

New Issue: Moody's assigns A1 to Buffalo, NY's \$30.1M GOLT bonds; outlook stable

Global Credit Research - 02 Apr 2015

Affirms A1 rating on outstanding GO Debt

BUFFALO (CITY OF) NY
Cities (including Towns, Villages and Townships)
NY

Moody's Rating

ISSUE	RATING
General Improvement Serial Bonds - 2015	A1
Sale Amount \$30,078,985	
Expected Sale Date 04/07/15	
Rating Description General Obligation Limited Tax	

Moody's Outlook STA

NEW YORK, April 02, 2015 --Moody's Investors Service has assigned a A1 rating to the City of Buffalo, NY's \$30.1 million General Improvement Serial Bonds - 2015. Concurrently, Moody's affirms the A1 rating on outstanding rated debt.

SUMMARY RATING RATIONALE

The A1 rating reflects the city's overall solid reserves and liquidity despite current declines and structurally imbalanced budgets in the multi-year plan. The rating also factors: (1) challenges posed by the city's below average demographic profile; (2) a high debt burden that is expected to gradually moderate; (3) the challenges posed by open employee contracts (4) the oversight of city operations by the Buffalo Fiscal Stability Authority (BFSA, sales tax and state aid secured bonds rated Aa1), which has approved the city's four-year financial plan; (5) the city's improved revenue raising flexibility given modest growth in assessed valuation and improved taxing margin; and (6) additional bondholder security provided by the city's legally required and trustee-held bi-annual set-aside of debt service payments from first property taxes collected.

OUTLOOK

Moody's stable outlook reflects our belief that the city's liquidity and reserve position have improved substantially, as evidenced by elimination of the need for seasonal cash flow borrowing. The currently healthy cash position is expected to provide satisfactory cushion against risks related to the weak economy, potential state budget cuts and disbursement delays as well as liabilities related to open labor contracts and ongoing litigation. The outlook factors our expectation that management will maintain its currently strong financial position in the face of these challenges, despite continued use of reserves to balance the budget.

WHAT COULD MAKE THE RATING GO UP

- Demonstrated ability to maintain satisfactory financial flexibility and liquidity relative to peers
- Structurally balanced budgets which reduce the annual fund balance appropriation and declining reserve position
- Continued strengthening of city financial policies
- Significant increases in socio-economic profile

WHAT COULD MAKE THE RATING GO DOWN

- Continued use of reserves to support operations
- Structurally imbalanced operating results
- Reversal of trend of increasing taxing capacity

STRENGTHS

- State oversight board provides third-party supervision of city's finances
- Conservative budget and strong management have led to solid reserve position and liquidity
- Direct pay of first-in property tax money to the trustee for payment of debt service

CHALLENGES

- Uncertainty around outstanding union contracts and pending litigation
- State aid cuts could put significant pressure on city's finances
- Use of Fund balance to balance budgets

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recent developments are incorporated in the Detailed Rating Rationale.

DETAILED RATING RATIONALE

ECONOMY AND TAX BASE: TAX BASE CONTINUES TO EXPAND DRIVEN BY NEW DEVELOPMENT DESPITE CONTINUED POPULATION LOSSES

Despite large population declines, income levels well below state averages and high poverty rates major real estate developments continue throughout the city. According to U.S. Census figures, the city's 2010 population was 261,310, down 10.7% from 2000, a continuation of the trend that began in 1950 when the city's population peaked at 580,132. Positively, the rate of decline appears to have slowed as the city's population has lost 0.9% since 2010. Despite this slower rate of decline, Moody's Analytics reports in its January 2015 report that the demographic picture for the Buffalo MSA is bleak; among the nation's 100 largest metro areas only Cleveland, Detroit, and Rochester are expected to lose more residents over the next decade.

New York State Governor Andrew Cuomo has made economic development of the Buffalo region one of his top priorities. The goal of his "Buffalo Billion" plan was to infuse \$1 billion into the Buffalo economy over 10 years. As a result of this initiative, there has been considerable development in the Buffalo MSA.

Recently, SolarCity announced that it planned to invest up to \$5 billion in the Riverbend Project, up from the \$750 million under previous ownership, to construct the largest solar production facility in the western hemisphere. When complete the Riverbend Project is expected to support up to 3,000 new high paying technology jobs. As part of the Buffalo Billion, International Business Machines Corporation (IBM, Aa3 stable), announced in 2014 its commitment to bring 500 new information technology jobs to the city. In addition, the city has significant economic development activity within in the city and along the waterfront and inner harbor. These include the Buffalo Sabres' HARBORcenter Development, LLC a new hockey-themed complex along the inner harbor, the ongoing developments at the Buffalo Niagara

Medical Campus and the University of Buffalo. In total these projects represent nearly a \$1 billion in investments within the city and will result in thousands of new jobs.

