

RESPONSE TO
PUBLIC ADVOCATE’S INTERROGATORIES
AND
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
QUESTIONS 1-9

Dated: March 2022

PA-III-1. REFERENCE PAGE 3, LINES 13 THROUGH 15 OF THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN. IF DIFFERENT THAN WHAT IS PROVIDED IN SCHEDULE BV-4, PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY OF THE FINANCIAL PLAN THAT WAS REFERENCED IN THIS SECTION OF THEIR TESTIMONY AND SHOW WHERE IN THE RATING AGENCIES' REPORT THEY DISCUSS THE DEPARTMENT MEETING SPECIFIC FINANCIAL GOALS OR TARGETS THAT ARE PRESENTED IN THE FINANCIAL PLAN.

RESPONSE:

The Financial Plan refers to the Key Financial Policies outlined in the 2018 Rate Board Decision and discussed throughout various testimonies since that time. These include:

- Debt Service Coverage of 1.3 times
- Pay Go funding of 20%
- Minimum Balance of the Rate Stabilization (\$135 million) and Residual Fund (\$15 million) combined at \$150 million

These policies have been shared with the Rating Agencies and bond investors as Rate Board supported financial metrics and critical financial targets for the Department.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)

PA-III-2. REFERENCE PAGE 3, LINES 19 THROUGH 21 OF THE DIRECT
TESTIMONY OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN. PLEASE PROVIDE THE
BASIS AND EVIDENCE FOR THE STATEMENT: “THESE METRICS IN THE
DEPARTMENT’S FINANCIAL PLAN SHOULD BE SEEN AS A ‘FLOOR’.”

RESPONSE:

In comparing the financial metrics with other peer systems and credit agency medians,
these metrics are on the lower side and should be viewed as such.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and
Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)

PA-III-3. REFERENCE PAGE 3, LINE 19 OF THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE SPECIFIC METRICS THAT THE WITNESSES STATE SHOULD BE SEEN AS A “FLOOR”.

RESPONSE:

Please refer to the Peer Utility Comparison in ML-2 of Melissa LaBuda’s testimony, found on pdf page 52.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)

1 **PA-III-4.** REFERENCE PAGE 3, LINE 22 THROUGH PAGE 4, LINE 2 OF THE DIRECT
2 TESTIMONY OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN. THE WITNESSES
3 STATE: “A KEY FINANCIAL METRIC TO MAINTAIN IS THE \$135
4 MILLION BALANCE FOR THE RATE STABILIZATION FUND (“RSF”)
5 WHICH IS AN APPROPRIATE ‘MINIMAL THRESHOLD’ FOR FINANCIAL
6 PLANNING.” PLEASE PROVIDE ANY EVIDENCE, OTHER THAN THE
7 WITNESSES OPINION, THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE \$135 MILLION
8 IS THE APPROPRIATE MINIMAL BALANCE FOR THE RSF.
9

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 Concerns regarding the lack of liquidity was mentioned by all three credit agencies in the
12 last rating review. Please refer to the credit agency report excerpts below which describes
13 the concern about the Departments fund balances or adequate liquidity.
14

15 **Moody's:** While Moody's affirmed the Department's rating of “A1” during the most recent credit
16 review, they clearly are concerned about PWD's rate pressures and specifically noted as a factor that
17 could lead to a downgrade is the “inability to increase rates commensurate with coverage
18 requirements and in line with the department's internal standards”. (Credit Report September 17,
19 2021). The rating report specifically credits the Department with conservative financial forecasts
20 and if forecasts are outperformed view this as a credit positive. Also noted “Of concern, however,
21 is the department's continued projections for fairly narrow ‘legally enacted’ debt service coverage.
22 Also of material concern is the rate board's continued limitations on the departments revenue raising
23 ability, which serves to materially curtail managements operating flexibility.”
24

25 **Standard & Poor's:** S&P also affirmed the Departments rating in the most recent report
26 (September 17, 2021) at an “A+” with a stable outlook. At the time of the rating, S&P noted the
27 balance of the unrestricted liquidity, including the RSF, to be approximately \$200 million as a factor
28 in providing some level of financial flexibility. However, clearly stated was concern with the Rate

1 Board's continued move towards resisting rate increases. "While the city's Rate Board has
2 historically supported rate increases to maintain ample capacity for Philadelphia Water Board's
3 (PWD's) operations and capital needs, we foresee futures challenges that could place downward
4 pressure on PWD's financial position, most notably funding of a large capital improvement program
5 (CIP) while concentrating on rate affordability." In discussing possible credit downside scenarios,
6 S&P states "If we (S&P) believe that future rate covenant compliance is likely to rely on unplanned
7 additional rate increases to achieve revenue requirements, deplete the RSF below the targets \$120
8 million indicated in its current projections, or require significant or COA project delays, we would
9 likely lower the rating."

10
11 **Fitch:** Fitch also affirmed the Departments rating of "A+" with a stable outlook (September 16,
12 2021). It is noted that the rating and outlook assumes that PWD will continue to obtain rate
13 adjustments to maintain its current level of liquidity and leverage. Specifically mentioned as leading
14 to a negative rating action is having leverage ratios increase to over 10 times (from current 8x) and
15 a failure to secure rate increases sufficient to maintain "current financial profile". Leverage ratios
16 will increase if funds available for debt service do not increase with future debt burden needed to
17 address ongoing and growing capital needs. Further decreasing the Rate Stabilization Fund below
18 the Departments financial metrics of \$135 million rather than maintaining the current rate structure
19 is contrary to strengthening the Departments financial health.
20
21

22 **RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:** PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and
23 Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PA-III-5.** ON PAGE 4, LINES 3 AND 4 OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN'S
2 DIRECT TESTIMONY, THEY DESCRIBE THE \$125 MILLION RSF
3 BALANCE ACHIEVED IN FY 2021 AS "SUB-OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE."
4 PLEASE CLARIFY WHAT "SUB-OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE" MEANS. IF 0
5 (ZERO) IS FAILURE AND 10 IS OPTIMAL, WHAT VALUE WOULD THEY
6 ASSIGN TO "SUB-OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE?"
7

8 **RESPONSE:**

9 If the goal of the Rate Board is to maintain the fiscal health of the department in order to
10 protect City assets and to ensure the ability of the Department to provide the required services,
11 then we would view taking any action that would result in credit deterioration as sub-optimal.
12 The financial metrics used by the credit agencies are a result of assessing a system's ability to
13 continue to provide service, maintain the health of its assets, comply with all regulatory
14 requirements and have resources to meet any unexpected challenges that might arise. These
15 medians and credit assessment reflect the water and sewer sector nationally and are not just
16 the view of the financial advisors.
17

18 **RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:** PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and
19 Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PA-III-6.** REFERENCE SCHEDULE ML-3 OF MS. LA BUDA'S TESTIMONY. PLEASE
2 IDENTIFY WHERE IT IS STATED, IN EACH OF THE RATING AGENCIES'
3 REPORTS, THAT ESTABLISHING A RSF MINIMAL THRESHOLD
4 BALANCE OF LESS THAN \$135 MILLION WOULD TRIGGER A CREDIT
5 RATING DOWNGRADE.

6
7 **RESPONSE:**

8 Please see response to PA-III-4.
9

10 **RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:** Philadelphia Water Department
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PA-III-7. REFERENCE THE PEER UTILITY COMPARISON ATTACHED TO MS. LA
BUDA'S TESTIMONY. PLEASE PROVIDE THE CRITERIA USED IN THE
SELECTION OF EACH OF THE PEER UTILITIES.

RESPONSE:

The peer comparison reflects utilities from the east coast and Midwest region. Please see
the attached Moody's rating criteria (Response Attachment PA-III-7).

