

# Bernalillo County, New Mexico

## General Obligation Bonds New Issue Report

### Ratings

#### New Issues

General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016	AAA
General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2016A	AAA

#### Outstanding Debt

Unlimited Tax Bonds	AAA
Gross Receipts Tax Bonds	AA+

### Rating Outlook

Stable

### Related Research

[Bernalillo County, New Mexico \(February 2015\)](#)

[Fitch Rates Bernalillo County, NM GO Bds 'AAA'; Outlook Stable \(April 2014\)](#)

### Analysts

Jose Acosta  
+1 512 215-3726  
[jose.acosta@fitchratings.com](mailto:jose.acosta@fitchratings.com)

Leslie Cook  
+1 512-215-3740  
[leslie.cook@fitchratings.com](mailto:leslie.cook@fitchratings.com)

### New Issue Details

**Sale Information:** \$10,290,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016, and \$13,540,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2016A, scheduled to sell competitively on Feb. 16.

**Security:** Annual unlimited property tax levy.

**Purpose:** Bond proceeds will be used for various public improvements and to refund outstanding debt for interest cost savings.

**Final Maturity:** Aug. 15, 2030 (series 2016); Aug. 15, 2027 (series 2016A).

### Rating Drivers

**Finances Pressured But Still Sound:** The county's financial position has been affected by spending pressures, particularly in public safety, but remains solid. Financial reserves remain large despite three consecutive years of sizable drawdowns. Enhanced revenues and stabilized detention center spending should allow the county to restore structural balance in fiscal 2016 as planned.

**Solid GRT Coverage:** Debt service coverage of the county's gross receipts tax (GRT) revenue bonds remains solid; furthermore, legal and practical limitations on further leverage are strong.

**Favorable Debt Profile:** The county's debt profile remains positive, as evidenced by moderate debt levels, a rapid GO and GRT bond principal payout rate, moderate carrying costs, and modest capital plans.

**Broad Economy:** The county's economic base is broad but has been slow to recover from recessionary employment losses. The unemployment rate remains moderate. The county's recent development as a technology hub may aid its recovery while further enhancing economic diversity.

### Sensitivities

**Continued Draws on Fund Balance:** Failure to maintain ample reserves due to unabated spending pressure or revenue declines could lead to negative rating pressure.

**Large Defense Installations Pose Vulnerability:** The large presence of military and defense installations exposes the county's economic base to potential future military downsizing. Any resulting financial impact on the county's revenue base without offsetting actions could lead to downward rating pressure.

**Rating History — GO Bonds**

Rating	Action	Outlook/ Watch	Date
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	2/11/16
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	2/13/15
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	4/21/14
AAA	Affirmed	RWN	2/18/14
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	2/22/13
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	9/22/11
AAA	Affirmed	Stable	5/20/10
AAA	Revised	Stable	4/30/10
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	12/4/09
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	6/3/09
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	6/4/08
AA+	Assigned	Stable	10/7/04

**Rating History — Gross Receipts Tax Bonds**

Rating	Action	Outlook/ Watch	Date
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	2/11/16
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	2/23/15
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	4/21/14
AA+	Affirmed	RWN	2/18/14
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	2/22/13
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	9/22/11
AA+	Affirmed	Stable	5/20/10
AA+	Revised	Stable	4/30/10
AA	Affirmed	Stable	12/4/09
AA	Affirmed	Stable	6/3/09
AA	Affirmed	Stable	6/4/08
AA+	Assigned	Stable	10/7/04

Fitch recently published exposure drafts of state and local government tax-supported criteria (Exposure Draft: U.S. Tax-Supported Rating Criteria, dated Sept. 10, 2015 and Exposure Draft: Incorporating Enhanced Recovery Prospects into U.S. Local Tax-Supported Ratings, dated Feb. 2, 2016). The drafts include a number of proposed revisions to existing criteria. If applied in the proposed form, Fitch estimates the revised criteria would result in changes to less than 10% of existing tax-supported ratings. Fitch expects that final criteria will be approved and published in the first quarter of 2016. Once approved, the criteria will be applied immediately to any new issue and surveillance rating review. Fitch anticipates the criteria to be applied to all ratings that fall under the criteria within a 12-month period from the final approval date.