Despite recent building activity the employment picture continues to be a concern. While the city's unemployment rate has been in decline over the past three years this has largely been due to a declining workforce and not an improvement in the labor participation rate. As of December 2015, the number of employed in the city had reached its lowest level yet. We do expect the employment numbers to improve over the long-term though driven by continued development within the city and a more family friendly downtown.

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS AND RESERVES: RESERVES STILL STRONG DESPITE RECENT DRAW DOWN

Over the past decade reserves have improved significantly driven by conservative budget management and oversight of operations by BFSAs. Over the past five years total Operating Fund (City General Fund, BOE General Fund, City Debt Service Fund and BOE Debt Service Fund) has averaged approximately 30% of revenues. Fiscal 2014 finished at the lowest level since 2009 following an operating deficit of \$34 million. The City General Fund finished with a \$24 million decline, the result of a planned \$12 million draw, a settlement with both the police and fire collective bargaining units, judgments and claims against the city and additional pay-go capital. Positively, the city did not incur additional debt as a result of either the new collective bargaining contracts or the judgments and claims, a common occurrence for local governments in New York. Additionally, the city made its full pension payment on-time and did not partake in the amortization program. The BOE's General Fund declined by \$10 million, after the BOE was able to replenish \$20 million in originally budgeted appropriations. The better than budgeted result is attributable to conservative budgeting for expenses.

Fiscal 2015 (June 30 year end) is currently tracking on budget for the city and slightly positive for the BOE. However, the City budgeted the use of \$27 million in reserves to the year and expects to use nearly all the appropriations. Despite savings in fuel and pension costs, the city was hard hit by seven feet of snow in November 2014 which eliminated any savings in the budget to date. Management is in discussions with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to be reimbursed for costs. It is unclear as to how much FEMA will reimburse the city and management is not currently projecting a reimbursement. The BOE budgeted the use of approximately \$10 million and currently expects to conservatively use half of its appropriations.

The fiscal 2016 budget process is in its early stages, and the city has no estimates for the next fiscal year. However, management is required to do four year financial plans. As of May 2014, the city had anticipated using another \$25 million to balance the budget in fiscal 2016. Another \$25 million decline, on top of what is currently projected for 2015, would bring the city's General Fund down to approximately \$100 million, approximating the city's informal policy. It would also be a significant decline in financial flexibility that had been built up over the past decade. The BOE also plans to continue to use reserves to balance the budget, however at a much lower level. Failure to adhere to the city's informal policies, and structurally balance operations going forward, could result in negative rating pressure in the future.

Liquidity

Liquidity for the combined Operating Fund is strong, at over 30% of revenues. The city has not required the issuance of short-term cash flow notes since 2007.

Debt and Pensions

Debt will remain manageable despite its elevated position given additional tax base growth and a policy to not issue more debt than what is being retired. Direct debt is a high 5.1% of full value, well above the state wide median of 1.8%. This figure includes debt that is issued for schools, however. Most cities in New York do not combine school debt with city debt. Management anticipates issuing approximately \$20-25 million in new money on an annual basis.

Debt Structure

All of the debt is fixed rate.

Debt-Related Derivatives

The city is not exposed to derivatives.

Pensions and OPEB

Like all local governments in New York, the city continues to be challenged with pension and OPEB costs. However, management continues to make pension payments in full and on time and has no plans to amortize payments in the future. The City contributes to the New York State Police and Fire Retirement System (PFRS), Teachers Retirement System (TRS) and Employees' Retirement System (ERS), all of which are multi-employer cost-sharing defined benefit plans. The Annual Required Contribution (ARC) for 2013 for PFRS, TRS and ERS was \$76.8 million or 6.3% of total operating expenditures. The districts combined adjusted net pension liability for 2013, under Moody's methodology for adjusting reported pension data, was \$1.9 billion, or an average 0.94 times total operating revenues. The adjustments are not intended to replace the city's reported liability information, but to improve comparability with other rated entities. We determined the city's share of liability for the state-run plans in proportion to its contributions to the plans and do not factor in the town's recent amortizations.