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Philadelphia Water Department

PA-III-8. FOR EACH OF THE PEER UTILITIES INCLUDED IN THE PEER UTILITY COMPARISON ATTACHED TO MS. LA BUDA'S TESTIMONY, PLEASE IDENTIFY THE AUTHORITATIVE/REGULATORY ENTITY THAT ESTABLISHES THE RATES FOR EACH UTILITY AND INDICATE WHETHER THAT ENTITY IS AN INDEPENDENT BODY.

RESPONSE:

Peer utility: City of Baltimore (MD) Water Utility
Rate Regulatory Entity: Board of Estimates (per Ordinance 941)
Independent Body: Yes – Independent of Water Utility, but part of City

Peer utility: City of Baltimore (MD) Wastewater Utility
Rate Regulatory Entity: Board of Estimates (per Ordinance 941)
Independent Body: Yes – Independent of Water Utility, but part of City

Peer utility: Boston (MA) Water and Sewer Commission
Rate Regulatory Entity: Boston Water and Sewer Commission
Independent Body: No

Peer utility: Greater Cincinnati (OH) Water Works
Rate Regulatory Entity: City Council
Independent Body: Yes – City Council approves rates in conformity with Trust Indenture Rate Covenant

Peer utility: Columbus (OH) Department of Public Utilities
Rate Regulatory Entity: City Council
Independent Body: Yes– Independent of Public Utility, but part of City

1 Peer utility: Indianapolis (IN) Water System
2 Rate Regulatory Entity: Department of Public Utilities of the City of Indianapolis (d/b/a/
3 Citizens Energy Group, a political subdivision created by the
4 Indiana General Assembly and is a public charitable trust)
5 Independent Body: Yes. Citizens Energy Group owns and operates the Water
6 System and sets the rates, but such rates are subject to the
7 approval of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
8
9 Peer utility: New York City (NY) Water System as operated by the
10 Department of Environmental Protection
11 Rate Regulatory Entity: New York City Water Board
12 Independent Body: Yes
13
14 Peer utility: City of St. Louis (MO) Water Division, an enterprise fund of the
15 City
16 Rate Regulatory Entity: Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis
17 Independent Body: Yes
18
19 Peer utility: District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water)
20 Rate Regulatory Entity: Board of Directors of DC Water
21 Independent Body: No
22

23 Note: For purposes of this response, Independent Body is assumed to be an entity other than the
24 utility itself (which may be a department in the government entity).
25

26 **RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:** City of Philadelphia Water Department
27
28

1 **PA-III-9.** REFERENCE PAGE 4, LINE 18 OF MS. CLUPPER AND MR. NISSEN'S
2 DIRECT TESTIMONY. PLEASE PROVIDE THE BASIS OF
3 CHARACTERIZING THE FY 2021 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AS
4 "LACKLUSTER" GIVEN THAT PWD REVENUES EXCEEDED THE
5 AMOUNT PROJECTED IN THE SETTLEMENT BY 3.16% WHILE THE
6 OPERATING EXPENSES EXCEEDED THE AMOUNT PROJECTED IN THE
7 SETTLEMENT BY ONLY 0.002%. ALSO, DEFINE "LACKLUSTER" AS
8 USED IN THIS CONTEXT.
9

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 Please refer to the discussion in PWD Statement 1 at pages 16-21 and Schedule ML-2.
12 Please also note that FY 2021 financial performance was sub-optimal because (i) financial
13 metrics for the RSF, debt service coverage and pay-go financing were all below the targets
14 accepted by the Rate Board; (ii) PWD has continued to deplete the RSF for several years
15 and the Department's financial statements show continued erosion of revenues and reserves
16 during the fiscal period ended June 30, 2021; and (iii) PWD continues to perform well below
17 its peer utilities.
18

19 **RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:** PWD Financial Advisors (PFM Financial Advisors, LLC. and
20 Acacia Financial Group, Inc.)
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MOODY'S

INVESTORS SERVICE

RATING METHODOLOGY US Municipal Utility Revenue Debt

This rating methodology replaces "US Municipal Utility Revenue Debt", last revised on December 15, 2014. We have updated some outdated links and removed certain issuer-specific information.

Table of Contents:

SUMMARY	1
FACTOR 1: SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS (30%)	7
FACTOR 2: FINANCIAL STRENGTH (40%)	10
FACTOR 3: MANAGEMENT (20%)	13
FACTOR 4: LEGAL PROVISIONS (10%)	15
APPENDIX: MUNICIPAL UTILITY REVENUE BOND SCORECARD	19
MOODY'S RELATED PUBLICATIONS	22

Analyst Contacts:

NEW YORK +1.212.553.1653

Edward Damutz +1.212.553.6990
Vice President - Senior Credit Officer
edward.damutz@moodys.com

Timothy Blake +1.212.553.4524
Managing Director - Public Finance
timothy.blake@moodys.com

Alexandra Parker +1.212.553.4889
Managing Director - Public Finance
alexandra.parker@moodys.com

Leonard Jones +1.212.553.3806
Managing Director - Public Finance
leonard.jones@moodys.com

SAN FRANCISCO +1.415.274.1708

Matthew A. Jones +1.415.274.1735
Senior Vice President/Manager
matthew.jones@moodys.com

Summary

This methodology explains how we evaluate the credit quality of essential service US municipal utility revenue bonds. The approach described in this methodology applies to six basic categories of municipal utilities: water distribution, gas distribution, electric distribution, sanitary sewerage, stormwater disposal, and solid waste disposal.¹

The primary factors that drive our credit analysis for these types of utilities are the size and health of the system and its service area, the financial strength of its operations, the legal provisions governing its management, and the strength of its rate management and regulatory compliance.

We intend for this methodology to help investors, municipalities, utilities, and other interested market participants understand how key quantitative and qualitative risk factors are likely to affect ratings in the municipal utility sector. This document does not offer an exhaustive treatment of all factors that are reflected in our ratings, but should enable the reader to understand the considerations that are usually most important for ratings in this sector. While reflecting many of the same core principles that we have used in assigning ratings to this sector, this methodology uses a scorecard that quantifies several factors that we previously evaluated in qualitative ways.

The purpose of the scorecard is to provide a reference tool that market participants can use to approximate most credit profiles within the US municipal utility sector. The scorecard provides summarized guidance for the factors that we generally consider most important in assigning ratings to these issuers. However, the scorecard is a summary that does not include every rating consideration. The weights the scorecard shows for each factor represent an approximation of their importance for rating decisions. In addition, the scorecard was built based on historical results, while our ratings are based on forward-looking expectations. As a result, we would not expect the scorecard-indicated outcome to match the actual rating in every case.

THIS RATING METHODOLOGY WAS UPDATED ON OCTOBER 10, 2019. WE HAVE UPDATED SOME OUTDATED REFERENCES AND ALSO MADE SOME MINOR FORMATTING CHANGES.

¹ Different methodologies are used to assign ratings to municipal utility districts, global regulated water utilities, regulated electric and gas utilities, electric generation and transmission cooperatives, and waste to energy projects. A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Introduction

This methodology covers debt secured by the revenues generated by US municipal utilities providing monopolistic services essential to public health and functional economies.

The security for a municipal utility revenue bond is typically defined in a bond resolution or a trust indenture, which acts as a contract between the utility and its bondholders. The resolution or indenture most often identifies the bond's security as a lien on the net revenues of the system after the payment of regular operating and maintenance expenses.

