of December 31, 2016, FGIC had net admitted assets of approximately \$2.48 billion and total liabilities of approximately \$2.41 billion.

The information relating to FGIC and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by FGIC or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Municipal Assurance Corporation ("MAC"). MAC is a New York domiciled corporation providing municipal bond insurance for municipal and infrastructure bonds. MAC currently guarantees only public finance transactions. MAC is an Assured Guaranty company owned jointly by its affiliates Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. and Assured Guaranty Corp. MAC is part of the Assured Guaranty Group.

On July 17, 2013, S&P assigned MAC a long-term financial strength and counterparty credit rating of AA- to MAC with a stable outlook. On March 18, 2014, S&P raised its financial strength and enhancement rating on MAC from AA- to AA. The rating action reflects S&P's view that MAC's competitive position remains strong relative to its peers' in the bond industry. S&P continues to view MAC as having a stable outlook. This rating was reaffirmed by S&P on June 20, 2016.

As of June 30, 2014, MAC had a total net admitted assets of \$1,519,869,768 and total liabilities of \$999,277,625 resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$520,592,143.

The information relating to MAC contained above is based upon publicly available information or upon information that has been provided by the ratings agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation ("National Guarantee") (formerly MBIA Insurance Corp. of Illinois ("MBIA Illinois") and MBIA Insurance Corporation ("MBIA Corp.")). MBIA, Inc., a Connecticut corporation, conducts its financial guarantee business through its wholly-owned subsidiaries MBIA Corp., which writes global structured finance and non-U.S. public finance financial guarantee insurance, and National Guarantee, which writes U.S. public finance guarantees.

On February 18, 2009, MBIA, Inc. announced the restructuring of its financial guaranty insurance operations following the approval of the New York and Illinois insurance regulators. The restructuring involved the

segregation of its financial guaranty insurance operations into two separately capitalized sister companies, with National Guarantee assuming the risk associated with its U.S. municipal exposures, and with MBIA Corp. insuring the remainder of the portfolio, including all international and structured finance exposures. Business ceded to MBIA Corp. from FGIC in 2008 has been assigned to National Guarantee. To provide additional protection for its municipal bond policyholders, National Guarantee has also issued second-to-pay policies for the benefit of the policyholders covered by the reinsurance and assignment. The second-to-pay policies, which are a direct obligation of National Guarantee, will be held by The Bank of New York Mellon as insurance trustee. These policies provide that if MBIA Corp. or FGIC, as applicable, do not pay valid claims of their policyholders, the policyholders will then be able to make a claim directly against National Guarantee under the second-to-pay policies. On March 19, 2009, MBIA Illinois formally changed its name to National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation. Effective December 1, 2009, National Guarantee was redomesticated to the State of New York and is subject to insurance regulations and supervision of the State of New York. National Guarantee is a wholly owned subsidiary of MBIA, Inc. and independently capitalized with \$5.6 billion in claims-paying resources as of December 31, 2010. In certain states, National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation may operate under its prior name, MBIA Insurance Corp. of Illinois.

May 21, 2013, Moody's upgraded the insurance financial strength rating of National Guarantee to Baa1 from Baa2, with a positive outlook. The May 21, 2013, rating action reflects National Guarantee's improved credit profile following the repayment of the loan from its weaker affiliate, MBIA Corp., and the termination of the litigation related to the 2009 restructuring.

On May 10, 2013, S&P raised the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of National Guarantee to A from BB, with a stable outlook. On March 18, 2014, S&P raised the counterparty credit, financial strength and financial enhancement ratings of National Guarantee to AA- from A, with a stable outlook. The March 18, 2014, upgrade reflects S&P's view that National Guarantee's prospective strong business risk profile and strong financial risk profile, based on the belief that the company will have a strong competitive position and strong operating performance, as well as its current extremely strong capital adequacy position. On June 26, 2017, S&P lowered its financial strength rating of National Guarantee to A, with a stable outlook. The downgrade of National Guarantee reflects S&P's view that National Guarantee's business risk profile is weaker than its peers', as National Guarantee has struggled to gain wide market acceptance.

On May 21, 2013, Moody's upgraded the insurance financial strength rating of MBIA Corp. to B3 from Caa2, with a positive outlook.

On June 26, 2017, S&P affirmed its CCC financial strength rating of MBIA Corp. and revised its outlook from negative to stable. This rating action reflects S&P's view that MBIA Corp.'s liquidity remains weak despite a minor improvement. The stable outlook reflects S&P's view that MBIA Corp.'s capital and liquidity are adequate to meet claim payments through 2017. On June 26, 2017, S&P lowered its long-term counterparty credit rating of MBIA Corp., Inc. to BBB, with a stable outlook. S&P's downgrade of MBIA, Inc., reflects its structural subordination to National Guarantee.

As of December 31, 2016, National Guarantee had total net admitted assets of \$4.35 billion and total liabilities of \$1.6 billion, resulting in a surplus as regard policyholders of \$2.73 billion.

As of December 31, 2016, MBIA, Inc. and its subsidiaries had total assets of \$11.13 billion and total liabilities of \$7.89 billion. MBIA, Inc.'s total shareholders' equity as of December 31, 2016 was \$3.22 billion, decreasing from \$3.72 billion as of December 31, 2015.

The information relating to MBIA and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by MBIA or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Syncora Guarantee Inc. ("Syncora Guarantee") (formerly XL Capital Assurance Inc. ("XLCA")). Syncora Guarantee, a wholly owned subsidiary of Syncora Holdings Ltd. ("Syncora Holdings"), is a New York domiciled

financial guarantee insurance company which provides credit enhancement and protection products to the public finance and structured finance markets throughout the United States and internationally.

In February 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of XLCA to A3 from Aaa. On June 20, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of XLCA from A3 to B2, reflecting XLCA's severely impaired financial flexibility and proximity to minimum regulatory capital requirements relative to Moody's estimates of expected case losses. On October 24, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee from B2 to Caa1. On November 18, 2008, S&P lowered its insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee to B from BBB- with developing expectations. S&P's November 18, 2008 downgrade resulted from the Syncora Guarantee's delay in implementing its restructuring plan and slow progress in its negotiations with counterparties of its CDO of ABS exposure. On January 29, 2009, S&P lowered the issuer credit and financial strength ratings of Syncora Guarantee to CC from B, with a negative outlook. S&P's January 29, 2009 downgrade resulted from S&P's recent update to its distressed exchange criteria. On March 9, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee from Caa1 to Ca, with a developing outlook, as a result of the large loss reserve and credit impairment charges taken by Syncora Guarantee on its mortgage-related exposures during the fourth quarter, which have resulted in a \$2.4 billion statutory deficit at Syncora Guarantee as of December 31, 2008. On April 27, 2009, S&P revised the financial strength and financial enhancement ratings of Syncora Guarantee to R from CC (an issuer rated "R" by S&P is under regulatory supervision because of its financial condition). Also on April 27, 2009, S&P revised the counterparty credit rating of Syncora Guarantee to D from CC (an issuer rated "D" by S&P has failed to pay one or more of its financial obligation when it became due). S&P's April 27, 2009 rating actions resulted from Syncora Guarantee's announcement that pursuant to an order of the New York Insurance Department ("NYID"), the company must suspend any and all claims payments until it has restored its policyholders' surplus to a level greater than or equal to \$65 million, the minimum the state requires. On July 28, 2010, S&P withdrew the D counterparty credit rating and the R financial strength and financial enhancement ratings of Syncora Guarantee. S&P's July 28, 2010 ratings actions resulted from S&P's belief that there is not sufficient information to judge Syncora Guarantee's claims paying ability.

