S&P Global Ratings

RatingsDirect®

Summary:

New York City; Appropriations; General Obligation; Joint Criteria; Moral Obligation

Primary Credit Analyst:
Hilary A Sutton, New York (1) 212-438-7093; hilary.sutton@spglobal.com

Secondary Contact:
Rahul Jain, New York 212-438-1202; rahul.jain@spglobal.com

Table Of Contents

Summary:

New York City; Appropriations; General Obligation; Joint Criteria; Moral Obligation

Credit Profile		
US$800.0 mil Tax - Exempt bnds fiscal ser 2017 A-1 due 08/01/2040		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$174.185 mil Taxable bnds fiscal ser 2017 A-2 due 08/01/2028		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$75.815 mil Taxable bnds fiscal ser 2017 A-3 due 08/01/2028		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$55.51 mil GO bnds fiscal ser 2017- 1 due 08/01/2023		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New

Rationale

S&P Global Ratings assigned its 'AA' long-term rating and stable outlook to New York City's fiscal 2017 series A (tax-exempt subseries A-1 and taxable subseries A-2 and A-3) general obligation (GO) bonds. We understand officials plan to use proceeds for capital purposes. S&P Global Ratings also assigned its 'AA' rating to the city's fiscal 2017 series 1 GO bonds based upon the expected conversion of the fiscal 1994 series C and subseries E-2 adjustable-rate bonds to the fixed-rate mode on Aug. 18, 2016. Concurrent with the issue of the subseries A-1, A-2, and A-3 fixed-rate bonds and conversion of the fiscal 1994 series C and subseries E-2 adjustable-rate bonds, the city plans to issue fiscal 2017 subseries A-4 through A-7 multimodal variable-rate bonds to raise $382 million.

S&P Global Ratings affirmed its 'AA' long-term rating on New York City's GO debt outstanding and its 'AA-' rating on the city's lease revenue bonds. The city's faith, credit, and unlimited ad valorem pledge secure the GO bonds, while the lease revenue bonds are subject to annual appropriation. Bondholders also benefit from the security of the general debt service fund, with city real estate tax revenue deposited into the fund and retained under a statutory formula in an amount sufficient to cover debt service.

S&P Global Ratings also affirmed its 'AA-' rating on the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York's (DASNY) lease revenue bonds outstanding based on the city's appropriation pledge. A state aid intercept mechanism further secures the DASNY bonds. In addition, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its 'A+' rating on the New York City Health & Hospitals Corp.'s (HHC) health system bonds based on the city's moral obligation pledge, although the bonds are additionally secured by a pledge of health care reimbursement revenues. We believe the HHC is essential to the city's health care infrastructure, in particular, its Medicaid population, and its medically underserved areas and, as such, we rate the bonds two notches below the GO debt rating rather than the customary three notches.

Finally, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its dual ratings on various issuances where the short-term ratings are based on the liquidity support provided by various financial institutions.

The outlook on all long-term ratings is stable.

The 'AA' GO rating reflects our view of New York City's:

- Strong economy, with access to a broad and diverse metropolitan statistical area (MSA);
- Adequate budgetary performance, with break-even operating results in the general fund but an operating deficit at the total governmental fund level in fiscal 2015;
- Very strong management and historically conservative budgeting practices;
- Strong budgetary flexibility despite limitations on the city's ability to maintain general fund reserves under the Financial Emergency Act, which New York City has adjusted for by using surplus to prepay subsequent-year expenditures and fund a reserve for future retirees' health insurance costs;
- Very strong liquidity with access to external liquidity we consider exceptional; and
- Very strong institutional framework score.

These strengths are offset, in our view, by the city's very weak debt profile and its large pension and other postemployment benefit (OPEB) obligations, and the lack of a plan to sufficiently address the OPEB obligation.

Strong economy

We consider New York City's economy strong. With an estimated population of 8.5 million, the city is the most populous in the nation and continues to grow. It also anchors the broad and diverse New York-Newark-Jersey City MSA and has a projected per capita effective buying income of 105.1% of the national level. New York City's full valuation increased 11.8% year-over-year to $1.05 trillion in fiscal 2017, resulting in a per capita market value of $123,928. Its weight-averaged unemployment rate was 5.7% in 2015.

