Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

General Obligation Bonds

New Issue Report

Ratings

New Issues

General Obligation Bonds, Series 2014A	A–

Outstanding Debt

General Obligation Bonds	A–

Rating Outlook

Stable

Related Research

Fitch Rates Philadelphia, PA's General Obligation Bonds 'A–' (January 2014)

Analysts

Eric Friedman
+1 212 908-9181
eric.friedman@fitchratings.com

Karen Wagner
+1 212 908-0230
karen.wagner@fitchratings.com

New Issue Details

Sale Information: $158,620,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2014A, selling the week of Jan. 27 via negotiation.

Security: Philadelphia's (the city) full faith and credit general obligation and its ad valorem tax pledge, without limitation as to rate or amount.

Purpose: To refund outstanding general obligation bonds.

Final Maturity: July 15, 2038.

Key Rating Drivers

Constrained Financial Flexibility: Fund balance has shown notable improvement beginning in fiscal 2011. However, financial flexibility is constrained by a high overall tax burden, a somewhat low general fund balance position and a high level of fixed costs.

Sizable Debt Burden: Debt ratios will likely remain elevated over the long term.

Large Unfunded Pension Liability: The city's pension fund is poorly funded, and costs will continue to rise.

Weak Socioeconomic Profile: Wealth levels remain notably low, and above-average unemployment persists. Despite this weakness, Philadelphia remains an important center for healthcare and higher education, with good prospects for long-term economic stability.

Solid Financial Management: Fitch views positively management's efforts in recent years to contain costs and raise available revenues to address an ongoing budget imbalance, although significant budgetary pressures remain.

Rating Sensitivities

Direction of Fund Balance: Continued growth of the city's fund balance levels through operating surpluses would increase the city's financial flexibility, while a reversal of recent positive trends would cause concern.

Labor Outcomes: Several of the city's primary labor contracts have been unsettled for four years. Resolution of these contracts could have a material impact on the city's finances, particularly regarding its elevated pension costs.

Pension Challenges: Failure to develop additional strategies to improve low pension funding levels could have a negative rating impact. Conversely, a material improvement in pension funding levels would be viewed positively.

Rating History

Rating	Action	Outlook/ Watch	Date
A–	Affirmed	Stable	1/15/14
A–	Affirmed	Stable	9/5/13
A–	Affirmed	Stable	6/12/13
A–	Affirmed	Stable	12/3/12
A–	Affirmed	Stable	4/4/12
A–	Affirmed	Stable	3/28/11
A–	Revised	Stable	4/30/10
BBB	Downgraded	Stable	12/7/09
BBB+	Affirmed	Negative	7/14/09
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	6/11/09
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	12/1/08
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	3/28/08
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	12/4/07
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	11/29/07
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	7/24/07
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	11/21/06
BBB+	Affirmed	Stable	7/7/06
BBB+	Affirmed	Negative	9/29/05
BBB+	Affirmed	Negative	2/14/05
BBB+	Downgraded	Negative	10/19/04
A–	Assigned	Negative	11/13/03

Related Criteria

Tax-Supported Rating Criteria (August 2012)

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

Credit Profile

Important Economic Center Tempered by Challenging Demographics

Philadelphia is both a city and county with an estimated population of slightly more than 1.5 million. The city serves as a regional economic center with a stable employment base weighted in the higher education and healthcare sectors. Led by the University of Pennsylvania, Jefferson Health System and Temple University, the city is home to several large colleges and universities and is anchored by multiple hospitals and health systems. Several of these institutions are engaged in sizable development projects, and the city has also benefitted from notable investments by local corporations.

Above-average unemployment and weak income indicators persist, although current data suggests some recent improvement. Unemployment, measured at 10.1% in October 2013, remains elevated but is down from its recent high. The unemployment rates of the broader metropolitan statistical area (MSA) and commonwealth were appreciably lower at 7.6% and 6.9%, respectively. Income levels grew at a slightly better clip over the prior decade in comparison to the state and nation but continue to be weak, at just 68% of the MSA and 78% of the commonwealth and nation, respectively, in 2011. The city's poverty rate stands at 26%, approximately twice that of the MSA, state and nation. The population has grown slightly over the past decade after nearly 50 years of population loss.