On July 20, 2010, Syncora Holdings announced that Syncora Guarantee has completed its remediation plan sufficient to meet its minimum statutory policyholder surplus requirements and address previously announced short and medium term liquidity issues. Also on July 20, 2010, Syncora Holdings announced that the NYID had approved Syncora Guarantee's plan for the payment of accrued and unpaid claims and for the payment of new claims as they become due in the ordinary course of business, resulting in the recommencement of claim payments by Syncora Guaranty on regularly scheduled payment dates occurring on or after July 21, 2010.

As of December 31, 2016, Syncora Guarantee had total assets of \$1.27 billion and total liabilities of \$71 million, and a policyholders' surplus of \$1.18 billion.

The information relating to Syncora Guarantee and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by Syncora Guarantee or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

The public can read and copy any materials the above referenced companies file with the SEC at the SEC's Public Reference in Washington, D.C. You may obtain information about the Public Reference Room by calling 1-202-551-8090. Reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers, which may include the companies listed above, that file electronically with the SEC available on the EDGAR Database on the SEC's Internet site at <http://www.sec.gov>.

The extent of state insurance regulation and supervision varies by jurisdiction, but New York and most other jurisdictions have laws and regulations prescribing permitted investments and governing the payment of dividends, transactions with affiliates, mergers, consolidations, acquisitions or sales of assets and incurrence of liabilities for borrowings.

In order to be in an Insured Trust, bonds must be insured by one of the Preinsured Bond Insurers. In determining eligibility for insurance, the Preinsured Bond Insurers have applied their own standards which correspond generally to the standards they normally use in establishing the insurability of new issues of municipal bonds and which are not necessarily the criteria used in the selection of bonds by the Sponsor. To the extent the standards of the Preinsured Bond Insurers are more restrictive than those of the Sponsor, the previously stated Trust investment criteria have been limited with respect to the bonds. This decision is made prior to the Date of Deposit, as debt obligations not eligible for insurance are not deposited in an Insured Trust. Thus, all of the bonds in the portfolios of the Insured Trusts are insured by the issuer of the bonds prior to the deposit of such bonds in a Trust.

Preinsured Bonds in an Insured Trust may or may not have a higher yield than comparably uninsured bonds. In selecting such bonds for an Insured Trust, the Sponsor has applied the criteria described under “The Trusts--Objectives and Bond Selection”.

In the event of nonpayment of interest or principal, when due, in respect of a bond, a Preinsured Bond Insurer shall make such payment after the respective insurer has been notified that such nonpayment has occurred or is threatened (but not earlier than the date such payment is due). The Preinsured Bond Insurer, as regards any payment it may make, will succeed to the rights of the Trustee in respect thereof. All policies issued by the Preinsured Bond Insurers, if any, are substantially identical insofar as obligations to an Insured Trust are concerned.

The Internal Revenue Service has issued a letter ruling which holds in effect that insurance proceeds representing maturing interest on defaulted municipal obligations paid to holders of insured bonds, under policy provisions substantially identical to the policies described herein, will be excludable from federal gross income under Section 103(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code to the same extent as if such payments were made by the issuer of the municipal obligations. Holders of Units in an Insured Trust should discuss with their tax advisers the degree of reliance which they may place on this letter ruling. However, counsel for the Sponsor at the time of the closing of the Insured Trust, had given an opinion to the effect such payment of proceeds would be excludable from federal gross income to the extent described under “Federal Tax Status” in Prospectus Part II.

The information relating to each Preinsured Bond Insurer, if any, has been furnished by such companies. The financial information with respect to each Preinsured Bond Insurer appears in reports filed with state insurance regulatory authorities and is subject to audit and review by such authorities. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information or as to the absence of material adverse changes in such information subsequent to the dates thereof.

Portfolio Administration

The Trustee is empowered to sell, for the purpose of redeeming Units tendered by any Unitholder, and for the payment of expenses for which funds may not be available, such of the bonds designated by the Supervisor as the Trustee in its sole discretion may deem necessary. The Supervisor, in designating such bonds, will consider a variety of factors including (a) interest rates, (b) market value and (c) marketability. The Sponsor may direct the Trustee to dispose of bonds if the supervisor determines there exists any default in payment of principal or interest, institution of certain legal proceedings, default under other documents adversely affecting debt service, default in payment of principal or interest or other obligations of the same issuer, decline in projected income pledged for debt service on revenue bonds or decline in price or the occurrence of other market or credit factors, including advance refunding (*i.e.*, the issuance of refunding securities and the deposit of the proceeds thereof in trust or escrow to retire the refunded securities on their respective redemption dates), so that in the opinion of the Supervisor the retention of such bonds would be detrimental to the interest of the Unitholders. In connection with the Insured Trusts to the extent that bonds are sold which are current in payment of principal and interest in order to meet redemption requests and defaulted bonds are retained in the portfolio in order to preserve the related insurance protection applicable to said bonds, the overall quality of the bonds remaining in such Trust's portfolio

will tend to diminish. The Sponsor is empowered, but not obligated, to direct the Trustee to dispose of bonds in the event of an advanced refunding.

The Sponsor is required to instruct the Trustee to reject any offer made by an issuer of any of the bonds to issue new obligations in exchange or substitution for any bond pursuant to a refunding or refinancing plan, except that the Sponsor may instruct the Trustee to accept or reject such an offer or to take any other action with respect thereto as the Sponsor may deem proper if (1) the issuer is in default with respect to such bond or (2) in the written opinion of the Sponsor the issuer will probably default with respect to such bond in the reasonably foreseeable future. Any obligation so received in exchange or substitution will be held by the Trustee subject to the terms and conditions of the Trust Agreement to the same extent as bonds originally deposited thereunder. Within five days after the deposit of obligations in exchange or substitution for underlying bonds, the Trustee is required to give notice thereof to each Unitholder of the Trust thereby affected, identifying the bonds eliminated and the bonds substituted therefore. Except as stated herein and under “Fund Administration—Replacement Bonds” in Prospectus Part II regarding the substitution of Replacement Bonds for Failed Bonds, the acquisition by a Trust of any securities other than the bonds initially deposited is not permitted.

If any default in the payment of principal or interest on any bonds occurs and no provision for payment is made therefore within 30 days, the Trustee is required to notify the Sponsor thereof. If the Sponsor fails to instruct the Trustee to sell or to hold such bonds within 30 days after notification by the Trustee to the Sponsor of such default, the Trustee may in its discretion sell the defaulted bond and not be liable for any depreciation or loss thereby incurred.