The sector is varied and fragmented. US municipal utilities provide many different services whose rates or fees can secure debt. The utilities mostly fall into one or more of six basic categories:

- 1) **Water utilities** take water from the ground, a river, a lake, or in special cases the ocean, treat it to a potable standard, and distribute it to customers for drinking, cleaning, and commercial, industrial, or agricultural uses. These utilities can be involved in any or all of the functions of water supply: water treatment, long-distance transmission, and retail water distribution. Some water utilities have no treatment capacity and purchase potable water wholesale.
- 2) **Gas utilities** take natural gas from a wholesale² pipeline, odorize it for safety detection, and pressurize it and deliver it to customers through a pipe network for uses such as heating, cooking, or commercial and industrial applications. Some municipal gas systems may encompass their own natural gas supplies.
- 3) **Electric utilities** purchase electricity³ from wholesale suppliers and deliver it to residential, commercial, and industrial customers for a wide range of power uses.
- 4) **Sanitary sewer** utilities collect and treat wastewater, discharging it into a waterway or injecting it underground, and landfilling or incinerating the residual sludge. Some sewer utilities with no treatment capacity gather wastewater and transmit it to another utility that treats it.
- 5) **Stormwater** utilities collect and treat rainwater before discharging it into a body of water such as an ocean or a river. While every city or county addresses stormwater drainage as an integral element of its streets and highways, the stormwater systems that require capital markets financing are typically large in scale and are necessary to avert flooding from heavy seasonal rainfall in hilly areas.
- 6) **Solid waste** utilities collect residential or commercial refuse and dispose of it through landfills, waste-to-energy plants, or other waste-disposal processes. A solid waste system can be complete or collection-only, relying on another municipal or private entity for long-haul removal and disposal through landfill or incineration.

This publication does not announce a credit rating action. For any credit ratings referenced in this publication, please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on www.moodys.com for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

² This methodology covers gas distribution utilities. These utilities purchase their supply from providers covered under the regulated electric and gas utilities methodology, or other providers. A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

³ Only those municipal electric utilities that generate less than 20% of their own power are covered by this methodology. We rate electric generation utilities under different methodologies. For information, see our methodology that describes general principles related to US public power electric utilities with generation ownership exposure and also our methodology that describes general principles related to US municipal joint action agencies. A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Defining the municipal utility universe

This methodology covers essential-service utilities that operate as departments, boards, or independent authorities of US states or local governments.

States and subdivisions of states, such as counties and cities, often issue bonds secured by the net revenues generated by a system operated directly under their auspices, such as a city water department. Other times, states or state subdivisions create an independent authority or special purpose district that operates the system and issues the bonds. This distinction is usually unimportant for rating purposes, although in some cases a separate authority has beneficial management expertise.

This methodology focuses on revenue bonds for essential-service functions. Other types of public utilities issue bonds backed by revenues charged for services such as telephone, cable television, or parking. These services are typically competitive and subject to greater elasticity in pricing and utilization. Bonds secured by revenues generated by these services are not rated under this methodology. Also not rated under this methodology are utility revenue bonds whose rating is ultimately based on a General Obligation guaranty. Lastly, the electric utilities covered under this methodology are typically retail distributors of electricity mostly generated elsewhere. Electric generation utilities, municipal waste-to-energy facilities, and US municipal joint action agencies are rated under separate methodologies.⁴

The credit quality of essential-service utility revenue bonds is generally strong. Its numerous fundamental strengths include:

- 1) The provision of essential services, usually in a government-protected monopoly
- 2) Typically unregulated and independent rate-setting authority
- 3) The ability to discontinue service to delinquent accounts and in many cases to put a lien on the property for nonpayment
- 4) Utility cost burdens that are typically low relative to household income and to tax burdens
- 5) A generally strong federal and state regulatory framework that is designed to keep utilities functioning in order to protect public health and achieve environmental goals
- 6) A "special revenue" designation that may insulate a utility from a parent's bankruptcy

The Relationship Between General Obligation (GO) and Utility Revenue Bond Ratings

A municipality's GO credit quality may directly affect the strength of its associated utility systems. This section outlines the broad principles that apply when assessing the credit linkages between a municipality's GO and utility debt. These broad principles are meant to enhance transparency around our view of the relationship between related ratings and explain why, in most cases, the ratings of GO and associated utility revenue debt are and will remain relatively close.

Municipal utility debt is generally exposed to similar credit strengths and pressures as the GO and can thus expect to experience simultaneous credit improvement or deterioration. Examples of credit linkages between the GO and utility debt include:

- » Economy: Utility systems usually rely on a coterminous or overlapping economic base and service area.

⁴ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

- » Legal structure: Utility bond indentures sometimes contain events of default tied to the bankruptcy or insolvency of the general government.
- » Finances and Debt: Cash can often flow between the two entities, sometimes with a formal funding mechanism. Debt and other long-term liabilities are often paid by the same group of constituents. GO and utility issuers may also be exposed to the same pension plan.
- » Management and Governance: Management of the city and the utility may be the same or have close ties. For instance, city management may appoint the board of the utility or have the power to affect enterprise rates.
- » Capital Markets: The GO and the utility issuer may need to access the same capital markets for funding.

Because of these linkages, in most cases, ratings of a municipality's utility debt will typically be within two notches of its GO rating.

There are, however, cases where a utility's credit strength may be sufficiently independent from its associated GO rating to justify a larger notching difference. We expect these cases to be rare, and they would likely include several of the following characteristics:

- » An unusually weak GO rating which is driven by idiosyncratic factors less relevant to the utility's credit strength.
- » A non-coterminous service area, so that utility revenues are derived from a larger and more diversified base.
- » A closed loop flow of funds, wherein the GO issuer is unable to access utility revenues.
- » A strict separation of accounts and assets.
- » The absence of rating triggers tied to the GO credit quality in utility financings.
- » Separation of management and governance.

Conversely, a utility rating more than two notches below its associated GO generally has one or more of the following characteristics:

- » An unusually weak utility rating which is driven by factors less relevant to the general government's credit strength.
- » A utility service that is narrower and less diverse than the municipality as a whole.
- » A lack of expectation that the general government would transfer funds to assist a utility experiencing financial distress.
- » A strict separation of accounts and assets.
- » The absence of rating triggers tied to the utility credit quality in GO financings.
- » Separation of management and governance.

Essential service revenue bonds in bankruptcy

An important property of public utility revenue bonds is that they enjoy a potential moat from a general government's bankruptcy. Under Chapter 9 of the US bankruptcy code, a lien on "special revenue" bonds remains valid and enforceable even if the issuer is granted bankruptcy protection.

The potential survival through bankruptcy of a lien on the net revenues of a utility system is a key strength. When a debtor is granted bankruptcy protection, its unsecured assets are subject to an automatic stay, which freezes outflows unless approved by the bankruptcy judge. An asset secured by a lien that is not subject to the automatic stay enjoys a credit advantage over a related General Obligation credit that is subject to the stay.

Further, a special revenue bond is less susceptible to adjustment in bankruptcy if its lien leads to an interpretation of the bonds as enjoying secured status.

Although the bankruptcy code establishes these strengths of a special revenue bond, Chapter 9 remains largely untested. Case law offers few precedents, and only a handful of examples to support the assertion that a special revenue designation protects revenue bonds in bankruptcy.

The political reality is that utility systems are often major cash-generating assets that other stakeholders frequently would like to bring into bankruptcy negotiations. Moreover, bankruptcy judges in some cases have allowed the cash flows generated by special revenue systems to pay the legal costs of related parents in bankruptcy.

It is premature to conclude that utility revenue bonds are completely insulated from Chapter 9 bankruptcies, and the risks and costs of a general government bankruptcy remain considerable.

The Scorecard

The municipal utility scorecard (see Exhibit 1) is a tool providing a composite score of a utility's credit profile based on the weighted factors we consider most important, universal and measurable, as well as possible notching factors dependent on individual credit strengths and weaknesses. The scorecard is designed to enhance the transparency of our approach by identifying critical factors as a starting point for analysis, along with additional considerations that may affect the final rating assignment.