New York City's economy remains robust as it serves as the economic engine for the Mid-Atlantic region. Its major employment sectors are trade, financial activities, professional services, education, health services, and government. Despite recent diversification of the city's economy, there is still a higher-than-average reliance on the financial sector. In the future, S&P Global Ratings expects the mid-Atlantic region to see normal GDP growth of about 1.8% for the year, but at a slower rate and lagging behind some of the country.

The city's housing market continues to have good, stable value despite high prices. Real estate prices held steady while those in other metropolitan areas nosedived when the housing bubble burst. The residential real estate market continues to experience overwhelming demand and a consistent undersupply of living space. As stated in our report "State And Local Government Credit Conditions Outlook: Smoother Sailing--Maybe--After A Turbulent Start", published April 19, 2016, on RatingsDirect, increases in home prices should have a positive effect on municipalities as most rely on property tax collection revenues. This is relevant for New York City as 29.3% of its revenues (44% of its total tax revenues) are derived from the real estate tax.

Despite the continued employment strength, the long-term growth prospects for the city are hampered by the state of its infrastructure. Given the large population that commutes into the city daily, this could worsen as New York City's infrastructure ages. The construction sector will remain a vital part of the MSA's economy; the state has committed about $1 billion in state funds for the rebuilding of the Tappan Zee Bridge; in our opinion, this will have the combined impact of supporting the local labor force and mitigating some of the MSA's infrastructure needs. The direction and magnitude of capital spending on city infrastructure will be integral to the region's growth prospects, in our opinion.

Adequate budgetary performance

We consider New York City's budgetary performance adequate, with balanced general fund operations in fiscal 2015 after discretionary transfers--in compliance with the Fiscal Emergency Act--and a slight 1.6% total governmental fund deficit after adjusting for reimbursements to its central treasury for capital expenditures. Year-end results reflected a $3.6 billion debt service prepayment for fiscal 2016 budget stabilization (significantly higher than the 2014 prepayment of $2 billion for 2015 budget stabilization) and a $955 million increase in the reserve for future retirees' health insurance costs.

New York City submitted its financial plan for fiscal 2017-2020 on June 14, 2016, and included a modification to the June 2015 financial plan for fiscal 2016. The fiscal 2016 budget now stands at $82.36 billion and includes a $3.99 billion budget stabilization prepayment for 2017. The prepayment amount was not budgeted for in the adopted budget and represents a healthy $470 million increase from the actual budget stabilization prepayment for fiscal 2016. We continue to view this as increased flexibility for the city. In the June 2016 plan, net revenues are $2.02 billion higher than the June 2015 plan; significant variances include higher-than-expected real property transfer and mortgage recording taxes ($590 million), real property taxes ($529 million), and personal income taxes ($209 million). While the city projects a $173 million decrease in business tax revenue, we believe the aforementioned positive variances are evidence of New York City's continued economic stability and steady growth. Other notable variances include tax audit revenue (projected to increase $349 million) and the other revenues category (projected to increase $626 million due largely to settlement activity). As for net expenditures, the June 2016 financial plan projects fiscal 2016 spending that is $1.97 billion lower than what is identified in the June 2015 plan. The citywide savings program alone is expected to result in a $1.64 billion decline in expenditures due, in part, to conservative assumptions in debt service costs. New York City's active management of its expenses is a credit positive, in our view, and underpins its stable credit profile.

The city's revenue stream is largely locally derived; New York City projects local revenue (including real estate, personal income and sales tax receipts, user charges, and miscellaneous revenues) are expected to provide roughly 74% of the total in fiscal 2017 and state aid about 17%. The city projects $82.1 billion in expenses for fiscal 2017, which we believe supports increased flexibility in the near term by including a set-aside of $1 billion in general reserves and $500 million in capital reserves. As previously mentioned, the adopted budget includes an increased prepayment of nearly $4 billion for fiscal 2017 expenses. The largest year-to-year increases in cost, based on current fiscal 2016 estimates, are for debt service and fringe benefits, at 11.3% and 5.4%, respectively. We believe debt service costs are conservative based on the city's interest rate assumptions as well as the budgeting for cash flow borrowing, which hasn't been done in 12 years. Fringe benefits ($9.7 billion) are expected to make up a larger share of expenses than pensions ($9.4 billion) in fiscal 2017, a trend we believe may continue into future years. We believe that the city's historically strong and proactive management will remain an important component of balancing its operations as New York City implements its fiscal 2017 budget.