Sponsor Information

Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. is the Sponsor of the Trust. The Sponsor is a wholly owned subsidiary of Invesco Advisers, Inc. (“Invesco Advisers”). Invesco Advisers is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of Invesco Ltd., a leading independent global investment manager that provides a wide range of investment strategies and vehicles to its retail, institutional and high net worth clients around the globe. The Sponsor’s principal office is located at 11 Greenway Plaza, Houston, Texas 77046-1173. As of March 31, 2017, the total stockholders’ equity of Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. was \$98,932,003.85 (unaudited). The current assets under management and supervision by Invesco Ltd. and its affiliates were valued at approximately \$834.8 billion as of March 31, 2017. (This paragraph relates only to the Sponsor and not to the Trust or to any other Series thereof. The information is included herein only for the purpose of informing investors as to the financial responsibility of the Sponsor and its ability to carry out its contractual obligations. More detailed financial information will be made available by the Sponsor upon request.)

Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. and your Trust have adopted a code of ethics requiring Invesco Ltd.’s employees who have access to information on Trust transactions to report personal securities transactions. The purpose of the code is to avoid potential conflicts of interest and to prevent fraud, deception or misconduct with respect to your Trust.

If the Sponsor shall fail to perform any of its duties under the Trust Agreement or become incapable of acting or shall become bankrupt or its affairs are taken over by public authorities, then the Trustee may (i) appoint a successor Sponsor at rates of compensation deemed by the Trustee to be reasonable and not exceeding amounts prescribed by the SEC, (ii) terminate the Trust Agreement and liquidate the Trusts as provided therein or (iii) continue to act as Trustee without terminating the Trust Agreement.

Trustee Information

The Trustee is The Bank of New York Mellon, a trust company organized under the laws of New York. The Bank of New York Mellon has its principal unit investment trust division offices at 2 Hanson Place, 12th Floor, Brooklyn, New York 11217, telephone (800) 856-8487. The Bank of New York Mellon is subject to supervision and examination by the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York and the Board of Governors of the

Federal Reserve System, and its deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent permitted by law.

The duties of the Trustee are primarily ministerial in nature. It did not participate in the selection of bonds for the portfolios of any of the Trusts. In accordance with the Trust Agreement, the Trustee shall keep proper books of record and account of all transactions at its office for the Trusts. Such records shall include the name and address of every Unitholder of the Trusts. Such books and records shall be open to inspection by any Unitholder at all reasonable times during the usual business hours. The Trustee shall make such annual or other reports as may from time to time be required under any applicable state or federal statute, rule or regulation. The Trustee is required to keep a certified copy or duplicate original of the Trust Agreement on file in its office available for inspection at all reasonable times during the usual business hours by any Unitholder, together with a current list of the bonds held in the Trusts.

Under the Trust Agreement, the Trustee or any successor trustee may resign and be discharged of the trusts created by the Trust Agreement by executing an instrument in writing and filing the same with the Sponsor. The Trustee or successor trustee must mail a copy of the notice of resignation to all Unitholders then of record, not less than 60 days before the date specified in such notice when such resignation is to take effect. The Sponsor upon receiving notice of such resignation is obligated to appoint a successor trustee promptly. If, upon such resignation, no successor trustee has been appointed and has accepted the appointment within 30 days after notification, the retiring Trustee may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for the appointment of a successor. The Sponsor may remove the Trustee and appoint a successor trustee as provided in the Trust Agreement at any time with or without cause. Notice of such removal and appointment shall be mailed to each Unitholder by the Sponsor. Upon execution of a written acceptance of such appointment by such successor trustee, all the rights, powers, duties and obligations of the original trustee shall vest in the successor. The resignation or removal of a Trustee becomes effective only when the successor trustee accepts its appointment as such or when a court of competent jurisdiction appoints a successor trustee. Any corporation into which a Trustee may be merged or with which it may be consolidated, or any corporation resulting from any merger or consolidation to which a Trustee shall be a party, shall be the successor trustee. The Trustee must be a banking corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any state and having at all times an aggregate capital, surplus and undivided profits of not less than \$5,000,000.

Termination of the Trust Agreement

A Trust may be terminated at any time by consent of Unitholders of 51% of the Units of such Trust then outstanding (or with respect to Van Kampen Unit Trusts, Municipal Series 654 and subsequent series, by consent of Unitholders of 75% of the Units of such Trust then outstanding) or by the Trustee when the value of such Trust, as shown by any semi-annual evaluation, is less than 20% of the original principal amount of bonds. A Trust will be liquidated by the Trustee in the event that a sufficient number of Units not yet sold are tendered for redemption by the Underwriters, including the Sponsor, so that the net worth of such Trust would be reduced to less than 40% of the principal amount of the bonds initially deposited in the Trust. If a Trust is liquidated because of the redemption of unsold Units by the Underwriters, the Sponsor will refund to each purchaser of Units the entire sales charge paid by such purchaser. The Trust Agreement provides that each Trust shall terminate upon the redemption, sale or other disposition of the last bond held in such Trust, but in no event shall it continue beyond the end of the year preceding the fiftieth anniversary of the Trust Agreement in the case of an IM-IT, an IM-IT Laddered Series, an Investment Grade Municipal, an Investment Grade Municipal Limited Maturity Trust, a 10-20 Year Trust, an IM-IT Discount, a U.S. Territorial IM-IT, a High Grade Tax-Exempt Bond Trust, 20+ Year Series, a Long-Term State or a National Quality Trust, or beyond the end of the year preceding the twentieth anniversary of the Trust Agreement in the case of a Strategic Municipal Trust Intermediate Series, an IM-IT Limited Maturity Trust, an IM-IT Intermediate Trust, a State Intermediate Trust, a State Intermediate Laddered Maturity Trust, an IM-IT Short Intermediate Trust, an Investment Grade Municipal Intermediate Trust and a Quality Municipals Income Trust Limited Maturity Series. In the event of termination of

any Trust, written notice thereof will be sent by the Trustee to each Unitholder of such Trust at his address appearing on the registration books of such Trust maintained by the Trustee. Within a reasonable time thereafter the Trustee shall liquidate any bond then held in such Trust and shall deduct from the funds of such Trust any accrued costs, expenses or indemnities provided by the Trust Agreement, including estimated compensation of the Trustee and costs of liquidation and any amounts required as a reserve to provide for payment of any applicable taxes or other government charges. The sale of bonds in the Trust upon termination may result in a lower amount than might otherwise be realized if such sale were not required at such time. For this reason, among others, the amount realized by a Unitholder upon termination may be less than the principal amount or par amount of bonds represented by the Units held by such Unitholder. The Trustee shall then distribute to each Unitholder his share of the balance of the Interest and Principal Accounts. With such distribution the Unitholder shall be furnished a final distribution statement of the amount distributable. At such time as the Trustee in its sole discretion shall determine that any amounts held in reserve are no longer necessary, it shall make distribution thereof to Unitholders in the same manner.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, in connection with final distributions to Unitholders of an Insured Trust, it should be noted that because the portfolio insurance obtained by an Insured Trust, if any, is applicable only while bonds so insured are held by such Trust, the price to be received by such Trust upon the disposition of any such bond which is in default, by reason of nonpayment of principal or interest, will not reflect any value based on such insurance. Therefore, in connection with any liquidation, it shall not be necessary for the Trustee to, and the Trustee does not currently intend to, dispose of any bond or bonds if retention of such bond or bonds, until due, shall be deemed to be in the best interest of Unitholders, including, but not limited to, situations in which a bond or bonds so insured have deteriorated market prices resulting from a significant risk of default. Since the Preinsured Bonds will reflect the value of the related insurance, it is the present intention of the Sponsor not to direct the Trustee to hold any of such Preinsured Bonds after the date of termination. All proceeds received, less applicable expenses, from insurance on defaulted bonds not disposed of at the date of termination will ultimately be distributed to Unitholders of record as of such date of termination as soon as practicable after the date such defaulted bond or bonds become due and applicable insurance proceeds have been received by the Trustee.