The scorecard is not a calculator. Its purpose is not to determine the final rating, but rather to provide a standard platform from which to begin viewing and comparing municipal utility credits. It, therefore, acts as a starting point for a more thorough and detailed analysis.

The scorecard-indicated outcome will not match the actual rating in every case, for a number of reasons including the following:

- » Our methodology considers forward-looking expectations that may not be captured in historical data.
- » The scorecard is a summary that does not include every rating consideration.
- » In some circumstances, the importance of one factor may escalate and transcend its prescribed weight in this methodology.

EXHIBIT 1

Municipal Utility Scorecard Factors

Broad Scorecard Factors	Factor Weighting	Subfactors	Subfactor Weighting
System Characteristics	30%	Asset Condition (Remaining Useful Life)	10%
		Service Area Wealth (Median Family Income)	12.5%
		System Size (O&M)	7.5%
Financial Strength	40%	Annual Debt Service Coverage	15%
		Days Cash on Hand	15%
		Debt to Operating Revenues	10%
Management	20%	Rate Management	10%
		Regulatory Compliance and Capital Planning	10%
Legal Provisions	10%	Rate Covenant	5%
		Debt Service Reserve Requirement	5%
Total	100%	Total	100%

We intentionally limited our scorecard metrics to major rating drivers that are common to most issuers. Outside of these drivers, we may adjust the scorecard score for a variety of "below-the-line" adjustments, which are more idiosyncratic factors that are likely not to apply to all issuers, but that can impact credit strength. The scorecard score is the result of the "above-the-line" score based quantitatively on the above-the-line factors, combined with any "below-the-line" notching adjustments. The scorecard score is a guideline for discussion, but does not determine the final rating. The rating is determined by a rating committee, which considers, but is not bound by, the scorecard score.

Discussion of Scorecard Factors

To arrive at a scorecard-indicated outcome, we begin by assigning a score for each subfactor. We have chosen measures that act as proxies for a variety of different service area characteristics, financial conditions, and governance behaviors that can otherwise be difficult to measure objectively and consistently. Based on the scores and weights for each subfactor, a preliminary score is produced that translates to a given rating level.

We may then move the score up or down a certain number of rating notches based on additional “below-the-line” factors that we believe impact a particular utility’s credit quality in ways not captured by the statistical portion of the scorecard. This is where analytical judgment comes into play. We may also choose to make adjustments to the historical inputs to reflect our forward-looking views of how these statistics may change.

The scorecard score, combined with below-the-line notching, then provides an adjusted score. This adjusted score is not necessarily the final rating. Because some utilities’ credit profiles are idiosyncratic, one factor, regardless of its scorecard weight, can overwhelm other factors, and other considerations may prompt us to consider final ratings that differ from the scorecard-indicated outcome.

Below, we discuss each factor and subfactor, as well as the below-the-line adjustments and other considerations that we analyze within each category of this methodology.

Factor 1: System Characteristics (30%)

EXHIBIT 2

System Characteristics (30%)

		Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B and Below
Asset Condition (10%)	Net Fixed Assets/Annual Depreciation :	> 75 years	75 years ≥ n > 25 years	25 years ≥ n > 12 years	12 years ≥ n > 9 years	9 Years ≥ n > 6 Years	≤ 6 Years
System Size (7.5%)	Water and/or sewer / Solid Waste:	O&M > \$65M	\$65M ≥ O&M > \$30M	\$30M ≥ O&M > \$10M	\$10M ≥ O&M > \$3M	\$3M ≥ O&M > \$1M	O&M ≤ \$1M
	Stormwater:	O&M > \$30M	\$30M ≥ O&M > \$15M	\$15M ≥ O&M > \$8M	\$8M ≥ O&M > \$2M	\$2M ≥ O&M > \$750K	O&M ≤ \$750K
	Gas or Electric:	O&M > \$100M	\$100M ≥ O&M > \$50M	\$50M ≥ O&M > \$20M	\$20M ≥ O&M > \$8M	\$8M ≥ O&M > \$3M	O&M ≤ \$3M
Service Area Wealth (12.5%)		> 150% of US median	150% ≥ US median > 90%	90% ≥ US median > 75%	75% ≥ US median > 50%	50% ≥ US median > 40%	≤ 40% of US median

Why it matters

This factor on the scorecard measures a utility’s capacity to fund its operations and capital needs based on the health of its capital assets, the size and diversity of its operations, and the strength and resources of its service base.

The scope of this factor is broad. Each of the subfactors contributes to an analysis of what magnitude of expenditures is necessary to keep the system functioning, and how large, diverse, and flexible the available resources are to meet those expenditures.

Subfactor 1a: Asset condition (10%)

Input: Net fixed assets divided by most recent year's depreciation, expressed in years

The condition of a utility's capital assets determines its ability to comply with environmental regulations and continue delivering adequate service with existing resources.

Depreciation is an accounting concept that acts as a proxy for the rate at which a utility's plant and equipment are aging. Central to our analysis of capital adequacy is an assessment of how utilities "fund depreciation," meaning make capital replacements and repairs to address aging plant and equipment.

The consequences of failing to fund depreciation can be costly. Implicit in this measure is the concept of deferred capital investment. Utilities that delay investing in their systems, replacing aging plant and equipment, and modernizing their facilities often find it more expensive to do so later. Capital investments are ordinarily more expensive when deferred.

Further, systems whose facilities deteriorate often run afoul of environmental regulations. The failure to fund depreciation, which will manifest as a declining useful remaining life, can lead to sewage overflows, inflow and infiltration problems, or non-compliant wastewater discharges, resulting in civil fines, litigation, or regulatory consent decrees. These are usually more expensive than funding depreciation through a prudent multi-year capital plan that replaces assets as they deteriorate or break down.

The inherent differences between types of utilities are manifested in their component parts, which can have very different useful lives. Because a solid waste utility is largely automotive-based, with collection vehicles and earthmoving equipment at the landfill, the useful life of its assets will be well under 20 years, compared to a water utility whose distribution mains and reservoir have useful lives of 40 to 100 years. We generally acknowledge and address these differences below the line.

For utilities whose asset condition ratios are not determinable, such as utilities that utilize cash accounting and do not report net fixed assets or depreciation, we are likely to assess the sufficiency of capital assets based on other available information.

Subfactor 1b: Service area wealth (12.5%)

Input: Median family income of the service area, expressed as a percentage of the US median

Most of the costs of operating a utility and maintaining its capital assets are borne by ratepayers. The income of the residents of the service base conveys the capacity of its ratepayers to bear higher rates to fund operations and capital upgrades. The median family income breakpoints in this scorecard are aligned with the ones in our US local government general obligation debt methodology.⁵

Utilities that serve lower-income ratepayers may have more difficulty implementing higher rates, if utility costs consume a considerable share of residents' budgets. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) considers wastewater costs exceeding 2% of median household income to be a heavy burden, for example, a threshold that would be reached more quickly for a utility serving lower-income ratepayers.

We believe MFI is the best proxy for the wealth of a service base, but other indicators such as the poverty rate, unemployment, home foreclosures, per capita income, and median home value supplement our analysis of ratepayer capacity.

⁵ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Subfactor 1c: System size (7.5%)

Input: Most recent year operations and maintenance expenditures, expressed in dollars

Larger systems tend to be more diverse and enjoy economies of scale. The size of a system implies the flexibility and resilience not only of its operations, but also of its service base.

Small systems present a number of risks. They are less likely to have redundancies, which allow a system to shut down some of its operations in an emergency or to make repairs without interrupting service. Small standalone water or sewer systems will typically depend upon a single supply of water or a single sewage treatment plant. They are more likely to be exposed to a concentrated customer base. They are more susceptible to the departure of a single large customer. An unexpected capital need is likely to be more costly relative to its annual budget. The collective engineering and scientific expertise is likely to be less robust than a larger system's.