Out-year gaps are $2.82 billion for fiscal 2018, $2.95 billion for 2019, and $2.33 billion for 2020, compared with the average over the previous 13 years of $3.06 billion in the first year, $3.73 billion in the second, and $3.90 billion in the third. While projected out-year gaps are lower than historical levels and are based on what we view as conservative revenue and expenditure growth assumptions, we believe they could be problematic if economic conditions deteriorate given the city's fixed-cost structure. In addition, the city has presented a plan for health and hospitals (H+H) that relies on the successful execution of planned efficiency savings and increased revenues. Without these changes, operating deficits will approach $1.8 billion in fiscal 2020. Despite increased operating subsidies and debt service relief from the city in the adopted budget, the H+H corporation may require additional support if the plan does not successfully close the gap to cover shortfalls in projected federal and state revenue and nonreimbursement to the city for medical malpractice claims and fringe benefits.

S&P Global Ratings views the following as significant highlights contained in the June 2016 financial plan covering 2017-2020:

- Budgeting of $20 million in general reserves in fiscal 2016 and $1 billion in general reserves from fiscal years 2017 and 2020;
- Budgeting partial state intercept sales tax revenues in 2017-2019;
- Agreement with 99% of the workforce;
- Elimination of the water rental payment due from the New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority to the general fund; and
- Lower prepayments and wider out-year gaps should the city fail to achieve additional savings through a new "Citywide Savings Plan."

Very strong management

We view the city's management as very strong, with "strong" financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment methodology, indicating financial practices are strong, well embedded, and likely sustainable. New York City's budgets and four-year financial plan are prepared with conservative revenue and expenditure projections that are based on an evaluation of historical data and incorporate information from outside resources, including private economists and economic forecasting services. Monthly financial statements and cash flows are prepared to identify major variances from the financial plan. The city publicly reports on cash balances and investments on a regular, at least quarterly, basis. New York City's three-tiered capital planning process is comprehensive and regularly updated, and its ability to issue debt is limited by both the Financial Emergency Act and New York State Constitution. As mentioned previously, New York City is unable to maintain a reserve as per state statute but has a practice of prepaying the subsequent year's expenditures from current revenue.

Strong budgetary flexibility

The city's budgetary flexibility is strong, in our view. The Financial Emergency Act limits New York City's ability to maintain reserves from current-year revenue, translating into zero dollars in the available general fund balance at fiscal year-end. In response, the city has historically used its surplus in the fourth quarter of each year to prepay subsequent-year expenditures (primarily debt service). We view these prepayments as a form of reserve balance and a source of budgetary flexibility. New York City also funds a discretionary reserve for future retirees' health insurance costs and we view this amount as available for operations, if necessary, based on historical use of these funds in prior years. Combined, the fiscal 2015 unrestricted budget stabilization contribution ($3.5 billion) and the reserve for retirees' health insurance costs ($3.4 billion) represented 9% of adjusted general fund expenditures.

We expect budgetary flexibility to remain strong over the next two years given that the adopted fiscal 2017 budget includes a slight increase in the 2016 budget stabilization contribution and the city made a $500 million deposit into the retiree health benefits trust fund. In addition, we believe that, despite statutory limitations on its major revenue sources (such as limits around the amount of revenue it can raise from property taxes in support of operations) New York City historically has retained a degree of additional budgetary flexibility, based on its record of receiving state legislative approval for proposed revenue increases. In our opinion, legislative approval has proven a lower hurdle than direct-voter approval. In addition, we believe the city has historically made these revenue requests sparingly and, as a result, has obtained legislative approvals or otherwise made adjustments when needed. Although the state did not agree to Mayor Bill de Blasio's proposed tax increase of 0.534% for households earning more than $500,000 per year, it did provide funding for New York City's universal prekindergarten initiative, which we believe supports this assessment.

Very strong liquidity

We view New York City's liquidity position as very strong. Total governmental cash and liquid investments were 10.9% of adjusted total governmental fund expenditures in fiscal 2015, and 89.6% of debt service. In addition, New York City has demonstrated exceptional access to capital markets based on its frequent debt issues backed by multiple security types.