Description of Ratings

Standard & Poor's, A Division of S&P Global. A Standard & Poor's municipal bond rating is a current assessment of the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to a specific debt bond. This assessment of creditworthiness may take into consideration obligors such as guarantors, insurers or lessees.

The bond rating is not a recommendation to purchase or sell a security, inasmuch as it does not comment as to market price.

The ratings are based on current information furnished to Standard & Poor's by the issuer and obtained by Standard & Poor's from other sources it considers reliable. The ratings may be changed, suspended or withdrawn as a result of changes in, or unavailability of, such information.

The ratings are based, in varying degrees, on the following considerations:

- I. Likelihood of payment—capacity and willingness of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on an obligation in accordance with the terms of the obligation.
- II. Nature of and provisions of the obligation.
- III. Protection afforded by, and relative position of, the bond in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization or other arrangements under the laws of bankruptcy and other laws affecting creditors' rights.

AAA—This is the highest rating assigned by Standard & Poor's. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is extremely strong.

AA—An obligation rated “AA” differs from the highest-rated obligations only in small degree. The obligor’s capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is very strong.

A—An obligation rated “A” is somewhat more susceptible to adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher-rated categories. However, the obligor’s capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is still strong.

BBB—An obligation rated “BBB” exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

Plus (+) or Minus (-): The ratings from “AA” to “BBB” may be modified by the addition of a plus or minus sign to show relative standing within the major rating categories.

Provisional Ratings: A provisional rating (“p”) assumes the successful completion of the project financed by the debt being rated and indicates that payment of debt service requirements is largely or entirely dependent upon the successful and timely completion of the project. This rating, however, while addressing credit quality subsequent to completion of the project, makes no comment on the likelihood of or the risk of default upon failure of such completion. The investor should exercise his own judgment with respect to such likelihood and risk.

Moody’s Investors Service, Inc. A brief description of the applicable Moody’s rating symbols and their meanings follows:

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

Aa—Bonds which are rated Aa are judged to be of high quality by all standards. Together with the Aaa group they comprise what are generally known as high grade bonds. They are rated lower than the best bonds because margins of protection may not be as large as in Aaa securities or fluctuations of protective elements may be of greater amplitude or there may be other elements present which make the long-term risks appear somewhat larger than in Aaa securities.

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

Baa—Bonds which are rated Baa are considered as medium grade obligations; *i.e.*, they are neither highly protected nor poorly secured. Interest payment and principal security appear adequate for the present but certain protective elements may be lacking or may be characteristically unreliable over any great length of time. Such bonds lack outstanding investment characteristics and in fact have speculative characteristics as well.

Note: Moody’s applies numerical modifiers, 1, 2 and 3 in each generic rating classification from Aa through B in its corporate bond rating system. The modifier 1 indicates that the security ranks in the higher end of its generic rating category; the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking; and the modifier 3 indicates that the issue ranks in the lower end of its generic rating category.

Fitch Ratings. Long-Term Ratings Scales. Fitch rated entities in a number of sectors, including financial and non-financial corporations, sovereigns and insurance companies, are generally assigned Issuer Default Ratings (“IDRs”). IDRs opine on an entity’s relative vulnerability to default on financial obligations. The “threshold” default risk addressed by the IDR is generally that of the financial obligations whose non-payment would best reflect the uncured failure of that entity. As such, IDRs also address relative vulnerability to bankruptcy, administrative receivership or similar concepts, although the agency recognizes that issuers may also make pre-emptive and therefore voluntary use of such mechanisms.

In aggregate, IDRs provide an ordinal ranking of issuers based on the agency's view of their relative vulnerability to default, rather than a prediction of a specific percentage likelihood of default. For historical information on the default experience of Fitch-rated issuers, please consult the transition and default performance studies available from the Fitch Ratings website.

- The ratings do not predict a specific percentage of default likelihood over any given time period;
- The ratings do not opine on the market value of any issuer's securities or stock, or the likelihood that this value may change;
- The ratings do not opine on the liquidity of the issuer's securities or stock;
- The ratings do not opine on the possible loss severity on an obligation should an issuer default;
- The ratings do not opine on the suitability of an issuer as a counterparty to trade credit;
- The ratings do not opine on any quality related to an issuer's business, operational or financial profile other than the agency's opinion on its relative vulnerability to default;

AAA--'AAA' ratings denote the lowest expectation of default risk. They are assigned only in cases of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.

AA--'AA' ratings denote expectations of very low default risk. They indicate very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.

A--'A' ratings denote expectations of low default risk. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered strong. This capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to adverse business or economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings.

BBB--'BBB' ratings indicate that expectations of default risk are currently low. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered adequate but adverse business or economic conditions are more likely to impair this capacity.

Obligations rated "BB," "B," "CCC," "CC" and "C" are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. "BB" indicates the least degree of speculation and "C" the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

The modifiers "+" or "-" may be appended to a rating to denote relative status within major rating categories. Such suffixes are not added to the 'AAA' Long-Term IDR category, or to Long-Term IDR categories below 'B'.

State Trust Risk Factors

California Risk Factors

The California Series invests primarily in California municipal securities. The value of its portfolio investments with respect to these securities will be highly sensitive to events affecting the fiscal stability of the State of California (referred to in this section as "California" or the "State") and its municipalities, authorities and other instrumentalities that issue such securities. The following information is only a brief summary of the complex factors affecting the financial situation in California and is based on information available as of the date of this prospectus primarily from official statements and legislative analyses relating to the State's budget, and from official statements for securities offerings of the State.

General Economic Conditions

Economic Outlook. The economy of the State is the largest among the 50 states and one of the largest and most diverse in the world. The diversified economy of the State has major components in high technology, trade, entertainment, agriculture, manufacturing, government, tourism, construction and financial services. Certain of the State's significant industries, such as high technology, are sensitive to economic disruptions in their export markets.

The State's economy is in the midst of a gradual recovery from the most severe economic downturn and financial pressure since the 1930s. Continued growth in the high-technology sector, international trade and tourism along with improvements in residential construction and real estate markets have been positive indicators of California's broadening economic recovery. While persistent unemployment impedes greater economic growth and revenue generation, analysts generally expect the State's economy to continue to expand at a moderate pace in the near future. The Legislative Analyst's Office ("LAO"), a non-partisan fiscal and policy adviser, has projected that the State's economic recovery should continue its steady progress and that the State will continue its progress in building budget reserves under Proposition 2; however, continued uncertainty about the effects of federal policy and weak global growth create fiscal risks and pressures to a more robust recovery. There can be no assurance that the positive economic and fiscal trends will continue or that the economy will not become more difficult.