We use different breakpoints for different types of systems in this subfactor, recognizing that not all types of utilities have the same cost structure. For instance, an electric distribution system is more expensive to run than a stormwater system. A distribution-only water system is likely to have a lower, more predictable cost base, but also depend on an external system for water supply and pay prices largely out of its control.

Utilities that are wholesalers to municipal government customers may exhibit operating stability not captured by size or service area wealth. Many of a utility's risks may be shifted to its municipal customers if their service contracts prevent these customers from switching providers or decreasing payments. If service contracts are so strongly worded and unconditional that municipal customers would have to pay the utility's debt service under any circumstances, then the utility's bonds may effectively represent a claim on the combined credit quality of the municipal governments.

For utilities that are exclusively wholesalers to municipal customers, we assess the customers' ("participants") credit quality, using our methodologies for general obligation bonds, lease revenue bonds, or other appropriate methodology determined by the nature of the participants' pledge to the utility.⁶ For bonds secured by a utility's net revenue pledge, we incorporate the strength of the municipal customers' credit quality as an important factor in the utility's revenue base. For utilities whose pledges are essentially a pass-through of the municipal customers' underlying pledges, we may rate their bonds using our public sector pool financings methodology, recognizing that bondholders enjoy a direct claim on the underlying municipalities' ability and willingness to pay.⁷

Below-the-line adjustments

Additional service area economic strength or diversity: We would use this adjustment, upward or downward, if the MFI statistic incompletely or inaccurately depicts that capacity of the service base to bear higher rates.

Significant customer concentration: A large exposure to a single user or industry, or a small number of users, poses substantial risks that might not be captured in MFI. We may adjust the scorecard score down if a large share of a utility's revenues comes from one or a small number of customers, or from a single industry. We would be more likely to use this adjustment for volatile, unpredictable, and mobile industries than for longer-standing, more stable ones. We are less likely to consider a wholesale customer as a factor contributing to concentration, as it is purchasing on behalf of end-users.

⁶ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

⁷ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Revenue per customer greatly over/under regional average: Revenue per customer conveys additional information about users' capacity for higher rates that might not be captured in MFI. We might adjust the above-the-line rating, upward or downward, if revenue per customer implies higher or lower ability to increase rates than MFI suggests.

Exposure to weather volatility, extreme conditions or market fluctuations: Large amounts of rain that infiltrate pipes or storms that destroy equipment are examples of credit risks that could result in below-the-line adjustments. Weather can also affect the prices that distribution systems pay third-party providers for electricity or natural gas.

Resource vulnerability: Water, gas, and electric distribution utilities sell a product whose availability can be limited or expensive in some cases. For instance, a water provider in a drought-stricken region may have to purchase expensive third-party water, and see declines in billable flow due to conservation efforts. We may adjust the scorecard score down if the availability of water, an adequate gas supply, or a dependable source of electricity is vulnerable or in doubt.

Sizeable or insufficient capacity margin: Our useful remaining life calculation is designed to assess the quality of existing capital assets, but it does not measure the adequacy of a system's capacity relative to demand. Areas that are growing need more water, gas, and electricity, and place greater demands on wastewater and trash disposal utilities. Systems that are close to capacity may face greater capital costs to expand in the future, suggesting larger debt burdens and posing additional risks that we may adjust the scorecard score downward for. Alternately, systems with ample capacity may be notched up, given the lack of capital spending requirements implied by the excess capacity. Further, excess capacity can sometimes imply a revenue-generating opportunity, since utilities can often sell their product or service to other parties. We are less likely to view excess capacity as a positive if it is caused by a declining user base.

Unusual depreciation practices relative to industry norms: Utilities typically have some flexibility to determine the depreciation schedules of their assets. Utilizing unreasonably long useful lives or employing other practices that distort depreciation schedules would also distort our remaining useful life calculation. We may notch a score down if an unreasonable depreciation schedule is inflating a utility's remaining useful life. Likewise, we may notch a score up if an unusually rapid depreciation schedule understates remaining useful life.

Factor 2: Financial Strength (40%)

EXHIBIT 3

Financial Strength (40%)	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B and Below
Annual Debt Service Coverage (15%)	> 2.00x	2.00x ≥ n > 1.70x	1.70x ≥ n > 1.25x	1.25x ≥ n > 1.00x	1.00x ≥ n > 0.70x	≤ 0.70x
Days Cash on Hand (15%)	> 250 Days	250 Days ≥ n > 150 Days	150 Days ≥ n > 35 Days	35 Days ≥ n > 15 Days	15 Days ≥ n > 7 Days	≤ 7 Days
Debt to Operating Revenues (10%)	< 2.00x	2.00x < n ≤ 4.00x	4.00x < n ≤ 7.00x	7.00x < n ≤ 8.00x	8.00x < n ≤ 9.00x	≥ 9.00x

Why it matters

The financial health of a utility determines its flexibility to respond to contingencies, resilience against potential short-term shocks, and cushion against a long-term unfavorable trend.

We measure utilities' financial health by looking at cash and other liquid reserves, the burden that debt places on operations, and the magnitude by which revenues are sufficient to meet expenditures.

Subfactor 2a: Annual debt service coverage (15%)

Input: Most recent year's net revenues divided by most recent year's debt service, expressed as a multiple

Debt service coverage is a core statistic assessing the financial health of a utility revenue system. The magnitude by which net revenues are sufficient to cover debt service shows a utility's margin to tolerate business risks or declines in demand while still assuring repayment of debt. Higher coverage levels indicate greater flexibility to withstand volatile revenues, unexpected outflows, or customer resistance to higher rates.

Utilities usually enter into a rate covenant under which they pledge to achieve a given level of debt service coverage each year. The covenant ensures that the utility utilizes its assets to generate sufficient income to pay bondholders.

The analysis of a utility system's debt service coverage demands ample context. If debt service escalates in future years, then the utility's current net revenues may be sufficient to cover debt service this year, but not in the future. Systems with greater revenue stability can operate comfortably at lower coverage levels. Systems with greater capital needs are likely to incur more debt, which will lead to increased debt service and decreased coverage. The debt service coverage calculation is the basis for a comprehensive analysis of a utility's financial flexibility and trend over the long term.

Rate covenants define a calculation method. These calculation methods vary, for example in the inclusion or exclusion of connection fees. Our coverage calculation will frequently differ from the coverage utilities report for purposes of complying with their rate covenants. Frequently, our analysis will consider several types of coverage, including maximum annual debt service (MADS) coverage, annual debt service coverage, coverage with and without connection fees, and coverage as calculated for the rate covenant. For entry on the scorecard, we include connection fees (when pledged) in revenues, recognizing that these are pledged revenues that are usually generated annually and are an important source of funding for expansion. If connection fees are particularly volatile, or if they represent an inordinate share of revenues, we may adjust below the line.

Subfactor 2b: Days cash on hand (15%)

Input: Unrestricted cash and liquid investments times 365 divided by operating and maintenance expenses, expressed in days

Cash is the paramount resource utilities have to meet expenses, cope with emergencies, and navigate business interruptions. Utilities with a lot of cash and cash equivalents are able to survive temporary disruptions and cash flow shortfalls without missing important payments. A large cash balance can also partially compensate for the lack of a debt service reserve fund. A low cash balance indicates poor flexibility to manage contingencies.

We include in this measure any cash or cash-equivalent that is both unrestricted and liquid. The measure does not include cash held in a debt service reserve fund, unspent bond proceeds, or cash that is restricted for capital.

