

# Buffalo, New York

## General Obligation Bonds New Issue Report

### Ratings

#### New Issue

General Improvement Serial Bonds,  
2015 A+

#### Outstanding Debt

Limited Tax General  
Obligation Bonds A+  
Unlimited General Obligation Bonds A+

### Rating Outlook

Stable

### New Issue Details

**Sale Information:** \$30,078,985 General Improvement Serial Bonds, 2015, scheduled for competitive sale the week of April 13.

**Security:** The full faith and credit of Buffalo, subject to the 2011 state statute limiting property tax increases to the lesser of 2% or an inflation factor (the tax cap law). This limit can be overridden by a 60% majority vote of the city common council.

**Purpose:** To refund outstanding bond anticipation notes and finance various capital projects.

**Final Maturity:** April 1, 2026.

### Key Rating Drivers

**Sound Fiscal Discipline:** The city has restored a sound fiscal foundation after dropping to low reserve and liquidity levels early last decade. The Buffalo Fiscal Stability Authority (BFSA), a state-imposed oversight entity in place since 2003, was a key factor in this improvement. Although the BFSA is now in an advisory period, the city has maintained the fiscal discipline established by the authority.

**Further Declines Projected:** Additional declines are projected from the city's current elevated fund balance levels. Fitch Ratings believes management will take the necessary steps to prevent declines that will reduce fund balance to levels that would impair financial flexibility.

**Extensive Economic Development Activity:** The economic base is benefitting from extensive investment by the University at Buffalo, the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus, the state of New York, and various private businesses such as SolarCity and IBM.

**Below-Average Socioeconomic Indicators:** Socioeconomic indicators are weak with below-average income levels, high individual poverty rates, and high unemployment rates.

**Elevated Unfunded OPEB Liability:** An elevated burden of unfunded other post-employment benefit (OPEB) liabilities is notable. Overall carrying costs are above average.

**Outstanding Debt Rating Parity:** The bonds are rated on parity with outstanding debt as the city may exceed the property tax cap in any one year with 60% approval of the common council.

### Rating Sensitivities

**Maintenance of Sound Reserves:** The rating is sensitive to the city's ability to consistently balance operations and maintain reserves consistent with those projected in the current four-year plan.

### Related Research

[Fitch Rates Buffalo, NY's LTGOs 'A+';](#)  
[Outlook Stable \(April 2015\)](#)

### Analysts

Eric Friedman  
+1 212 908-9181  
[eric.friedman@fitchratings.com](mailto:eric.friedman@fitchratings.com)

Karen Wagner  
+1 212 908-0230  
[karen.wagner@fitchratings.com](mailto:karen.wagner@fitchratings.com)

**Rating History**

Rating	Action	Outlook/ Watch	Date
A+	Affirmed	Stable	4/1/15
A+	Affirmed	Stable	3/4/14
A+	Affirmed	Stable	4/1/13
A+	Affirmed	Stable	8/27/12
A+	Affirmed	Stable	4/4/12
A+	Affirmed	Stable	7/20/11
A+	Affirmed	Stable	6/21/11
A+	Affirmed	Stable	1/20/11
A+	Affirmed	Stable	6/25/10
A+	Assigned	Stable	5/11/10

**Credit Profile**

Buffalo is located in upstate New York near the Canadian border and is the second largest city in the state. The city benefits from cross-border tourism and retains a fairly large manufacturing presence. Population has experienced chronic declines over the past few decades, including an 11% loss in the past decade and now stands a little below 260,000 residents.

**Economy Showing Signs of Improvement**

The city has a diverse economic base that benefits from its proximity to Canada with consistent tax base growth for the past five years, although market value per capita remains low at \$27,000. Notable economic anchors include Buffalo-Niagara Medical Campus (BNMC), Erie County Medical Center Corporation, Kaleida Health, and the University at Buffalo.

After years of declines, the city is showing notable signs of growth. In particular, BNMC, which employs roughly 12,000 people, has over \$500 million in new projects planned and is expected to add 4,000 new employees in the near future. SolarCity, a solar panel manufacturer, is investing \$5 billion combined with \$750 million from the state to build the largest solar manufacturing facility in the western hemisphere and create 3,000 jobs. Also, IBM announced it will be adding 500 jobs in Buffalo.