General Fund Financial Summary

($000, Audited Fiscal Years Ended June 30)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Tax Revenue	2,395,229	2,259,321	2,316,271	2,447,035	2,562,434
Intergovernmental Revenue	782,441	715,693	785,904	784,332	413,199
Other Revenue	265,657	276,042	245,945	295,937	273,973
General Fund Revenue	**3,443,327**	**3,251,056**	**3,348,120**	**3,527,304**	**3,249,606**
Public Safety	1,518,877	1,515,956	1,420,405	1,515,643	1,589,097
Health and Social Services	917,220	889,881	840,400	859,841	551,047
Culture and Recreation	159,177	147,895	129,507	133,720	139,220
Educational	65,468	67,176	65,008	64,009	74,339
Other	1,209,768	1,190,647	1,126,511	1,038,390	964,512
General Fund Expenditures	**3,870,510**	**3,811,555**	**3,581,831**	**3,611,603**	**3,318,215**
General Fund Surplus/(Deficit)	**(427,183)**	**(560,499)**	**(233,711)**	**(84,299)**	**(68,609)**
Transfers In	271,649	373,245	316,359	335,084	333,694
Other Sources	394,824	0	0	0	103,692
Transfers Out	103,353	122,747	137,340	144,435	153,665
Other Uses	389,329	0	0	0	102,602
Net Transfers and Other	173,791	250,498	179,019	190,649	181,119
Net Surplus/(Deficit)	**(253,392)**	**(310,001)**	**(54,692)**	**106,350**	**112,510**
Total Fund Balance	234,443	(75,558)	(130,250)	(23,900)	88,610
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out and Other Uses	5.4	(1.9)	(3.5)	(0.6)	2.5
Unreserved Fund Balance[a]	(24,346)	(274,554)	(251,847)	—	—
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out and Other Uses	(0.6)	(7.0)	(6.8)	—	—
Unrestricted Fund Balance[b]	—	—	—	(45,685)	70,506
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out and Other Uses	—	—	—	(1.2)	2.0

[a]Pre-GASB 54. [b]Reflects GASB 54 classifications: sum of committed, assigned and unassigned. Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Consecutive Surpluses Reverse Trend of Declines

The city has a diverse source of revenues. Primary revenue sources include the wage and earnings tax (the largest, at 46% of general fund tax revenues), the real estate tax, the business income and receipts tax, the sales tax, various charges for services and state aid.

Recessionary pressure in recent years coupled with a depressed housing market prompted a significant decline in tax revenues between fiscal years 2008–2010 (fiscal year-end June 30), leading to multiple years of large operating deficits. Management responded favorably with a number of expenditure cuts. The city also suspended through fiscal 2014 long-running annual rate cuts in its wage and business privilege taxes as part of a comprehensive budget-balancing plan.

In fiscal 2010, the city implemented a temporary five-year sales tax increase and the partial deferral of annual pension costs over the ensuing two fiscal years. These changes have been key drivers of recent positive operating results. Fitch believes the sustainability of these improved results once temporary measures are lifted in fiscal 2015 is uncertain. The city's five-year plan provides for the cessation of the temporary sales tax.

Fiscal 2011 ended with a sizable $106.4 million general fund surplus on a GAAP basis, which improved the unrestricted general fund balance (the sum of the unassigned, assigned and committed fund balance under GASB 54) to a still-weak negative $46 million. On a budgetary basis, the city reported a minimal year-end general fund balance of $92,000. Fiscal 2012 continued the improvement shown in fiscal 2011, with a $113 million surplus on a GAAP basis, bringing the unrestricted general fund balance to $71 million, or 2% of expenditures. On a budgetary basis, the surplus was $147 million, notably better than the budgeted $60 million surplus. The surplus and outperformance of budget resulted from tax revenues growing 4.4% over fiscal 2011 and $34 million of one-time pension aid from the commonwealth.

Fiscal 2013 on Pace to Outperform Budget

The fiscal 2013 general fund budget raised spending by almost 3%, mostly due to the repayment of previously deferred pension costs. At year end, total revenue is projected to be $130 million (4%) ahead of budget, or 3% ahead of fiscal 2012 results. The city projects year-over-year growth from all of its major taxes, with particularly strength in the business income and receipts tax. The budget featured a $17 million deficit, but the city currently projects a surplus of $110 million on a budgetary basis.