Similar to all other local governments in New York, the city and BOE pays OPEB on a pay-as-you-go basis. In 2014 the pay-go portion of OPEB was \$111 million (9.3% of expenses). Because the city does not fully fund the ARC (\$276.5 million), the unfunded OPEB liability increases every year. At the end of fiscal 2014, the OPEB liability amounted to \$3.5 billion.

Management and Governance

Management for the city is strong, with informal reserve policies, formal "Rainy Day Funds", and a debt policy to not issue more debt than what is being issued. Management is also required to submit its budgets and four year financial plans to BFSAs for review and do quarterly financial reporting. In addition, pursuant to the state enabling legislation, the city is required to set up a debt service reserve fund, to be funded with first-in property tax revenues, for the payment of debt service.

New York cities, towns and villages have an institutional framework score of 'A' or moderate. Revenues are largely comprised of property, sales, and mortgage taxes, as well as building permits. Property tax revenues are subject to the tax cap but can be overridden with a 60% vote of the local legislative body. Economically sensitive revenues remain below peak levels prior to recession. Expenditures are largely predictable but the presence of strong collective bargaining groups make it difficult to reduce expenditures.

KEY STATISTICS

2015 Full Value: \$6.9 billion

2015 Full Value Per Capita: \$26,425

Median Family Income as % of US: 57.6%

Fiscal 2014 Fund balance as a % of Revenues: 31.6%

5-Year Dollar Change in Fund Balance as % of Revenues: 11.1%

Fiscal 2014 Cash Balance as % of Revenues: 32.8%

5-Year Dollar Change in Cash Balance as % of Revenues: 7.4%

Institutional Framework: A

5-Year Average Operating Revenues / Operating Expenditures: 0.96x

Net Direct Debt as % of Full Value: 5.1%

Net Direct Debt / Operating Revenues: 0.3x

3-Year Average of Moody's ANPL as % of Full Value: 16.5%

3-Year Average of Moody's ANPL / Operating Revenues: 1.0x

OBLIGOR PROFILE

Buffalo is the second largest city by population in the State, after New York City. Located in western New York, on the border to Canada, the city is the economic hub of the region.

LEGAL SECURITY

The bonds are secured by a general obligation pledge as limited by the Property Tax Cap - Legislation (Chapter 97 (Part A) of the Laws of the State of New York, 2011).

USE OF PROCEEDS

Bond proceeds will permanently finance \$7 million in outstanding BANs and fund various capital projects throughout the city, the largest of which is for infrastructure improvements.

RATING METHODOLOGY

The principal methodology used in this rating was US Local Government General Obligation Debt published in

January 2014. Please see the Credit Policy page on www.moodys.com for a copy of this methodology.

REGULATORY DISCLOSURES

For ratings issued on a program, series or category/class of debt, this announcement provides certain regulatory disclosures in relation to each rating of a subsequently issued bond or note of the same series or category/class of debt or pursuant to a program for which the ratings are derived exclusively from existing ratings in accordance with Moody's rating practices. For ratings issued on a support provider, this announcement provides certain regulatory disclosures in relation to the rating action on the support provider and in relation to each particular rating action for securities that derive their credit ratings from the support provider's credit rating. For provisional ratings, this announcement provides certain regulatory disclosures in relation to the provisional rating assigned, and in relation to a definitive rating that may be assigned subsequent to the final issuance of the debt, in each case where the transaction structure and terms have not changed prior to the assignment of the definitive rating in a manner that would have affected the rating. For further information please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page for the respective issuer on www.moodys.com.

Regulatory disclosures contained in this press release apply to the credit rating and, if applicable, the related rating outlook or rating review.

Please see www.moodys.com for any updates on changes to the lead rating analyst and to the Moody's legal entity that has issued the rating.

Please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on www.moodys.com for additional regulatory disclosures for each credit rating.

Analysts

Robert Weber
Lead Analyst
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

Tiphany J. Lee
Backup Analyst
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

Gregory W. Lipitz
Additional Contact
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

Contacts

Journalists: (212) 553-0376
Research Clients: (212) 553-1653

Moody's Investors Service, Inc.
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
USA

MOODY'S
INVESTORS SERVICE

© 2015 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH

PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO CONSIDER MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS IN MAKING ANY INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO").

hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

For Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail clients. It would be dangerous for "retail clients" to make any investment decision based on MOODY'S credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

For Japan only: MOODY'S Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MOODY'S Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000. MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.