**Related Criteria**

[Exposure Draft: Incorporating Enhanced Recovery Prospects into U.S. Local Tax-Supported Ratings \(February 2016\)](#)

[Exposure Draft: U.S. Tax-Supported Rating Criteria \(September 2015\)](#)

[U.S. Local Government Tax-Supported Rating Criteria \(August 2012\)](#)

[Tax-Supported Rating Criteria \(August 2012\)](#)

**Credit Profile**

As the state’s largest county, population grew a notable 19% from 2000–2010 and currently exceeds 675,000; the increase was spurred in part by the area’s recent development as a technology hub. The city of Albuquerque comprises about 80% of the county’s population.

**Large Reserves Weather Spending Pressures**

The county’s financial profile remains solid, characterized by large reserves that typically exceed the state-required three-month (25%) minimum fund balance. Although spending pressure is evident, substantial reserves ranging from 49%–87% of spending have allowed the county to accommodate sizeable hikes in public safety spending (the county’s largest expenditure category) and capital outlays.

Due to other one-time expenditures, the county posted its third consecutive large drawdown in fiscal 2015. Improved prisoner processing at the metropolitan detention center (MDC) and resulting increased capacity and stabilization of related expenditures is expected to allow a return to balanced operations in fiscal 2016. A continued trend in large drawdowns would generate negative rating pressure.

The fiscal 2015 audit posted a general fund net deficit of \$10.5 million (4.1% of spending), well below the projected \$41 million draw down for one-time expenditures. The year-end financial cushion (comprised of its unrestricted fund balance and the state-required three-month reserve), totaled a still strong \$125.6 million or 49% of spending. Liquidity remained ample at over \$128 million, covering current liabilities by an ample 6.4x.

**Fiscal 2016 Budget Includes Additional GRTs**

The fiscal 2016 budget, adopted as part of the fiscal 2015–2016 biennial budget, includes a modest \$3 million (1% of spending) drawdown due to almost \$8 million in pay-as-you-go capital outlays. The county’s five-year forecast projects annual balanced operations, assumes no new revenue sources, and GRT collection growth of 1.7%–3.0% annually, which Fitch considers reasonable.

In fiscal 2016, the state will begin a 15-year phase-out of its hold-harmless payments to municipalities for the exemption of food and medicine from the GRT. The hold-harmless reduction is estimated at \$514,000 for the county in fiscal 2016, growing to a projected \$10 million by fiscal 2031. To offset these reductions, the state authorized municipalities to impose additional GRTs up to 3/8<sup>ths</sup> of 1%. The hold-harmless GRTs, in 1/8<sup>th</sup> increments, can be imposed through ordinance only and are not subject to referendum.

In fiscal 2016, the county imposed a 1/8<sup>th</sup> hold-harmless GRT for general purposes and a 1/8<sup>th</sup> hold-harmless GRT for mental health services. Concurrently, the county repealed a 1/16<sup>th</sup> GRT for general purposes. The net revenue increase to the general fund in the fiscal 2016 budget is projected at \$8.3 million (3.4% of general fund revenues), substantially greater than the projected hold-harmless payment reduction. GRT revenues account for 44% of general fund revenues, exposing the county to economically volatile taxes; this risk is mitigated by the county’s healthy fund balances.

**Ample Revenue Flexibility**

Fitch Ratings notes that the county retains significant revenue flexibility. An estimated \$14.2 million (5.6% of fiscal 2015 spending) in additional property tax revenue is available under the non-residential mill cap. Remaining authority in four different local option GRTs would generate

\$137 million (53% of spending), although only \$30 million (12% of spending) could be imposed without an election.

