

MOODY'S

INVESTORS SERVICE

New Issue: Moody's assigns Aa1 rating to City of Albuquerque's, NM \$42.7M GO Bonds Series 2015A&B; outlook is stable

Global Credit Research - 14 Apr 2015

Aa1 affirmed on outstanding parity debt

ALBUQUERQUE (CITY OF) NM
Cities (including Towns, Villages and Townships)
NM

Moody's Rating

ISSUE	RATING
-------	--------

General Purpose Bonds, Series 2015A	Aa1
-------------------------------------	-----

Sale Amount \$37,970,000

Expected Sale Date 05/04/15

Rating Description General Obligation

Storm Sewer Bonds, Series 2015B	Aa1
---------------------------------	-----

Sale Amount \$4,726,000

Expected Sale Date 05/04/15

Rating Description General Obligation

Moody's Outlook STA

NEW YORK, April 14, 2015 --Moody's Investors Service has assigned a Aa1 rating to the City of Albuquerque's, NM \$37.97 million General Purpose Bonds, Series 2015A and \$4.726 million Storm Sewer Bonds, Series 2015B. Concurrently, Moody's has affirmed the Aa1 rating on the city's outstanding rated parity debt. The outlook remains stable.

SUMMARY RATING RATIONALE

The Aa1 rating reflects the city's sizeable tax base that serves as an economic hub for the state as well as historically narrow and statutorily required financial reserves. The rating also incorporates the city's average socioeconomic profile and favorable debt profile with rapid principal amortization.

OUTLOOK

The outlook for the City of Albuquerque is stable, reflecting the city's stabilized financial operations, but a still narrow financial position in comparison to similarly rated entities. The outlook also reflects the city's slow but steady economic growth experienced in recent years. The financial and economic trends are expected to continue in the near future. Moody's still notes that the city's concentration in federal employment and procurement could be negatively impacted by federal spending reductions, which could erode economic stability and impact gross receipts tax collections. Future rating actions will assess the city's economic stability and ability to maintain structural balance.

WHAT COULD MAKE THE RATING GO UP

- Trend of operating surpluses bolstering financial reserves
- Significant economic expansion leading to economic metrics consistent with higher rating category

WHAT COULD MAKE THE RATING GO DOWN

- Trend of imbalanced operations with deterioration of financial reserves
- Weakening of the city's economic base or gross receipts tax collections

STRENGTHS

- Large and diverse tax base that serves as the economic engine for the state of New Mexico
- Favorable debt profile

CHALLENGES

- Tepid economic recovery; reliance on economically sensitive gross receipts tax revenues
- Stable but narrow financial position in comparison to similarly rated entities
- Hold harmless distributions starting to phase out in fiscal 2016
- Increased public safety expenditures after Department of Justice settlement

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recent developments are incorporated in the Detailed Rating Rationale.

DETAILED RATING RATIONALE

REVENUE GENERATING BASE: SIZEABLE TAX BASE; REGIONALLY IMPORTANT ECONOMY

We believe the city's economic and property tax base will continue to experience modest near-term growth given the city's regional importance to the economy. The City of Albuquerque is located in the north central portion of the state and is home to approximately 25% of the state's total population. The city's tax base growth has slowed to a limited 0.3% average annual rate between fiscal years 2010 and 2015. Taxable values declined a modest 0.6% in fiscal 2013 to \$11.87 billion, derived from a full value of \$43.5 billion. Management attributes the decline to a softening of commercial values. Expansion resumed in fiscal 2014 and fiscal 2015 with a 2.2% increase in the most recent year that increased taxable values to \$12.2 billion, derived from an estimated large full value of \$44.8 billion. Officials anticipate modest taxable value growth to continue into fiscal 2016 and fiscal 2017 as the number building permits rises. The city's tax base exhibits limited concentration with the top ten taxpayers contributing 3.2% to total assessed valuation for fiscal 2015. The city's top tax payer PNM Electric, contributes 1.4% to total assessed valuation for the same time period.

The December 2014 Moody's Economy.com report for Albuquerque states that the area has held off from falling back into recession despite lingering effects from sequestration and the 2013 government shutdown, but will significantly lag the rest of the U.S. job and income growth. The report also states that weaker demographics and migration trends will prevent the area from returning to previous growth rates, but the stable government presence could potentially provide the foundation for a more dynamic private sector.