Subfactor 2c: Debt to operating revenues (10%)

Input: Net debt divided by most recent year's operating revenues, expressed as a multiple

A utility's debt profile determines its leverage and fixed costs. Systems that carry a lot of debt have less ability to reduce costs if demand shrinks, and are generally more challenged to achieve higher debt service coverage.

A greater debt burden may also prohibit a utility from funding necessary capital upgrades, if a covenant prevents the issuer from incurring the debt necessary to fund those upgrades.

"Net debt" is a utility's long-term debt subtracted by debt service reserve funds.

Below-the-line adjustments

Debt service coverage (annual or MADS) below key thresholds: A debt service coverage ratio below 1 times is an important threshold, because coverage below 1 times indicates the utility is not fully covering debt service with income generated from operations. If a utility fails to achieve 1 times coverage, we may adjust the score down to reflect the financial imbalance of the utility's operations. Another key threshold that would likely prompt us to adjust the score down is if coverage were to fall below the utility's coverage covenant, even if that covenant is higher than 1 times. Management's willingness and ability to operate the system for bondholders' benefit is a crucial credit consideration, and a breach of covenant calls that willingness and ability into question. A coverage level that impedes the issuance of additional bonds under the utility's additional bonds covenant could also prompt us to adjust the score down, if we think it would prevent the utility from funding necessary capital upgrades.

Constrained liquidity position due to oversized transfers: It is common for utilities to transfer cash to their general governments regularly, either to share overhead costs, make payments in lieu of taxes for occupied property, or to help fund shared infrastructure. It is also common for parent governments to tap utilities' cash to fund General Fund operations. We may notch a utility's score down if these types of transfers are large and begin to strain its own liquidity. We are more likely to make this adjustment if the general government is operationally reliant on utility transfers and has the authority to increase them, particularly if the general government is struggling financially. Even if a utility has never transferred cash to its parent, such transfers remain a possibility⁸, one of the reasons for the relationship between a revenue rating and the GO rating of its general government.

Outsized capital needs: A utility with significant capital needs will likely need to incur additional debt not communicated in the existing debt metric. We may adjust the score downward for utilities under regulatory consent decree, or otherwise with great capital needs, that are likely to increase their debt levels.

Oversized adjusted net pension liability relative to debt, or significant actuarial required contribution underpayment: Employees of public utilities are usually members of a municipal pension plan. Most utilities either sponsor their own plan or participate in another entity's plan, and are responsible for funding their share of the plan's pension liabilities. We may adjust the score down if this liability is especially large, or if the utility has underfunded its contributions.

Significant exposure to puttable debt and/or swaps, or other unusual debt structure: The risks of a debt portfolio can be magnified if it is significantly composed of puttable debt. Utilities generally set rates with the intention of covering operating expenses and debt service in the current year. A debt put, accelerated amortization under a term-out, or other unexpected calls on a utility's resources can impose immediate and

⁸ Unless the utility's flow of funds is closed-loop. A closed-loop flow of funds is stronger than an open one for this reason.

substantial, unbudgeted cash outflows and upend that intention. We may notch a score down, potentially by several notches, if the composition of a debt portfolio, or cash-flow demands or unfavorable valuation of a swap, communicates a greater degree of risk than the existing debt metric.

Factor 3: Management (20%)

EXHIBIT 4

Management (20%)	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B and Below
Rate Management (10%)	Excellent rate-setting record; no material political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Strong rate-setting record; little political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Average rate-setting record; some political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Adequate rate-setting record; political, practical, or regulatory impediments place material limits on rate increases	Below average rate-setting record; political, practical, or regulatory impediments place substantial limits on rate increases	Record of insufficiently adjusting rates; political, practical, or regulatory obstacles prevent implementation of necessary rate increases
Regulatory compliance and capital planning (10%)	Fully compliant OR proactively addressing compliance issues; Maintains sophisticated and manageable Capital Improvement Plan that addresses more than a 10-year period	Actively addressing minor compliance issues; Maintains comprehensive and manageable 10-year Capital Improvement Plan	Moderate violations with adopted plan to address issues; Maintains manageable 5-year Capital Improvement Plan	Significant compliance violations with limited solutions adopted; Maintains single year Capital Improvement Plan	Not fully addressing compliance issues; Limited or weak capital planning	Not addressing compliance issues; No capital planning

Why it matters

If the legal provisions establish the minimum level of financial margin at which a utility must be run, the utility's management determines the actual level at which it is run.

Utility management refers to the dynamics of setting rates, planning for capital spending, budgeting for annual expenditures, and complying with environmental regulations. All of these factors interplay with one another to determine the credit strength of a utility system.

The scorecard captures two crucial aspects of management: rate-setting and capital planning. These two aspects encompass most of what is important in running a utility: keeping the system in good working order, and paying for it.

Subfactor 3a: Rate management (10%)

User rates are the primary, and sometimes only, mechanism utilities employ to pay for their operations.

Ideally, rates increase marginally and steadily, rather than choppily. It is common for utilities to split their rates into a "base" charge (flat rate charged to all users) plus a "volumetric" charge (per unit costs based on flow/usage). Utilities funded to a greater extent by the volumetric charge face greater risks, since volume can be economically sensitive or decline because of a shift in consumption patterns.

Management's track record at setting rates appropriately and increasing them when necessary drives this score. We tend to give higher scores to utilities that set rate structures under which increases are automatic, and do not require annual approval for implementation.

Embedded into this factor is the length of time required to implement a rate increase. Many public utilities enjoy the authority to set their own rates, and can enact a rate increase in short order by majority vote of the governing board. Some utilities must give the public a few weeks or months notice before increasing rates, or choose to do so by policy or practice. Some utilities require state approval to increase rates. Utilities that need state approval often have to file a rate case subject to public objection, and in some cases the state takes a long time to approve them or denies the full rate increase.

The longer it takes a utility to implement a rate increase, the less flexibility it has to quickly generate new revenues when faced with cash flow shortfalls.

Subfactor 3b: Regulatory compliance and capital planning (10%)

The public utility sector is heavily regulated. Most public utilities are regulated by federal as well as state agencies.

The EPA enforces the Safe Drinking Water Act for water distribution utilities, the Clean Water Act for sanitary sewer and stormwater utilities, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act for solid waste disposal systems, and the Clean Air Act for electric utilities. These statutes, and the methods employed to enforce them, are continually evolving, often intensifying over time. Additionally, many states have passed their own environmental regulations and are active enforcers.

This scorecard factor assesses utilities' compliance with relevant regulations and their plans for the capital expenditures required to comply in the future.

In addition to achieving environmental compliance, proper capital planning ensures the continued delivery of the product or service and the ongoing generation of revenues.

During our reviews, we look for indications of potential compliance gaps, such as environmental litigation, a delay in renewing a permit, or a consent decree with a state or federal enforcement body.

Below-the-line adjustments

Unusually strong or weak capital planning: Continued violations of environmental laws and the associated litigation can impose extraordinary costs on utilities. We may notch the score down if these costs threaten to overwhelm a system's resources, in the form of a large consent decree, lawsuit, or other costs. Alternately, we may notch the score up if a utility's capital planning is particularly sophisticated or forward-looking. More sophisticated and forward-looking capital management is more important for systems facing resource vulnerability or extreme weather volatility.

Factor 4: Legal provisions (10%)

EXHIBIT 5

Legal Provisions (10%)	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B and Below
Rate Covenant (5%)	> 1.30x	≥ n 1.30x > 1.20x	≥ n 1.20x > 1.10x	≥ n 1.10x > 1.00x		≤ 1.00x
Debt Service Reserve Requirement (5%)	DSRF funded at MADS	DSRF funded at lesser of standard 3-prong test	DSRF funded at less than 3-prong test OR springing DSRF	NO explicit DSRF; OR funded with speculative grade surety		

Why it matters

The legal provisions of a public utility revenue bond form the backbone of its security.