### General Fund Summary

(\$000; Fiscal Years Ended June 30)

	2010 <sup>a</sup>	2011 <sup>a</sup>	2012 <sup>a</sup>	2013 <sup>a</sup>	2014 <sup>a</sup>	2015 <sup>a</sup>
Revenues	229,176	223,886	247,483	232,490	234,552	244,283
Expenditures	204,515	219,388	222,379	248,856	258,700	242,537
<b>Net Change</b>	<b>24,661</b>	<b>4,498</b>	<b>25,104</b>	<b>(16,366)</b>	<b>(24,148)</b>	1,746
Transfers In	2,207	15	0	307	1	547
Other Sources	72	158	274	386	327	270
Transfers Out	8,480	12,970	10,621	10,403	17,960	13,108
<b>Net Income/(Loss)</b>	<b>18,460</b>	<b>(8,299)</b>	<b>14,757</b>	<b>(26,076)</b>	<b>(41,780)</b>	<b>(10,545)</b>
Total Fund Balance	194,118	186,930	207,059	180,982	139,202	128,657
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out & Other uses	91.1	80.4	88.9	69.8	50.3	50.3
Unrestricted Fund Balance	117,575	115,720	132,435	109,073	64,999	58,707
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out & Other Uses	55.2	49.8	56.8	42.1	23.5	23.0
Adjusted Unrestricted Fund Balance <sup>b</sup>	185,165	184,521	203,489	178,566	134,602	125,647
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out & Other Uses	86.9	79.4	87.3	68.9	48.7	49.1

<sup>a</sup>Audited. <sup>b</sup>Adjusted to include 3/12ths state-required reserve.

### GRTs Return To Growth

The GRT is imposed on businesses upon the sale of goods or services, subject to certain exemptions, making it broader than the typical sales tax. Recessionary pressures and the completion of major construction projects caused collections to fall by 3%–4% annually in fiscal years 2008–2011. Total GRT receipts remained sluggish through fiscal 2014 but increased by a solid 9.2% in fiscal 2015, due mostly to increased economic activity plus an accounting adjustment. Year-to-date GRTs are up by 7.9% for the first five months of fiscal 2016, inclusive of the additional 1/8<sup>th</sup> GRT imposed at the beginning of the fiscal year (netted against the repeal of a 1/16<sup>th</sup> GRT).

### Strong Debt Service Coverage of GRT Bonds

Debt service coverage of the county's GRT revenue bonds remains solid at nearly 3.0x maximum annual debt service (MADS), based on audited fiscal 2015 revenues. The GRT bonds' debt service reserve requirement is standard, although its additional bonds test is

### Property Value and GRT Trends

(\$000, Fiscal Years Ending June 30)

Fiscal Year	Assessed Valuation	% Change	Pledged Gross Receipts Taxes	% Change
2000	8,190,194	18.3	29,274	5.0
2001	8,456,366	3.2	30,545	4.3
2002	9,000,268	6.4	31,374	2.7
2003	9,284,129	3.2	32,871	4.8
2004	9,633,808	3.8	35,315	7.4
2005	10,091,960	4.8	37,452	6.1
2006	11,002,745	9.0	40,451	8.0
2007	11,715,540	6.5	42,235	4.4
2008	12,948,307	10.5	42,502	0.6
2009	13,976,092	7.9	40,431	(4.9)
2010	14,823,105	6.1	38,980	(3.6)
2011	14,384,729	(3.0)	39,231	0.6
2012	14,452,761	0.5	42,500	8.3
2013	14,394,423	(0.4)	45,895	8.0
2014	14,504,259	0.8	40,897	(10.9) <sup>a</sup>
2015	14,835,047	2.3	42,032	2.8
2016	15,119,725	1.9	—	—

<sup>a</sup>Decline due to the recognition of GRTs as revenue in fiscal 2013 for the county's fiscal 2012 and fiscal 2013 equalization distribution from the State of New Mexico of \$3 million and \$3.2 million, respectively. Decline also due to the recognition of the fiscal 2014 equalization distribution of \$3.2 million as a deferred inflow of resources in fiscal 2014 to satisfy the implementation of GASB 63.

strong, requiring pledged revenues to equal 2.0x MADS of existing and proposed GRT-secured debt.