**Below-Average Socioeconomic Profile**

Socioeconomic indicators are below average with per capita income levels at 63% and 72% of the state and national levels, respectively. Poverty rates are more than double the statewide average and the city's unemployment rate has been persistently above the state and national averages over the past decade, although it is down from past highs.

The most recent monthly unemployment figure (December 2014) was 6.7%, well below the 8.1% recorded a year prior as the reduction in the labor force outpaced the decline in jobs. The 6.7% for December 2014 remains well above the state rate of 5.7% and the U.S. rate of 5.4% for the same period.

**Financial Operations Improved During BFSA Control Period**

The city experienced financial pressures early in the past decade, resulting in chronic fiscal imbalance and ultimately a strain on liquidity. Consequently, in 2003, state lawmakers created the BFSA to facilitate financial reforms within the city. From inception, the authority operated as a hard control board and as such its powers included the ability to invalidate union contracts, impose wage and hiring freezes, and approve budgets and debt issuances.

The authority moved to an advisory role in 2012 as the city had achieved predetermined benchmarks. The hard control period can be reimposed if certain fiscal conditions are not maintained. Fitch looks favorably on management's efforts to codify many of the policies required by the BFSA so that best practices remain in place regardless of the nature of the oversight board.

The city achieved operating surpluses every year from fiscal 2003 through fiscal 2010. During this period, the general fund unreserved fund balance improved from \$9.7 million, or 2.6% of expenditures and transfers out to over \$110 million, or 24.5%.

**Related Criteria**

U.S. Local Government Tax-Supported Rating Criteria (August 2012)  
 Tax-Supported Rating Criteria (August 2012)

**Trend of Deficits Expected to Continue**

Following this period of strong budget performance, the city has operated at a deficit in three of the past four fiscal years, spending down a portion of its unreserved fund balance. A large surplus in fiscal 2013, derived primarily from receipt of one-time and catch-up revenues, offset these reductions, leaving the city with still ample flexibility. However, further deficit spending is projected for fiscal 2015 and fiscal 2016.

The enacted budget for the current year, fiscal 2015, assumed a flat property tax levy and state aid, increased pension costs, and use of \$27.5 million in fund balance. Management expects to meet budget as unexpected snow removal costs will be offset by savings from vacant positions. The projected draw would bring unrestricted fund balance down to about \$83 million, or 17% of expenditures.

The city's four-year financial plan features annual fund balance appropriations. The fiscal 2016 budget included a \$25 million deficit, bringing unrestricted fund balance down to about 12% of expenditures. Property taxes will again be flat, although an increase is being considered for fiscal 2017. Pension costs are expected to begin declining and the city expects to benefit from beginning to self-fund medical insurance in fiscal 2016. Sales tax growth assumptions are conservative and pay increases for unsettled labor contracts are included. The four-year plan includes smaller declines of \$10 million for fiscal 2017 and \$5 million for fiscal 2018. Failure to achieve projected results for fiscal years 2016–2018 would reduce fund balance levels below those appropriate for the current rating level and would likely cause downward rating pressure.

**Moderate Debt and Pension Burdens with High OPEB Liability**

The city's overall debt burden is low on a per capita basis at \$1,399 but elevated at 5.2% of the city's weak market value. Total debt outstanding has declined consistently since fiscal 2002. Future debt needs are modest with annual issuance below the amount of debt amortized and principal amortization is very rapid, with 96% retired in 10 years.

Employees participate in well-funded state-sponsored defined benefit pension plans and the city has made all required pension payments to the state. The plan for police and fire is 85% funded as of March 31, 2014

assuming a 7% rate of return while the plan for all other employees is 84% funded. Payments have been increasing but state-provided projections show payments declining beginning in fiscal 2016.