As of April 2017, California's unemployment was 4.8%, compared to 12.4% at the recession's peak in October 2010 and the pre-recession low of 4.8% in November 2006. Job growth in the State for the twelve-month period between April 2016 and April 2017 shows an increase of 1.4%. Due to slow but consistent job growth California has gained approximately 2,494,600 jobs through April 2017 since the economic expansion began in February 2010.

Geography. California's geographic location subjects it to earthquake and wildfire risks. It is impossible to predict the time, magnitude or location of a major earthquake or wildfire or its effect on the California economy. In August 2014, a major earthquake struck the Napa Valley area, causing significant damage in a three county area. In October 2007, a series of wildfires burned across Southern California, forcing approximately 1 million evacuations and causing significant damage in seven counties. The possibility exists that other such earthquakes or wildfires could create major dislocation of the California economy and could significantly affect State and local governmental budgets.

States of Emergency. On January 23, 2017, the Governor declared a statewide state of emergency to bolster the state's response to widespread and severe flooding in multiple counties in California. The actual impact of the flooding on the State's economy is impossible to estimate, however, the overall cost of the clean-up, repair and resulting loss of revenue could be substantial.

On May 20, 2015, the Governor declared a state of emergency for Santa Barbara County due to the effects of an oil spill. The spill was the result of a pipeline rupture that caused the release of more than 100,000 gallons of oil and other potentially hazardous substances into the Pacific Ocean near Refugio State Beach. In his proclamation of a state of emergency, the Governor acknowledged that local governments and businesses along the Santa Barbara County coast will suffer long-term impacts from the spill. The actual impact of the spill on the State's economy is impossible to estimate, however, the overall cost of the clean-up, long-term environmental damage and resulting loss of revenue could be substantial.

State Budgets

Budget Process. California has a fiscal year ending on June 30 of each year. Under the State constitution, the Governor must submit a proposed budget to the Legislature by January 10 of the preceding fiscal year and the Legislature must adopt a final budget by June 15 of the preceding fiscal year. Both the proposed budget and final budget are required to be balanced, in that General Fund expenditures must not exceed projected General Fund revenues and transfers for the fiscal year.

California receives revenues from taxes, fees and other sources, the most significant of which are personal income tax, sales and use tax and corporate tax (which collectively constitute more than 90% of General Fund revenues and transfers). During the economic downturn, historic revenue shortfalls resulted in multi-billion dollar budget deficits for consecutive fiscal years and severe cash shortages in California. During the 2011-12 and 2012-13 fiscal years, the State budget addressed approximately \$20 billion in annual deficits through a combination of significant spending cuts, temporary tax increases, borrowing, and other budgetary measures. While the State has continued to face fiscal pressure from deferred budgetary obligations accumulated over the prior decade, primarily to schools and local governments (the so-called “Wall of Debt”), and unfunded liabilities associated with the state employee retirement systems and state retiree health benefits, the State projects that the budget will be balanced in an ongoing manner until at least fiscal year 2017-18. However, unanticipated or rising costs, revenue shortfalls or the State’s inability to enact or effectively realize budget solutions may adversely affect California’s fiscal outlook and cause the State to continue facing acute long-term challenges and budget deficits.

Current Budget. The California State Budget for the 2016-2017 fiscal year (the “2016 Budget Act”) was passed by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor on June 15, 2016. The 2016 Budget Act projected General Fund revenues and transfers in fiscal year 2016-17 of \$126.3 billion (including the \$3.2 billion balance carried over from the 2015-16 fiscal year) and authorized General Fund expenditures of \$122.4 billion for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 2017. The 2014-15 budget established a multi-year plan to eliminate the \$74 billion in unfunded accrued liability in the California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) by increasing contributions from the State, school districts and teachers over time.

In its annual report on California’s fiscal outlook, released on November 16, 2016 (the “Fiscal Report”), the LAO provided an independent assessment of California’s economic outlook and the State’s projected General Fund revenues and expenditures. The Fiscal Report, which described the budget situation through 2017-18 as decidedly positive, estimated that California would continue to experience growth in General Fund revenues resulting in budget surpluses of \$11.5 billion by the end of fiscal year 2017-18, including \$8.7 billion in required reserves, which is available for a future budget emergency and \$2.8 billion in discretionary reserves, which the Legislature can appropriate for any purpose. The LAO estimated that the state has so far amassed enough reserves to cover almost of all of its operating deficits through 2020-21, which means that the state could weather a mild recession without cutting spending or raising taxes through 2020-21. While the LAO considered continued economic growth its main forecast scenario, the Fiscal Report cautioned that its outlook was based on the assumption that the state will not make any changes in any year leading up to 2020-21 to its current policies and programs, and that there would be no new changes in federal policy, even though the recent election results suggest that some changes are now likely.

The Governor’s proposed Budget for the 2017-18 fiscal year (the “2017 Budget Act”), released on January 10, 2017, provided an update to the State’s economic outlook at the end of the 2016-17 fiscal year relative to the 2016 Budget Act. The 2017 Governor’s Budget projected General Fund revenues and transfers of \$118.7 billion (a decrease of approximately \$1.6 billion) and General Fund expenditures of \$122.7 billion (an increase of approximately \$300 million) for the 2016-17 fiscal year. The 2017 Governor’s Budget reiterated the fiscal goals contained in the 2014 Budget Act for the State to eliminate the Wall of Debt and pay down the State’s unfunded retirement liabilities.

Future Budgets. The 2017 Governor’s Budget projected General Fund revenues and transfers in fiscal year 2017-18 of \$124.0 billion and proposed General Fund expenditures of \$122.5 billion for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018, assuming adoption of all proposed budget measures, including further reduction of California’s Wall of Debt. In preparing the 2017 Governor’s Budget, the administration concluded that the state’s fiscal condition has worsened, and, absent new budget solutions, the state’s rainy day fund would have a shortfall of \$1.6 billion by the end of fiscal year 2017-18. In reaching this conclusion, the administration estimated that crucial tax revenues are down \$3.2 billion in 2015-16 and 2016-17 combined.

To address its estimated \$1.6 billion dollar shortfall, the 2017 Governor's Budget includes more than \$3.2 billion in actions to reduce General Fund spending growth that otherwise might occur.

On May 11, 2017, the Governor released the may revision to the 2017 Budget Act (the "May Revision"), which projected General Fund revenues and transfers in fiscal year 2017-18 of \$127 billion and proposed General Fund expenditures of \$124 billion for the fiscal year ending June 2018. Among other expenditures, the May Revision proposed \$1.4 billion dollars in additional spending on schools. The May Revision also proposed mitigating a substantial portion of the approximately \$600 million in In-Home Supportive Services costs that would otherwise have to be borne by county realignment funds during the 2017-18 fiscal year. Assuming all the proposed budget expenditures and solutions in the May Revision are implemented, the May Revision projected a General Fund reserve of \$1.6 billion as of the 2017-18 fiscal year-end.