The county does not currently plan to further leverage this revenue source, as it relies on residual revenue after debt service for operations. Effective July 1, 2015, the county imposed and pledged one of the additional 1/8<sup>th</sup> hold-harmless GRTs to its outstanding GRT bonds. The county additionally pledged the second 1/8<sup>th</sup> hold-harmless GRT, which the county has allocated for mental health services, to its 2010A GRT bonds (which funded mental health facility improvements).

### Modest Future Debt Plans

The county maintains a formal capital improvement plan, the local portion of which has been historically financed with voter-approved GO bond authorizations every two years. County voters approved a \$27.5 million authorization in November 2014 by a wide margin. The current offering will exhaust that authorization and the next bond election is anticipated in November 2016 for an estimated \$27.5 million.

The combined GO and GRT bonds' payout rate is very rapid at 84% retiring in ten years. The county's revised debt policy reduces the final

maturity of bonds to 15 years from 20 years as part of its long-term goal to achieve level principal payments, which Fitch views favorably. Including GO bonds and GRT obligations, overall debt levels are a moderate \$2,451 per capita and 2.8% of full market value.

### Slow Employment Recovery

Recovery of the local employment base has lagged most of the U.S. in the wake of the last recession. During this period, the MSA's unemployment rate remained moderate and trended down annually, although this was due partly to annual labor force contractions. The MSA's December 2015 unemployment rate increased modestly to 5.7% from 5.4% the year prior, below the state average (6.2%) but above the U.S. average (4.8%). Recent commercial projects include the new headquarters for Flagship Food Group that will add 300 jobs and an expansion of Comcast's bilingual customer service center that is projected to add 450 jobs. The film industry is surging in the MSA, providing \$289 million in direct spending in 2015.

Any federal efforts to downsize the country's military operations could have a significant impact on the area's large federal installations. The combined workforce of Kirtland Air Force Base and Sandia National Labs exceeds 20,000, equal to 5% of the MSA's 2014 employment base. However, the magnitude of cuts to the military installations may be tempered given their unique role in maintaining the country's nuclear assets.

### Debt Statistics

(\$000)	
These Issues	23,830
<b>Outstanding Debt</b>	
GO Bonds	100,461
GRT Bonds	118,005
<b>Direct Debt</b>	<b>242,296</b>
Overlapping Debt	1,413,306
<b>Total Overall Debt</b>	<b>1,655,602</b>
<b>Debt Ratios</b>	
Direct Debt Per Capita (\$) <sup>a</sup>	359
As % of Estimated Actual Value <sup>b</sup>	0.4
Overall Debt Per Capita (\$) <sup>a</sup>	2,451
As % of Estimated Actual Value <sup>b</sup>	2.8

<sup>a</sup>Population: 675,551 (2015 estimate). <sup>b</sup>Estimated Actual Value: \$59,500,725,000 (Fiscal 2015). Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

### Improved Pension Funding

Full-time county employees participate in the Public Employee's Retirement Association (PERA) of New Mexico, a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit retirement plan. The county fully funds its statutorily required contribution. PERA reforms effective in 2013 increased contribution rates and established a new tier of benefits for new hires, which Fitch considers prudent.

Under GASB 68, the county reports its share of the PERA's net pension liability (NPL) at \$163.5 million, with fiduciary assets covering 81.29% of total pension liabilities at the plan's 7.75% investment rate assumption (approximately 75% based on a more conservative 7% investment rate assumption). The NPL represents less than 3/10<sup>ths</sup> of 1% of the county's fiscal 2016 market value. Carrying costs for debt service, pensions and OPEB are low at 10.6% of fiscal year 2015 governmental spending.

Other post-employment benefits are provided through the New Mexico Retiree Healthcare Authority on a pay-as-you-go basis from employer and employee contributions. The carrying costs of GO and GRT debt service plus pension and OPEB contributions totaled a moderate 14% of fiscal 2015 governmental spending.

Through labor contracts, the county has elected to make additional contributions of up to 69% of its employees' pension contributions, totaling \$10.9 million in fiscal 2015. Adjusting for these additional county pension contributions, which are expected to remain in place in future labor agreements, total carrying costs climb to a still moderate 17.3% of spending.

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 © 2016 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.