As of July 2014, the city's other post-employment benefits (OPEB) liability totaled \$1.6 billion, or a very high 24% of market value. The city currently funds its liability on a pay-as-you-go basis. The current labor contract for firefighters included a change in healthcare plans and a new white-collar contract eliminated post-employment health care for new hires, which should lower OPEB costs. Total carrying costs for debt, pension, and OPEB claimed an elevated 24% of governmental fund spending, largely due to OPEB costs.

**Debt Statistics**

(\$000)	
This Issue	30079
Outstanding Direct Debt – Net of Refunding	255,258
<b>Total Net Direct Debt</b>	<b>285,337</b>
Overlapping Debt	77,004
<b>Total Overall Debt</b>	<b>362,341</b>

**Debt Ratios**

Net Direct Debt Per Capita (\$) <sup>a</sup>	1,102
As % of Market Value <sup>b</sup>	4.1
Overall Debt Per Capita (\$) <sup>a</sup>	1,399
As % of Market Value <sup>b</sup>	5.2

<sup>a</sup>Population: 258,959 (2013). <sup>b</sup>Market value: \$6,755,333,000 (2014).  
Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

**General Fund Financial Summary**

(\$000, Audited Fiscal Years Ended June 30)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Property Tax Revenue	136,329	138,369	138,305	135,239	133,819
Other Tax Revenue	12,407	14,465	12,951	12,253	15,542
<b>Total Tax Revenue</b>	<b>148,736</b>	<b>152,834</b>	<b>151,256</b>	<b>147,492</b>	<b>149,361</b>
License and Permits	3,598	3,591	3,338	3,408	3,258
Fines and Forfeits	6,593	7,013	6,808	7,289	6,896
Charges for Services	10,359	11,328	11,040	13,719	12,543
Intergovernmental Revenue	196,513	184,855	256,772	217,650	198,568
Other Revenue	80,138	79,431	9,203	115,400	81,314
<b>General Fund Revenue</b>	<b>445,937</b>	<b>439,052</b>	<b>438,416</b>	<b>504,958</b>	<b>451,940</b>
General Government	56,613	57,286	55,744	53,395	54,412
Public Safety	145,564	138,904	138,346	136,468	149,302
Public Works	—	—	—	9,824	11,649
Health and Social Services	2,974	2,816	1,834	2,536	1,921
Culture and Recreation	3,177	7,182	6,697	6,864	6,656
Educational	70,323	70,323	70,323	70,323	70,323
Debt Service	898	891	867	831	812
Other s	137,713	148,560	155,068	147,618	156,926
<b>General Fund Expenditures</b>	<b>417,262</b>	<b>425,962</b>	<b>428,879</b>	<b>427,859</b>	<b>452,001</b>
<b>General Fund Surplus</b>	<b>28,675</b>	<b>13,090</b>	<b>9,537</b>	<b>77,099</b>	<b>(61)</b>
Transfers In	8,657	9,545	12,076	11,024	15,819
Transfers Out	33,190	35,424	37,932	35,957	35,182
Net Transfers and Other	(24,533)	(25,879)	(25,856)	(24,933)	(19,363)
<b>Net Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>4,142</b>	<b>(12,789)</b>	<b>(16,319)</b>	<b>52,166</b>	<b>(19,424)</b>
Total Fund Balance	142,740	129,951	113,631	165,797	146,373
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out, and Other Uses	31.7	28.2	24.3	35.7	30.0
Unreserved Fund Balance <sup>1</sup>	110,481	—	—	—	—
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out, and Other Uses	24.5	—	—	—	—
Unrestricted Fund Balance <sup>2</sup>	—	92,707	77,714	130,050	110,846
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out, and Other Uses	—	20.1	16.6	28.0	22.8

<sup>a</sup>Pre GASB54. <sup>b</sup>Reflects GASB 54 classifications: sum of committed, assigned, and unassigned. Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

The ratings above were solicited by, or on behalf of, the issuer, and therefore, Fitch has been compensated for the provision of the ratings.

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK [HTTPS://FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](https://fitchratings.com/understandingcreditratings) IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT [WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM](http://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM). PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.

Copyright © 2015 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion is based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at anytime for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.