In its January 13, 2017 "Overview of the Governor's Budget" (the "LAO Overview"), the LAO struck a cautiously optimistic tone regarding the state's fiscal outlook. While the LAO Overview suggested that the Governor's estimate of revenue growth is low, it acknowledged that more time is needed to determine the state's fiscal outlook. The LAO Overview stated that by the time of the May revision of the 2017 Governor's Budget, the state will have a clearer picture of its revenue and expenditure estimates. Among the factors adding to the current uncertainty, the LAO Overview cited uncertainty regarding the possible actions the new Congress and President might pursue. In light of the uncertainty facing the state, the LAO encouraged the state legislature to continue to set its target state reserves at—or preferably above—the level proposed by the Governor, which is higher than the target previously set by the state legislature.

It cannot be predicted what actions will be taken in the future by the Legislature and the Governor to deal with changing State revenues and expenditures. The State budget will be affected by national and State economic conditions and other factors.

Constraints on the Budget Process. Constitutional amendments approved by voters affect the budget process. These include Proposition 58, approved in 2004 and amended by voters effective as of the 2015-16 fiscal year, which requires the State to enact a balanced budget, establish a special rainy day fund in the General Fund and restrict future borrowing to cover budget deficits; and Proposition 25, approved by voters in 2010, which decreased the vote required for the Legislature to adopt a final budget from a two-thirds majority vote to a simple majority vote. Proposition 25 retained the two-thirds vote requirement for taxes. As a result of the provisions requiring the enactment of a balanced budget and restricting borrowing, the State may, in some cases, have to take immediate actions during the fiscal year to correct budgetary shortfalls. The balanced budget determination is made by subtracting expenditures from all available resources, including prior-year balances.

If the Governor determines that the State is facing substantial revenue shortfalls or spending deficiencies, the Governor is authorized to declare a fiscal emergency and call the Legislature into special session to consider proposed legislation to address the emergency. If the Legislature fails to pass and send to the Governor legislation to address the budgetary or fiscal emergency within 45 days, the Legislature would be prohibited from acting on any other bills or adjourning in joint recess until such legislation is passed. During the economic downturn from fiscal year 2008-09 to fiscal year 2010-11, the Governor declared fiscal emergencies on January 10, 2008, December 1, 2008, July 1, 2009, January 8, 2010, July 28, 2010, November 11, 2010 and January 20, 2011, and called five special sessions of the Legislature to resolve the budget imbalances, enact economic stimulus and address the State's liquidity problems.

Proposition 58 (adopted as section 20 of article XVI of the State's Constitution) also requires 3% of estimated annual General Fund revenues to be transferred by the Controller into a rainy day fund (the Budget Stabilization Account) no later than September 30 of each fiscal year. These transfers will be made until the balance in the Budget Stabilization Account reaches \$8 billion or 5% of the estimated General Fund revenues for that fiscal year, whichever is greater, and then whenever the balance falls below the \$8 billion or 5% target. The annual transfers can be suspended or reduced for a fiscal year by an executive order issued by the Governor no later than June 1 of the preceding fiscal year. The Governor issued such an executive order for each fiscal year from 2008-09

through 2013-14. The 2016 Budget Act includes a transfer of \$2 billion to the Budget Stabilization Account as of June 30, 2017, half of which would be used to repay outstanding economic recovery bonds.

Commencing in the 2015-16 fiscal year, Proposition 2 approved by voters in the November 2014 general election amends Proposition 58 to require 1.5% of estimated annual General Fund revenues and an additional specified portion of General Fund revenues attributable to personal income taxes on net capital gains to be transferred by the Controller into the Budget Stabilization Account no later than October 1 of each fiscal year. These transfers will be made until the balance in the Budget Stabilization Account reaches 10% of the estimated General Fund revenues for that fiscal year. From the 2015-16 fiscal year until the 2029-30 fiscal year, half of the General Fund revenues which would be transferrable to the Budget Stabilization Account will be used to repay deferred budgetary obligations, including unfunded state pension plan obligations and outstanding economic recovery bonds. As a result of the amendment under Proposition 2, the annual transfers may only be suspended or reduced by a bill passed by the Legislature in response to the Governor's proclamation of a budget emergency and withdrawals from the Budget Stabilization Account during budget emergencies are subject to limitations.

Proposition 58 prohibits certain future borrowing to cover budget deficits. This restriction applies to general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, and certain other forms of long-term borrowing. The restriction does not apply to certain other types of borrowing, such as short-term borrowing to cover cash shortfalls in the General Fund (including revenue anticipation notes or revenue anticipation warrants currently used by the State), or inter-fund borrowings.

Proposition 2 also creates a Public School System Stabilization Account for the support of California school districts and community college districts. General Fund revenues attributable to personal income taxes on net capital gains in excess of the specified portion dedicated to the Budget Stabilization Account are required to be transferred by the Controller to the Public School System Stabilization Account. Under current projections, Proposition 2 will result in \$7.1 billion in savings and \$5.5 billion in additional reductions of debt and liabilities in its first four years of operation.

Minimum Wage Increase. On April 4, 2016, the Governor signed SB 3, which gradually increases the minimum wage in California (currently \$10 per hour) to \$15 per hour by 2023 (at the earliest) for all businesses in the state. The Department of Finance estimates that increased General Fund costs will be \$20 million in fiscal year 2016-17, and up to \$3.6 billion per fiscal year upon full implementation. SB 3 includes provisions that allow the state to pause a scheduled increase in the minimum wage if certain economic and/or budget conditions occur. Consequently, the timing of full implementation will depend on any such pauses.

State Indebtedness

General Obligation Bonds and Revenue Bonds. As of April 1, 2017, the State had approximately \$83.25 billion aggregate principal of outstanding long-term general obligation bonds. The current estimate of the interest to be paid on the principal amount outstanding is approximately \$58.58 billion. As of April 1, 2017, general obligation bond authorizations of approximately \$34.7 billion remained unissued.

Ratings. As of July 2017 the State's general obligation bonds were rated Aa3 by Moody's, AA- by Standard & Poor's ("S&P"), and AA- by Fitch Ratings. On August 12, 2016, Fitch Ratings raised California's general obligation bond rating from A+ to AA-, stating that the upgrade reflected a combination of positive credit developments for the State. Fitch specifically stated that California is fundamentally better positioned to withstand a future economic downturn than has been the case in prior recessions due to numerous institutional improvements. On July 2, 2015, S&P raised California's general obligation bond rating from A+ to AA-, citing the enactment of the 2015 Budget Act as marking improved fiscal sustainability. On June 25, 2014, Moody's upgraded California's general obligation bond rating from A1 to Aa3, citing the State's "rapidly improving financial position, high but declining debt metrics, adjusted net pension liability ratios that are close to the state median, strong liquidity, and robust employment growth." On February 25, 2015, Fitch Ratings upgraded California's general obligation bond

rating from A to A+ citing the State's "continued improvement in its fundamental fiscal position, institutionalized changes to its fiscal operations, and its ongoing economic and revenue recovery as contributing to an improved financial position and enhancing the State's ability to address future fiscal challenges." The ratings agencies continue to monitor the State's budget outlook closely to determine whether to alter the ratings. It is not possible to determine whether, or the extent to which, Moody's, S&P or Fitch Ratings will change such ratings in the future.