When a municipality assigns its General Obligation pledge to a bond, it has promised to do whatever it has to do to cover debt service, in most cases from any revenues or resources at its disposal.

A utility revenue bond enjoys no such open-ended pledge, making the legal edifice of the bond critical to bondholder security. Most commonly, the legal security for municipal utility revenue bonds is a lien on the net revenues of the system. Occasionally, bondholders enjoy a lien on the gross revenues of a system. We ordinarily do not consider a gross revenue pledge as materially stronger than a net revenue pledge, because systems need to pay operating and maintenance costs in order to remain functional.

The linchpin of a bond's legal structure is its covenants: the legal compulsions the municipal utility agrees to when issuing the bonds.

Utilities abide by many different types of covenants. We consider three to be the most important: the rate covenant, the additional bonds test, and the debt service reserve fund. Also crucial in the analysis of a revenue bond's legal structure is whether the flow of funds is open-loop (accessible by another government entity) or closed.

Strong covenants bind the utility to utilize its assets to benefit bondholders by operating with a comfortable financial margin, not taking on too much debt, and maintaining adequate cash available to pay debt service. Weak or nonexistent covenants allow the utility to operate on a thin margin or even at a net loss, incur a lot of leverage, transfer its money to other government entities, or maintain inadequate cash, in ways that are detrimental to bondholders.

Covenants specify the minimum factors management must legally abide by. Utilities frequently exceed the minimum. Many of our ratings represent the expectation of performance at levels that exceed the covenants.

Subfactor 4a: Rate covenant (5%)

Input: Covenant governing net revenues (operating revenues minus operating expenditures net of depreciation) divided by annual debt service, expressed as a multiple

The rate covenant is a legal pledge to set rates such that net revenues will be sufficient to cover debt service at a prescribed level. For example, a covenant may bind a utility to ensure that net revenues cover debt service by 1.2 times. If net revenues fall short of this covenant in one year, the utility must raise rates to achieve a compliant coverage level the following year.

The rate covenant takes many forms. Some utilities pledge for net revenues to cover current year annual debt service by a given level. Others pledge to cover average annual debt service throughout the life of the bonds at that level. A strong coverage requirement would be for net revenues to cover maximum annual debt service (MADS) by a certain level.

Some rate covenant formats are materially weaker than this. Some utilities allow a "rolling" calculation, which includes outstanding cash from prior years' surpluses as part of the resources available to cover debt service. Many rate covenants allow connection fees to be included in available operating revenues.

The above-the-line coverage factor assumes the covenant is an annual debt service coverage calculation. We can adjust for any departures from this format below the line, upward or downward.

Subfactor 4b: Debt service reserve requirement (5%)

Input: Debt service reserve requirement

Many issuers agree to hold a specified amount of cash or other resources in a debt service reserve fund (DSRF), which the trustee can tap to pay debt service in the event that net revenues are inadequate. The DSRF covenant ordinarily requires the utility to replenish any draws from the DSRF.

The DSRF protects bondholders by assuring the payment of debt service even if net revenues fall short in one year.

DSRF funds can be funded with cash, or with surety policies from an insurer. We generally consider cash to be superior to a surety, although this is unlikely to materially affect the rating as long as the surety provider is rated investment grade.

One commonly used DSRF requirement is known as the "three-pronged test." Under tax law, the Internal Revenue Service limits the earning of interest on proceeds of a tax-exempt bond unless the invested proceeds comply with the three-pronged test. Under that test, the DSRF must be the lesser of 10% of principal, MADS, or 1.25 times average annual debt service. A DSRF set at the three-pronged test is usually weaker than one funded at MADS.

Revenue bonds have been issued without a DSRF in the past. This has resulted in a number of utilities with some bonds secured by a DSRF and other parity bonds secured by the same lien but no DSRF. We have rarely distinguished ratings between these parity bonds. The DSRF is a last-resort security measure, and most utilities comply with their coverage covenants and never have to tap their DSRF. We are most likely to distinguish between DSRF-secured bonds and bonds with no DSRF if the system holds narrow liquidity. A system operating with abundant liquidity can use its operating cash to meet debt service shortfalls, effectively executing a similar function to the DSRF. The combination of narrow liquidity and no DSRF exposes bondholders to greater risks of interrupted debt service payments, and is therefore more likely to be reflected in ratings.

For a utility whose debt is mostly, but not all, secured by a DSRF, we will still enter the DSRF requirement into the scorecard. For a utility whose debt is mostly not secured by a DSRF, we will adjust the DSRF entry downward⁹.

⁹ For example, if 1/3 of a utility's debt is secured by a DSRF funded at MADS and 2/3 is not secured by a DSRF at all, we may enter the DSRF requirement as a Baa.

Below-the-line adjustments

Coverage covenant other than annual debt service: Our input for the coverage covenant assumes the coverage refers to net revenue coverage of annual debt service. A "rolling" coverage covenant that includes outstanding cash, or some other modification that weakens the meaning of the covenant, may prompt us to notch the score down. Conversely, a MADS coverage covenant may prompt us to notch the score up.

Structural enhancements/complexities: The scorecard is designed to capture covenants as they are most commonly constituted, but cannot account for the myriad structures and complexities that arise in bond transactions throughout the sector. Enhancements such as a lock-box structure for debt service may lead us to notch the score up. Other shortcomings, such as a weak additional bonds test or the inclusion of cash in a coverage covenant, may lead us to notch the score down. Any characteristic of the legal provisions of a bond transaction may lead us to conclude that the scorecard does not adequately capture its risk profile.

Treatment of Different Liens on a US Municipal Utility's Net Revenues

It is common for utilities to issue debt secured by different liens on their net revenues. Senior bonds are secured by a first lien on net revenues, and subordinate bonds or loans secured by a subordinate, or junior, lien. Sometimes, utilities will issue debt secured by a third lien or lower.

Our practice is to evaluate the likelihood of default and the expected recovery in the event of default for each lien independently.

This will most commonly result in a rating distinction of one notch for each lien of subordination. In other words, if a municipal utility's senior lien is rated Aa3, its subordinate lien will most likely be rated A1 and the third lien will most likely be rated A2.

The reason for the typical one-notch-per-lien distinction is that subordinate liens are marginally more likely to default than senior liens, and subordinate liens' expected recovery in the event of default would be lower. Senior liens are typically afforded stronger legal protections under utilities' indentures, senior-lien debt service is usually paid earlier in the flow of funds, and the first lien would likely enjoy a better claim in bankruptcy.

For most investment grade municipal utilities, the probability of default for any lien is small, and so the notching distinction is driven primarily by a greater expected loss severity in the unlikely event of a default. This is comparable to our approach for ratings distinctions for different debt classes of investment grade corporations, where ratings distinctions are driven by differences in expected loss severities.¹⁰ In contrast to corporates, however, there often is not an explicit cross-default of senior municipal debt in the event of a subordinate payment default.

In some instances, we may conclude that an investment grade municipal utility's subordinate lien has a default probability and expected loss severity that is nearly as low or just as low as the senior lien (in which case we may not make a ratings distinction), or a default probability and expected loss severity that is materially higher than the senior lien (in which case we may make a ratings distinction of more than one notch).

Such a conclusion would be based on the municipal utility's management of its system with respect to its liens, and the characteristics of the legal framework governing the liens: rate covenants, additional debt provisions, and cross-default and acceleration provisions in a senior lien's variable rate debt resulting from a default on the subordinate lien, for example. If a utility has only a very small amount of senior lien debt, we may choose not to distinguish between liens.