Major employers in the Albuquerque MSA include the University of New Mexico, Kirtland Air Force Base, and Sandia National Laboratories. The institutional presence provided by these entities has historically been a stabilizing factor for the local economy. We note that potential federal spending cuts could erode the city's modest economic gains, slowing housing development and impacting gross receipts tax revenues. Healthcare and high-tech industries also have significant presence in the employment base. Favorably, the city's January unemployment rate of 5.4% was below the state (6.2%) and nation (6.1%) for the same time period. Resident wealth levels are modest with per capita income and median family income (from 2012 American Community Survey) approximating 94% and 93.1% of national levels, respectively.

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS AND POSITION: RESERVE POSITION REMAINS STABLE BUT NARROW; BUDGETARY CHALLENGES IN NEAR TERM FUTURE

The city has taken measures since mid-year 2010 to restore structural balance to operations, including downsizing of government expenditures, as well as increasing the operational levy of property taxes. The city is administratively required to maintain a minimum General Fund balance equal to 1/12 (8.3%) of budgeted expenditures. City operations were unbalanced for three consecutive years, reducing General Fund balance from a high of \$87.4 million at fiscal year-end 2006 to \$43.1 million for fiscal 2009. Fiscal years 2008 and 2009 recorded

the largest reductions in fund balance of \$26 million and \$15.6 million, respectively. City management undertook extensive cost reduction through elimination of vacant positions, pay reductions, and increased the operational property tax levy to structurally balance operations in fiscal 2010. The fiscal year ended with an operational surplus of approximately \$2 million, increasing General Fund balance to \$45.2 million or 9.9% of General Fund revenues. Structural balance was maintained for fiscal 2011, yielding an additional surplus of \$6.7 million, increasing the General Fund reserve position to \$53.2 million (11.7% of General Fund revenues). The fiscal 2011 General Fund balance included an additional increase of \$1.3 million due to a GASB 54 required General Fund balance restatement. Fiscal 2012 General Fund operations performed better than anticipated, resulting in an increase of \$11 million, building General Fund balance to \$59.2 million (12.7% of revenues). Management attributes the surplus to an increase slight increase in revenues and higher than anticipated reversions from departmental budgets.

The city incurred a modest \$884,863 deficit in fiscal 2013, decreasing total General Fund balance to \$58.3 million, or a still satisfactory 12.5% of revenues. The nominal deficit, which was expected to be a much higher at \$6.8 million, was attributable to increased expenses for benefits, additional positions, salary adjustments and transfers to other funds. Favorable variances in gross receipts tax collections and departmental budgets reduced the size of the deficit throughout the fiscal year. Despite anticipating a \$1.8 million deficit in fiscal 2014, positive expenditure variances and increasing revenues generated a favorable \$5.1 million surplus by fiscal year end. The surplus increased the total General Fund balance to \$63.4 million, or 13.3% of revenues. Fiscal 2014 General Fund revenues were primarily comprised of State Share Gross Receipts Tax (39.3%), Municipal Gross Receipts Tax (25.3%), and property tax revenues (16.4%). We note that the city's heavily reliance on volatile gross receipts tax collections can create operational challenges with unfavorable variances.

Officials anticipate a \$13 million reduction in reserves to a total General Fund balance of approximately \$50.4 million for fiscal 2015 or 9.1% of projected revenues. The deficit would be attributable to increased departmental expenditures and a large portion of non-recurring appropriations (\$21.6 million), but could be offset by favorable budgetary variances as seen in previous years. Similar to prior budgets, management projects an additional deficit for fiscal 2016, reducing General Fund reserves to near the city's minimum reserve policy, which Moody's considers weak for the rating category. The fiscal 2016 budget has presented more challenges to the city, as the hold harmless portion of the gross receipts tax is starting to be phased out over the next 15 years. GRT will decrease by approximately \$2.2 million to \$2.6 million annually over the next five years, accounting to a sizable \$12.3 million cumulative reduction by 2020. Officials anticipate that the phase-out will mute favorable growth in the revenue stream moving forward, but do not anticipate year over year declines. Another challenge the city faces are the increased police department expenditures related to a settlement with the United States Department of Justice. In order to comply with the settlement, the department will incur a \$4.7 million increase in annual expenditures over the prior year. Officials report that the increased expenditures associated with the settlement will start to taper off in the next couple of years and become more manageable. Downward rating pressure is possible if the near-term challenges drive imbalanced operations and impact reserve levels. The 8.3% minimum reserve policy is weak for the rating category, and consistency of reserves at least equal to this policy is key to maintenance of the current rating.