The fiscal 2014 budget projects a $102 million fund balance draw and includes the reservation of an additional $85 million to fund a portion of unsettled labor contracts. The budget includes a 5% increase in expenditures, driven by higher wage and benefits costs. Since the adoption of the budget, the city received an unfavorable ruling on its healthcare contract for firefighters that will cost it an additional unbudgeted $49 million in fiscal 2014, plus an additional $11.5 million per year for the following four years. The fiscal 2014 impact of this ruling can be absorbed by the strength of fiscal 2013 results.

In fiscal 2014, the city has implemented the actual value initiative (AVI), the first revaluation of the city's property tax base in many years. The city is currently projecting an approximately 2.7x increase in market value, although the sizable reduction of the tax rate and increased collections will make the change approximately revenue neutral for fiscal 2014. The city prudently implemented steps to mitigate the impact on residents facing steep increases.

The city relies on annual cash flow notes for liquidity. The $173 million note issuance for fiscal 2012 was well below historical borrowings, and the fiscal 2013 borrowing was $127 million,

reflecting further improvement in the city's liquidity. The fiscal 2014 borrowing of $100 million continued this trend.

Future Budgetary Challenges

The city faces several budgetary challenges in future years. The five-year increase in the sales tax was scheduled to end after fiscal 2014, resulting in an expected decline of approximately $130 million in revenue that has been factored into the city's five-year plan. Current discussions regarding the extension of the tax would divert future resources away from the city with the bulk of tax proceeds going towards the city's school district (Fitch's GO underlying rating of BB/Negative).

The majority of the city's labor contracts have been unsettled since fiscal 2009 and are in various states of legal challenges. The city has prudently budgeted for some cost increases from these contracts. Positively, the contracts that have been settled, most notably the police contract, contain features that are expected to lower the city's future pension costs.

Elevated Long-Term Liabilities

The city's aggregate debt burden, which includes debt associated with the Philadelphia School District, remains notably high at almost $4,800 per capita and 17% of market value, although Fitch incorporates into its analysis the likely overstated market value ratio, the result of antiquated property assessment practices. As noted above, the city is implementing the AVI in fiscal 2014, and the projected new market value would lower debt to a still-high approximately 6.4% of market value. Debt amortization is average, with 56% amortizing within 10 years.

Debt Statistics

($000)

This Issue	158,620
Outstanding Direct Debt – Net of Refunding	4,147,044
Total Net Direct Debt	**4,305,664**
Overlapping Debt	3,030,023
Total Overall Debt	**7,335,687**
Debt Ratios	
Net Direct Debt Per Capita ($)[a]	2,798
As % of Full Market Value[b]	9.8
Overall Debt Per Capita ($)[a]	4,768
As % of Full Market Value[b]	16.7

[a]Population: 1,538,567 (2011). [b]Market value: $43,982,000,000 (2012). Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

The city's fiscal 2014–2019 governmentwide capital improvement plan totals $10 billion, of which about $6.7 billion is for the city's self-supporting airport and water and sewer utility system. Of the remaining $3.3 billion in capital projects, the city expects the state and federal government to fund about $2.4 billion while the balance, estimated at $953 million, will be derived almost entirely from city-supported annual debt issuance.

Pension funding continues to be a key credit concern for Fitch, despite the recent implementation of cost-saving changes to pension benefits for uniformed employees. The city funds on an annual basis the amount required by state law, which is less than the amount actuarially determined by the city's policy. Full funding of the annual obligation resumed in fiscal 2012 following a partial deferral for budgetary relief in the previous two years. Annual pension payments rose by 13% and 5% in fiscal years 2013 and 2014, respectively, to meet the repayment obligation. Pension costs consumed a high 17% of annual general fund spending in fiscal 2013.

The most recent actuarial report shows a low funded ratio of 48% and an unfunded liability of about $5.1 billion. Using Fitch's 7% discount rate assumption, the city's pension plan would be

about 43% funded. The city's other post-employment benefit liability is also sizable at $1.2 billion based on the latest valuation available, although benefits are only provided for the first five years following retirement. Carrying costs are 17% of government fund expenditures and are expected to rise with increased pension costs.

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: HTTP://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. 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 © 2014 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. One State Street Plaza, 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.