The distinctions among a municipal utility's liens become starker when it faces a material likelihood of default or bankruptcy. For these situations, the different characteristics of the liens are likely to drive greater disparities in default probabilities and expected recoveries for disparate liens. Thus, we are more likely to employ ratings distinctions other than one notch for speculative grade municipal utilities' different liens as the Loss Given Default approach drives more of the analysis.

In nearly all instances, the ratings on the different liens of the same utility will remain closely related. The reason for this is that municipal utilities are actively managed enterprises that continually need to generate net revenues sufficient not only to cover debt service but also to fund capital needs. Even if senior lien coverage is strong, a utility that is unable to pay its junior lien debt service is not generating excess funds for capital investment and does not have capacity for capital borrowing. Thus, while subordinate liens face greater default probability and higher loss expectations based on their first-loss positions, an increased likelihood of default on a subordinate lien implies an increased likelihood of insolvency for the utility as a whole.

For this reason, we enter the debt-oriented inputs into the scorecard on a consolidated basis. For the debt to revenues factor, we enter total debt (senior and junior). For the debt service coverage factor, we enter total debt service coverage. It is the municipal utility's ability to cover all of its debt service with net revenues that determines its viability as a going concern. Even for a senior lien with a large coverage factor by net revenues, a narrow coverage of all debt service implies pressure to maintain healthy operations and generate funds sufficient for capital reinvestment.

¹⁰ For more information, see our cross-sector methodology that describes the alignment of corporate instrument ratings based on differences in security and priority of claim. A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Appendix: Municipal Utility Revenue Bond Scorecard

EXHIBIT 6

		Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B and Below
Numerical score		0.5 to 1.5	1.5 to 2.5	2.5 to 3.5	3.5 to 4.5	4.5 to 5.5	5.5 to 6.5
System Characteristics (30%)							
Asset Condition (10%)	Net Fixed Assets/Annual Depreciation :	> 75 years	75 years ≥ n > 25 years	25 years ≥ n > 12 years	12 years ≥ n > 9 years	9 Years ≥ n > 6 Years	≤ 6 Years
Service Area Wealth (12.5%)		> 150% of US median	150% ≥ US median > 90%	90% ≥ US median > 75%	75% ≥ US median > 50%	50% ≥ US median > 40%	≤ 40% of US median
System Size (7.5%)	Water and/or Sewer/ Solid Waste:	O&M > \$65M	\$65M ≥ O&M > \$30M	\$30M ≥ O&M > \$10M	\$10M ≥ O&M > \$3M	\$3M ≥ O&M > \$1M	O&M ≤ \$1M
	Stormwater:	O&M > \$30M	\$30M ≥ O&M > \$15M	\$15M ≥ O&M > \$8M	\$8M ≥ O&M > \$2M	\$2M ≥ O&M > \$750K	O&M ≤ \$750K
	Gas or Electric:	O&M > \$100M	\$100M ≥ O&M > \$50M	\$50M ≥ O&M > \$20M	\$20M ≥ O&M > \$8M	\$8M ≥ O&M > \$3M	O&M ≤ \$3M
Financial Strength (40%)							
Annual Debt Service Coverage (15%)		> 2.00x	2.00x ≥ n > 1.70x	1.70x ≥ n > 1.25x	1.25x ≥ n > 1.00x	1.00x ≥ n > 0.70x	≤ 0.70x
Days Cash on Hand (15%)		> 250 Days	250 Days ≥ n > 150 Days	150 Days ≥ n > 35 Days	35 Days ≥ n > 15 Days	15 Days ≥ n > 7 Days	≤ 7 Days
Debt to Operating Revenues (10%)		< 2.00x	2.00x < n ≤ 4.00x	4.00x < n ≤ 7.00x	7.00x < n ≤ 8.00x	8.00x < n ≤ 9.00x	≥ 9.00x
Management (20%)							
Rate Management (10%)		Excellent rate-setting record; no material political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Strong rate-setting record; little political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Average rate-setting record; some political, practical, or regulatory limits on rate increases	Adequate rate-setting record; political, practical, or regulatory impediments place material limits on rate increases	Below average rate-setting record; political, practical, or regulatory impediments place substantial limits on rate increases	Record of insufficiently adjusting rates; political, practical, or regulatory obstacles prevent implementation of necessary rate increases
Regulatory Compliance and Capital Planning (10%)		Fully compliant OR proactively addressing compliance issues; Maintains sophisticated and manageable Capital Improvement Plan that addresses more than a 10-year period	Actively addressing minor compliance issues; Maintains comprehensive and manageable 10-year Capital Improvement Plan	Moderate violations with adopted plan to address issues; Maintains manageable 5-year Capital Improvement Plan	Significant compliance violations with limited solutions adopted; Maintains single year Capital Improvement Plan	Not fully addressing compliance issues; Limited or weak capital planning	Not addressing compliance issues; No capital planning
Legal Provisions (10%)							
Rate Covenant (5%)		> 1.30x	1.30x ≥ n > 1.20x	1.20x ≥ n > 1.10x	1.10x ≥ n > 1.00x	≤ 1.00x ¹¹	
Debt Service Reserve Requirement (5%)		DSRF funded at MADS	DSRF funded at lesser of standard 3-prong test	DSRF funded at less than 3-prong test OR springing DSRF	NO explicit DSRF; OR funded with speculative grade surety ¹²		

¹¹ Scores as a Ba.¹² Scores as a Baa.

Adjustments/Notching Factors

Factor 1: System Characteristics

Additional service area economic strength or diversity

Significant customer concentration

Revenue-per-Customer greatly over/under regional average

Exposure to weather volatility or extreme conditions

Resource vulnerability (1/3 or greater)

Sizable or insufficient capacity margin

Weak depreciation/reinvestment practices relative to industry norms

Other analyst adjustment to System Characteristics (Specify)

Factor 2: Financial Strength

Debt Service Coverage (Annual or MADS) below key thresholds: Additional Bonds Test and 1.00x coverage

Constrained liquidity position due to oversized transfers

Outsized capital needs

Oversized ANPL relative to debt or significant under-payment of actuarial funding requirement

Significant exposure to puttable debt and/or swaps or other unusual debt structure

Other analyst adjustment to Financial Strength factor (Specify)

Factor 3: Legal Provisions

Structural Enhancements/Complexities

Other analyst adjustment to Legal Provisions factor (Specify)

Factor 4: Management

Unusually strong or weak operational or capital planning

Other analyst adjustment to Management factor (Specify)

Other

Credit Event/Trend not yet reflected in existing data set

Scorecard-Indicated Outcome	Overall Weighted Score
Aaa	0.5 to 1.5
Aa1	1.5 to 1.83
Aa2	1.83 to 2.17
Aa3	2.17 to 2.5
A1	2.5 to 2.83
A2	2.83 to 3.17
A3	3.17 to 3.5
Baa1	3.5 to 3.83
Baa2	3.83 to 4.17
Baa3	4.17 to 4.5
Ba1	4.5 to 4.83
Ba2	4.83 to 5.17
Ba3	5.17 to 5.5
B1	5.5 to 5.83
B2	5.83 to 6.17
B3	6.17 to 6.5

Moody's Related Publications

Credit ratings are primarily determined by sector credit rating methodologies. Certain broad methodological considerations (described in one or more cross-sector rating methodologies) may also be relevant to the determination of credit ratings of issuers and instruments. An index of sector and cross-sector credit rating methodologies can be found [here](#).

For data summarizing the historical robustness and predictive power of credit ratings, please click [here](#).

For further information, please refer to *Rating Symbols and Definitions*, which is available [here](#).

Report Number: 1095545

Author
Dan Seymour, CFA

Production Specialist
Shubhra Bhatnagar

© 2017 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 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 AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN 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's.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms 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 61 003 399 657 AFSL 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 investors. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Additional terms 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.