S&P Global Ratings does not view New York City's investment portfolio supporting operations and capital as risky because the portfolio is concentrated in U.S. government treasuries, agencies, and instruments. Investments also include high-grade commercial paper and repurchase agreements that are collateralized by U.S. government debt instruments. In our opinion, the city has limited exposure to contingent liability risk despite its variable-rate debt portfolio, based on our understanding that acceleration is not a permissible remedy in any of the liquidity facilities in an event of a default. One such liquidity facility recently expired with Wells Fargo Bank, and Wells Fargo purchased the related series of GO bonds for its own account pursuant to a continuing covenant agreement. We do not believe the terms of the agreement create contingent liability risk. Finally, as of June 30, 2016, the notional amount of the city's swaps was $1.5 billion. Given that the city's rating is far from any of the rating triggers, we do not believe these agreements present a credit risk.

Very weak debt and contingent liability profile

In our view, New York City's debt and contingent liability profile is very weak. Total governmental fund debt service is 12.2% of total governmental fund expenditures, and net direct debt is 84.6% of total governmental fund revenue. While we understand there are no term-out provisions on New York City's variable-rate bonds, we believe the city has some exposure to interest-rate risk given maximum bank rates on its variable-rate debt of up to 25%. Additional debt plans over the next two years (including the GO bonds and New York City Transitional Finance Authority future tax-secured bonds) totals $12.9 billion. We believe New York City's pledge to fund $2.5 billion of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority' 2015-2019 capital plan, which remains partially funded at $657 million in the authority's current capital plan, could create additional financing needs.

In our opinion, a credit weakness is New York City's large pension and OPEB obligation, without a plan in place that we think will sufficiently address the OPEB obligation. Required pension and actual OPEB contributions totaled 14.3% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2015. Of that amount, 10.5% represented required contributions to pension obligations, and 3.8% represented OPEB payments. The city made its full annual required pension contribution in 2015.

The city's primary pension funds are New York City Employees' Retirement System (NYCERS), Teachers' Retirement System of The City of New York (TRS), New York City Police Pension Fund, New York City Fire Pension Fund, and the New York City Board of Education Retirement System (BERS). Collectively, the plans have a $176.1 billion pension liability (70.5% funded), while the TRS has the largest single liability at $63.3 billion (68% funded). As of June 30, 2014, the city's actuarial accrued OPEB liability measured $70.4 billion and was 3.4% funded. We believe that pension and OPEB fixed costs are a significant share of New York City's budget and a source of pressure. The city is fully funding its annual required pension contribution, and funds OPEB costs on a pay-as-you-go basis. Although the health plan modifications agreed to with the Municipal Labor Committee could lead to a reduced OPEB liability, we believe the liability will remain substantial given the level of benefits, coupled with volatility in health care costs, unless further action is taken. We estimate that combined debt service, pension, and OPEB fixed costs were 26.2% of total governmental expenditures in fiscal 2015, which we consider elevated.

Very strong institutional framework

The institutional framework score for New York City is very strong.

Outlook

The stable outlook reflects what we view as New York City's deep and diverse economy and status as the nation's largest employment center. Strong and tested financial management policies and practices further support the rating. We believe these factors, together with the city's very strong liquidity position--but offset by the city's very weak debt and contingent liability profile--will be stable during the two-year outlook horizon.

Upside scenario

If the economy outperforms expectations over a long-term horizon and results in a strengthening of the city's financial performance and ability to manage its cost structure, while addressing needed infrastructure improvements without unduly increasing its debt profile, we could raise the rating. However, given the city's high debt position and weak contingent liability profile, it is unlikely that there would be a rating change over the two-year outlook horizon.

Downside scenario

In our view, New York City's projected budget gaps in fiscal years 2018-2020 are manageable relative to historically projected gaps if favorable economic conditions continue. However, should economic conditions deteriorate significantly, we believe the city could face problems adjusting its budget to maintain a stable financial position, given its fixed cost structure. An ongoing period of structural misalignment could result in weakened financial flexibility and performance and lead to a lower rating.