Liquidity

The liquidity within the city's General Fund is slightly under the total General Fund balance level, but is near historical levels. At fiscal year-end 2014 the city had \$52.8 million in cash, which represents 11.1% of revenues. The fiscal 2015 cash level is expected to decline in tandem with the anticipated draw on reserves in fiscal 2015.

DEBT AND OTHER LIABILITIES: MODEST DEBT BURDEN, RAPID PAYOUT YIELD FAVORABLE DEBT PROFILE

We expect the city's debt profile to remain manageable over the long term despite plans for continued annual borrowing. Inclusive of the current sale, the debt burden is modest at 0.9% direct and 2.7% overall (both expressed as a percentage of fiscal 2015 full value). We note that the city debt burden is capped per statute at 4% of assess valuation (fiscal 2015 - \$489.1 million), in which 78.9% of the capacity is used. The current issuances are authorized under the \$115.5 million voter approved bond package in October of 2013 and will exhaust the entire authorization. The city plans to return to voters every other year for additional general obligation debt authorization, which includes \$119 million in fiscal 2015. Proceeds will be used for various city improvements in-line with a ten year capital improvement plan.

Debt Structure

The city's debt profile includes a rapid principal amortization of 92.6% retired within ten years. By policy the city

issues bonds with a maximum maturity of 13 years.

Debt-Related Derivatives

The city has no exposure to variable rate debt or interest rate swaps.

Pensions and OPEB

The city has an above-average employee pension burden, based on unfunded liabilities for its share of the Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA), a cost sharing plan administered by the state. Moody's fiscal 2013 adjusted net pension liability (ANPL) for the city, under our methodology for adjusting reported pension data, is \$1.3 billion, or an elevated 2.50 times operating revenues. The three year average of the county's ANPL to operating revenues is 2.85 times, while the three-year average of ANPL to full value is high at 3.47%. Moody's ANPL reflects certain adjustments we make to improve comparability of reported pension liabilities. The adjustments are not intended to replace the city's reported liability information, but to improve comparability with other rated entities. For more information on Moody's insights on employee pensions and the related credit impact on companies, government, and other entities across the globe, please visit Moody's on Pensions at www.moody.com/pensions.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

New Mexico cities have an institutional framework score of "A" or moderate. Cities receive the majority of their revenues through gross receipt and property taxes and both remain moderately predictable. About 64% of New Mexico cities are at the O&M levy cap and therefore be considered to have a moderate level of ability to raise revenues. Expenditures are moderately stable and management teams have a higher level of ability to reduce expenditures related to salaries and public safety. Roughly 20% of all expenditures consist of debt service and pensions contributions.

The City is a home rule municipality, with its charter originally adopted in 1971, and has a Mayor-Council form of government with a salaried full-time Mayor elected every four years.

KEY STATISTICS

- Assessed Value (Full Value), Fiscal 2015: \$44.8 billion
- Assessed Value (Full Value) Per Capita, Fiscal 2015: \$80,441
- Median Family Income as % of US Median (2012 American Community Survey): 93.10%
- Fund Balance as % of Revenues, Fiscal 2014: 13.40%
- 5-Year Dollar Change in Fund Balance as % of Revenues: 1.33%
- Cash Balance as % of Revenues, Fiscal 2014: 11.28%
- 5-Year Dollar Change in Cash Balance as % of Revenues: 1.72%
- Institutional Framework: "A"
- 5-Year Average Operating Revenues / Operating Expenditures: 1.00x
- Net Direct Debt as % of Assessed Value: 0.92%
- Net Direct Debt / Operating Revenues: 0.77x
- 3-Year Average ANPL as % of Assessed Value: 3.47%
- 3-Year Average ANPL / Operating Revenues: 2.85x

OBLIGOR PROFILE

Albuquerque is the largest city in the State of New Mexico (GO rated Aaa stable), accounting for roughly one-quarter of the State's population. Located at the center of the State in Bernalillo County (Aaa stable) at the intersection of two major interstate highways and served by both rail and air, Albuquerque is the major trade, commercial and financial center of the State.

LEGAL SECURITY

The bonds are secured by a direct and continuing property tax levied, without limitation as to rate of amount, on all taxable property within the city.

USE OF PROCEEDS

Proceeds from Series 2015A and 2015B of the current sale will finance general city improvements and storm water projects, respectively.

PRINCIPAL 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

John Nichols
Lead Analyst
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

James Hobbs
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.