Infrastructure Planning. On January 10, 2017, the Governor released "California's Five-Year Infrastructure Plan" (the "Infrastructure Plan"), the statewide infrastructure plan provided by the Governor to the California Legislature. The plan proposed \$43 billion in infrastructure spending over the next five years, including \$39 billion for the preservation and improvement of the State's transportation systems and construction of the State's high-speed railway system. Of this amount, \$8.1 billion is from the State's various special funds, \$13.6 billion is expected to be paid from federal funding, \$338 million from general obligation bond issuances, \$524 million from General Fund revenues, \$14.6 billion from high-speed rail funds, and \$4.1 billion from other sources.

On June 16, 2015, the Governor called a special legislative session to consider funding improved maintenance of roads, highways and other infrastructure. The proposals from the special legislative session, including a \$3.6 billion annual increase for state and local transportation infrastructure programs, are generally reflected in the 2017 Governor's Budget. In April 2017, the California Legislature passed a \$52 billion transportation package that will focus on fixing the State's roads, highways, bridges, and certain transit facilities. The legislation aims to raise the funds through, among other things, a 12 cent gas tax and increased vehicle registration fees. The legislature is considering other legislation to enact permanent and sustainable funding to maintain and repair the state's transportation and critical infrastructure, improve the state's key trade corridors and complement local infrastructure efforts.

The 2014 Budget Act passed by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor on June 20, 2014, permanently allocated 60% of future cap and trade auction proceeds to support sustainable communities, public transit, and the high-speed railway project. Consistent with the 2014 Budget Act, the 2017 Governor's Budget allocates 60% of cap and trade revenues to support sustainable communities, public transit, and the high-speed railway project.

In January 2014, the administration released a Water Action Plan to address water challenges facing California through the 2018-19 fiscal year, including limited and uncertain water supplies, poor-quality surface water and groundwater, impaired ecosystems and high flood risk. In addition to the Water Action Plan, in the November 2014 general election, voters authorized the State to issue \$7.5 billion in general obligation bonds for state water supply infrastructure projects, such as public water system improvements, surface and groundwater storage, advanced water treatment technology, drought relief, emergency water supplies, and ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration. The 2015 Budget Act proposed spending \$1.5 billion over the next three years and the 2016 Governor's Budget featured \$635 million in increased spending on projects to improve safe drinking water, water recycling, wastewater treatment projects, storm water management, groundwater sustainability, and to prevent groundwater contamination.

In March 2015, the Governor signed legislation providing \$1.06 billion in funds for flood protection projects and projects to improve access to water supplies. The funding package includes \$267 million for drinking water and recycling projects, \$53 million to provide immediate assistance to communities facing water supply issues and \$26 million to help the State deal with drought related environmental issues. In February 2017, the Governor announced a \$437 million proposal to accelerate implementation of existing plans to fund infrastructure needs relating to water and flood control. Of the \$437 million, \$387 million would go primarily to providing new flood protection the Central Valley and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, two areas greatly impacted by severe flooding in the first quarter of 2017. The Governor's proposal requires legislative approval. As of December 31, 2016, the third year since the implementation of the Water Action Plan, the State has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in local projects that recycle water, improve farm irrigation water efficiency, capture storm water,

and otherwise safeguard and protect water supplies. The State also created a five-agency framework for moving California beyond emergency, one-size-fits-all drought restrictions on water to permanent water-use efficiency standards in a way that accounts for local conditions and demographics. In addition, the State has launched dozens of habitat restoration projects around the state, including the largest tidal wetlands restoration project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Under certain circumstances, the State also provides infrastructure funding assistance to local governments and the private sector such as for schools and local transportation programs, water projects, housing developments, and hospitals.

Deferred Obligations. As part of the budget solutions in fiscal years during the recession, the State repeatedly deferred payment of certain General Fund obligations (including Proposition 98 payments to schools, Medi-Cal reimbursements, state payrolls and payments to the state pension fund) and approved the sale of economic recovery bonds, interfund borrowing and loans from state and local governments. As a result of these short-term budget-balancing actions, the General Fund is obligated to repay or make reimbursements in future years. The State's enacted budgets for fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 reduced these repayment obligations from \$34.2 billion to \$14.9 billion. The 2016 Governor's Act proposed further reductions in California's deferred obligations and projected that all outstanding budgetary deferrals and borrowing of the State will be repaid by the end of the 2018-19 fiscal year.

State Pension Funds. The two main State pension funds, the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") and CalSTRS, currently have substantial unfunded liabilities. CalPERS estimated that its unfunded accrued liability as of June 30, 2016 was approximately \$59.5 billion, as compared to approximately \$49.6 billion as of June 30, 2015. CalSTRS reported that the unfunded actuarial liability of its Defined Benefit Plan as of June 30, 2015 was \$72.6 billion on an actuarial basis and \$61.8 billion on a market value basis. The State also has an unfunded liability relating to other State retirees' post-employment health care benefits which is estimated to be \$76.5 billion as of June 30, 2016.

General Fund contributions to CalPERS and CalSTRS for fiscal year 2016-17 are estimated to be approximately \$3.1 billion and \$2.5 billion, respectively. The 2017 Budget Act includes contributions to CalPERS and CalSTRS of \$3.5 billion and \$2.8 billion respectively. The May Revision includes a one-time \$6 billion supplemental payment to CalPERS with a loan from the Surplus Money Investment Fund in order to reduce unfunded liabilities, stabilize state contribution rates, and save \$11 billion over the next two decades. According to the State, the supplemental payment is necessary to mitigate the impact of increasing pension contributions due in part to the CalPERS Board's recent action to lower its assumed investment rate of return from 7.5 percent to 7 percent. The 2014 Governor's Budget enacted a plan to eliminate CalSTRS' current unfunded liability by the 2045-46 fiscal year by increasing the mandatory contributions by the State, teachers and school districts. Recent legislation and changes in actuarial assumptions and funding methodologies are also expected to result in significant annual increases in the amount the state is required to pay from the General Fund. The actual amount of such increases will depend on a variety of factors, including but not limited to, investment returns, actuarial assumptions, and retirement benefit adjustments.

On September 12, 2012, the State adopted the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 which reduces pension benefits for newly-hired CalPERS employees, encourages later retirement and caps compensation in calculating pension benefits for higher-income employees. In a preliminary actuarial analysis, CalPERS estimated that the reform legislation will reduce costs to the State by \$10.3 billion to \$12.6 billion over the next 30 years.

Medi-Cal and Health Care Reform. Following the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, total Medi-Cal enrollment rose from 7.9 million in fiscal year 2012-13 to 14.1 million in fiscal year 2016-17, covering over a third of the State's population. The Governor's May Revision estimates Medi-Cal General Fund spending in 2016-17 to be \$18.9 billion, which is a \$690 million reduction compared to the 2017 Budget Act estimate of General Fund Medi-Cal spending. The lower estimate in the May Revision is attributable to many different factors, including

lower caseload estimates, higher than anticipated prescription drug rebates, and managed care capacitated rate adjustments resulting in greater General Fund savings. The May Revision proposes \$18.6 billion in General Fund funding for Medi-Cal in 2017-18, a \$540 million reduction compared to the 2017 Budget Act.

The net impact of the health care reform on the State's budget will depend on a number of factors, including levels of individual and employer participation and any changes in the federal matching rate and insurance premiums. Actual costs could differ materially as the Affordable Care Act is implemented and as the California Legislature realigns responsibility for certain health care and long-term care programs between the State and local governments.