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016)		
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City asdj rate GO fiscal 2004 subser A-3		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
New York City go bnds fiscal 2004 adj rate subser A-5 dtd 07/14/2003 due 08/01/2031		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City go bnds fiscal 2004 subser A-4		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO adj rate		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds fiscal 2005 (tax-exempt & taxable) ser O P Q dtd 06/02/2005 due 06/01/2007-2016 2019-2025 2027 2030 2033 2035 & 08/01/2005-2025		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	New Rating
New York City GO bnds ser 2016 C due 08/01/2035		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds ser 2016 D due 08/01/2035		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds subseries 2014 I-1		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds subser J-8 ser 2008 J dtd 04/01/2008 rmktd 03/19/2013 due 08/01/2021		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds tax-exempt ser fiscal 1997 Ser E&F dtd 11/21/1996 due 08/01/2000-2013 2016 2024 2026		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds, fiscal 2015 series F Subser F-6 due 06/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds, fiscal 2015 F Subser F-5 due 06/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-2/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO rmktd to index rate FRN bnds		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO to index rate bnds FRN		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO var rate dem bnds		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO var rate dem bnds subseries J-3 ser 2008J dtd 04/01/2008 due 08/01/2023		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-2/Stable	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	NR(SPUR)	
New York City GO VRDB fiscal 2006 subser I-6		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO (wrap of insured) (MBIA) (AGM) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
New York City GO (ASSURED GTY) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO (ASSURED) (MBIA)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO (Fiscal 1996) Subser J-1 (AGM)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO (MBIA) (National)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	NR(SPUR)	
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-2/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	NR(SPUR)	
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City JOINTCRIT		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City adj rate fiscal 94 ser H subser H-3 dtd		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City rev bnds ser 2012 A-4		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
New York City GO		
Unenhanced Rating	NR(SPUR)	
New York City GO adj rate		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO VRDB subser J-5 ser 2008J		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
Dorm Auth of the St of New York, New York		
New York City, New York		
New York State Dorm Auth (New York City) court fac		
Long Term Rating	AA-/NR	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York State Dorm Auth (New York City) lse rev bnds (Mun Hlth Facs Imp Prog)		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
New York State Dorm Auth (New York City) mun hlth		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
New York St Dorm Auth (New York City) court facs lse (The City Of New York Issue) (wrap of insured) (AMBAC & BHAC) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York St Dorm Auth (New York City) lse (Mun Hlth Facs Imp Prog) (BHAC) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
DASNY (New York City) (Court Fac Prog)		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
New York St Dorm Auth (NYC) court fac ser 1999 & 2005		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York St Dorm Auth (NYC) (Mun Hlth Fac Imp Prog)		

Ratings Detail (As Of July 29, 2016) (cont.)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Educl Const Fd, New York		
New York City, New York		
New York City Educl Const Fd (New York City)		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Educl Const Fd (New York City) rev bnds (New York City) ser 2007A 01/18/2007 due 04/01/2009-2026 2031 2037		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Educl Const Fd (New York City) rev bnds (New York City) ser 2007A 01/18/2007 due 04/01/2009-2026 2031 2037		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Educl Const Fd (New York City) APPROP		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Hlth & Hosp Corp, New York		
New York City, New York		
New York City Health & Hospital Corporation (New York City) hlth sys - 2008B		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Health & Hospital Corporation (New York City) hlth sys - 2008C		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Health & Hospital Corporation (New York City) hlth sys - 2008D		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Health & Hospital Corporation (New York City) hlth sys - 2008E		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Hlth & Hosp Corp (New York City) hlth sys		
Long Term Rating	A+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Hlth & Hosp Corp (New York City) hlth sys (AGM) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Hlth & Hosp Corp (New York City) GO rev bnds		
Long Term Rating	A+/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Hlth & Hosp Corp (New York City) hlth sys bnds & var rate		
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City Indl Dev Agy, New York		
New York City, New York		
New York City Industrial Development Agency (NYC-New York Stock Exchange Proj)		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed

Many issues are enhanced by bond insurance.

Certain terms used in this report, particularly certain adjectives used to express our view on rating relevant factors, have specific meanings ascribed to them in our criteria, and should therefore be read in conjunction with such criteria. Please see Ratings Criteria at www.standardandpoors.com for further information. Complete ratings information is available to subscribers of RatingsDirect at www.globalcreditportal.com. All ratings affected by this rating action can be found on the S&P Global Ratings' public website at www.standardandpoors.com. Use the Ratings search box located in the left column.