Local Government. The primary units of local government in California are the counties, which vary significantly in size and population. There are also hundreds of incorporated cities and thousands of other special districts formed for education, utility and other services. Counties are responsible for provision of many basic services, including indigent healthcare, welfare, courts, jails and public safety in unincorporated areas. The 2011 Budget Act instituted a major realignment of responsibility for public safety programs from the State to local governments, including certain criminal justice programs, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, child and elderly welfare programs and the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CaWORKs). With the implementation of the federal Affordable Care Act, counties are expected to experience significant savings in their indigent healthcare programs as participants enroll in the State's expanded Medi-Cal program. In recognition of this shift in responsibility for indigent healthcare, the 2013 Budget Act established a mechanism to redirect a portion of each county's cost savings to benefit the State.

Local governments are limited in their ability to raise revenues due to constitutional constraints on their ability to impose or increase various taxes, fees, and assessments without voter approval. Counties, in particular, have had fewer options to raise revenues than many other local government entities.

Local governments in California have experienced notable financial difficulties from time to time, and there is no assurance that any California issuer will make full or timely payments of principal or interest or remain solvent. It should be noted that the creditworthiness of obligations issued by local California issuers may be unrelated to the creditworthiness of obligations issued by the State, and there is no obligation on the part of the State to make payment on such local obligations in the event of default.

Proposition 1A, enacted by the Legislature and approved by the voters in November 2004, has reduced the Legislature's authority over local government revenue sources by placing restrictions on the State's access to local governments' property, sales and vehicle licensing revenues. Proposition 1A also prohibits the State from mandating activities on cities, counties or special districts without providing for the funding needed to comply with the mandates. The State mandate provisions of Proposition 1A do not apply to schools or community colleges or to mandates relating to employee rights.

Proposition 22, enacted by the Legislature and approved by the voters in November 2010, supersedes Proposition 1A and prohibits any future borrowing by the State from local government funds, and generally prohibits the Legislature from making changes in local government funding sources. Allocation of local transportation funds cannot be changed without an extensive process.

Constitutional and Legislative Factors. Initiative constitutional amendments affecting State and local taxes and appropriations have been proposed and adopted pursuant to the State's initiative process from time to time. If any such initiatives are adopted, the State could be pressured to provide additional financial assistance to local governments or appropriate revenues as mandated by such initiatives. Propositions that may be adopted in the future may also place increasing pressure on the State's budget over future years, potentially reducing resources available for other State programs, especially to the extent any mandated spending limits would restrain the State's ability to fund such other programs by raising taxes. Because of the complexities of constitutional amendments and related legislation concerning appropriations and spending limits, the ambiguities and possible inconsistencies in their terms, the applicability of any

exceptions and exemptions and the impossibility of predicting future appropriations, it is not possible to predict the impact on the bonds in the portfolio of the California Series.

Effect of other State Laws on Bond Obligations. Some of the California municipal securities in which the California Series can invest may be obligations payable solely from the revenues of a specific institution or secured by specific properties. These are subject to provisions of California law that could adversely affect the holders of such obligations. For example, the revenues of California healthcare institutions may be adversely affected by State laws reducing Medi-Cal reimbursement rates, and California law limits the remedies available to a creditor secured by a mortgage or deed of trust on real property. Debt obligations payable solely from revenues of healthcare institutions may also be insured by the State but no guarantee exists that adequate reserve funds will be appropriated by the Legislature for such purpose.

Litigation. The State is a party to numerous legal proceedings, many of which normally occur in governmental operations. In addition, the State is involved in certain other legal proceedings that, if decided against the State might require the State to make significant future expenditures or impair future revenue sources. Because of the prospective nature of these proceedings, it is not presently possible to predict the outcome of such litigation or estimate the potential impact on the ability of the State to pay debt service costs on its obligations.

Two cases seeking to proceed as class actions (*Bakersfield Mall LLC v. Franchise Tax Board* and *CA-Centerside II, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board*) challenge the fee imposed by the California tax code upon limited liability companies registered in California, alleging discrimination against interstate commerce, violation the U.S. and California Constitutions, improper exercise of the State's police powers, and misapplication by the Franchise Tax Board. The cases were coordinated for hearing as the *Franchise Tax Board LLC Tax Refund Cases* and subsequently denied class certification by a coordination trial judge. The plaintiffs appealed the order to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District. If the trial court order is reversed and the plaintiffs prevail on the merits on behalf of themselves and the purported classes, the potential refunds could total \$1.2 billion.

Two pending cases challenge the state's right to require interstate unitary businesses to report their income on a combined basis while allowing intrastate unitary businesses to report the income of each business entity on a separate basis. *Harley Davidson, Inc. and Subsidiaries v. California Franchise Tax Board* and *Abercrombie & Fitch Co. & Subsidiaries v. California Franchise Tax Board* challenge the constitutionality of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 25101.15, allowing intrastate unitary businesses the option to report their income on a separate rather than combined basis. The trial court in *Harley Davidson* ruled on the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment, granting the Board's motion and denying plaintiff's motion. Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal. In each of these matters, plaintiff proposed an alternative method of calculating tax, which the Board estimated would have a possible one-time fiscal impact on corporate tax revenue of \$5 billion and \$1.5 billion annually thereafter. The Board argued the proposed method is unsupported by existing law. At the trial of the *Abercrombie* matter, the court granted the Board's motion for judgment in its favor at the close of plaintiff's presentation of its evidence. Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal. At this time, it is unknown what future fiscal impact a potential adverse final ruling on the merits would actually have on corporation taxes (including potential rebates of previously collected taxes and reduced future tax revenue) because of the uncertainty regarding the number of businesses which would pay the tax and how taxation on those companies would change as a result of an adverse ruling. However, the fiscal impact could be significant.

A pending case challenges the validity of a Board of Equalization regulation that requires the sales tax on mobile telephones to be based on the full "unbundled" price of the telephone rather than any discounted price that is contingent on a service plan commitment. In *Bekkerman et al. v. Board of Equalization*, the petitioners seek to invalidate the regulation insofar as it relates to sales in carrier-operated stores. The Petitioners also filed a second class action lawsuit seeking refunds of any excess sales tax paid. Should the court in the first action rule that the regulation is invalid, the second action, *Bekkerman et al. v. Board of Equalization, et al.* could result in an order requiring sales tax refunds, potentially exceeding \$1 billion. The

second action was removed to federal court in the United States District Court, Eastern District of California, but the court returned the case to state court.

In *Tos, et al. v. California High-Speed Rail Authority, et al*, the plaintiffs seek a declaration that a state law enacted in 20 is an unconstitutional amendment of the high-speed rail bond act and to prevent the California High-Speed Rail Authority from expending bond proceeds in reliance on the challenged state law. The trial court' denied plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order and, in April 2017, the trial court heard arguments on whether to issue a preliminary injunction on the project. In the event of a final decision that prevents the use of bond proceeds, it is possible that the federal government may require the state to reimburse federal funds provided for the high-speed rail project if the state fails to provide other matching funds consistent with the federal grant agreement. As of February 2017, the amount of unmatched federal spending on the project that the state may have to reimburse is approximately \$1.9 billion.

U-SECSUP0817