S&P Global
Ratings

RatingsDirect®

Summary:

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

Primary Credit Analyst:
Rahul Jain, New York + 1 (212) 438 1202; rahul.jain@spglobal.com

Secondary Contact:
Nora G Wittstruck, New York (1) 212-438-8589; nora.wittstruck@spglobal.com

Table Of Contents

Summary:

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

Credit Profile		
US$660.545 mil GO tax-exempt bnds Fiscal 2019 ser A ser 2019A due 08/01/2028		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$108.075 mil GO tax-exempt bnds fiscal 2019 ser B ser 2019B due 08/01/2029		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$59.995 mil GO taxable bnds fiscal 2019 ser C ser 2019C due 12/01/2027		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
US$40.935 mil GO bnds fiscal 1994 ser H-3 ser 1994H-3 dtd 08/22/2018 due 08/01/2023		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	New
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed

Rationale

S&P Global Ratings assigned its 'AA' long-term rating to New York City's approximately $871 million of general obligation (GO) bonds, composed of approximately $660 million tax-exempt fiscal 2019 series A, approximately $110 million tax-exempt series B, and about $60 million taxable series C GO bonds as well as approximately $41 million fiscal 1994 series H, subseries H-3 GO bonds, which are being converted from adjustable rate to a fixed rate mode. At the same time, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its 'AA' long-term ratings on all series of the city's GO debt outstanding, its 'AA-' rating on all of the city's appropriation debt outstanding, and its 'A+' rating on the city's moral obligation debt outstanding and Liberty Development Corporation bonds. Finally, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its ratings on various issuances where the short-term ratings are based on the liquidity support provided by various financial institutions. The outlook on all ratings is stable.

Our affirmation of the GO rating reflects our view of the city's tentatively settled contract with District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, which includes raises of 2% retroactive to Sept. 26, 2017, 2.25% effective Sept. 26, 2018, and 3% effective Oct. 26, 2019, and runs through fiscal 2021. The agreement, which covers about a quarter of the city's workforce, is the first major collective bargaining agreement extended through fiscal 2019 and may provide a pattern for future settlements. If the pattern were to hold across all bargaining units, the gross cost in fiscal 2022 would be $3.4 billion, offset by $2.1 billion from the city's 1% labor reserve and health care savings contractually enforceable through arbitration, for a net cost of $1.3 billion, or about 1.3% of total revenues forecasted. The most recent version of the adopted financial plan does not include the projected costs from the settlement or updated salary and wage expectations; however, we believe potential increases in out-year gaps remain manageable, given the city's conservative revenue projections and strong management oversight and controls.

We understand proceeds from the fiscal 2019 series A, series B, and series C bonds will refund outstanding bonds, and proceeds from approximately $41 million of the tax-exempt fixed rate bonds, which will be used to convert outstanding floating rate bonds into fixed rate bonds.

New York City's faith, credit, and unlimited ad valorem pledge secure the outstanding GO bonds. The Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY) and Educational Construction Fund (ECF) lease revenue bonds are subject to annual appropriation. These bonds are secured by lease rental payments the city, as lessee, makes to the authority, as lessor. The city's industrial development agency series 2009A bonds are secured by the city's payment obligation under the financing agreement, subject to annual appropriation. We rate the city's appropriation-backed obligations one notch lower than New York City's general creditworthiness, reflected in the GO rating, to account for the risk of non-appropriation associated with the lease payments and under the financing agreement.

We rate the city's Health And Hospital Corp.'s (H&H) health system bonds based on the city's moral obligation pledge, although a pledge of health care reimbursement revenues also secures the bonds. Based on the city's relationship with H&H, including its continued funding support, the pledge of H&H's health care reimbursement revenues, and local support of the entity as a major service provider to its Medicaid population and medically underserved areas, we rate the bonds two notches below the city's general creditworthiness.

The rating on the series 2011 liberty revenue bonds is one notch below the lower of our ratings on the city's appropriation pledge and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) per our multiple revenue streams criteria. We base our rating on the weaker of the two pledges from the PANYNJ and New York City, the latter of which leases space at 4 World Trade Center and is responsible for a portion of debt service unless it does not renew its operating lease at pre-determined termination dates. Based on the application of our "Issue Credit Ratings Linked To U.S. Public Finance Obligors' Creditworthiness" criteria, published Jan. 22, 2018, we notch one below the city GO rating (AA/Stable) due to the renewal risks associated with the operating lease. In our view, the lease terms and features are non-standard; however, we believe there remains a strong relationship between the city and the project financed by the bonds, based on the city's recognition of the project's significance in the economic redevelopment of downtown Manhattan. We also view the obligation as having strong political and administrative support evidenced by the city's centralized management of its leases and strong history of honoring its obligations. The intended payment source is also strong, in our view, as the lease payments are made from the city's general fund. We view the PANYNJ's source of payments, revenue left in the consolidated bond reserve fund after paying debt service on consolidated bonds, payment into the general reserve fund, and other funding requirements as being one notch below the 'AA-' rating on the consolidated bonds, which is consistent with our approach under our "Assigning Issue Credit Ratings Of Operating Entities" criteria, May 20, 2015. Therefore, we rate the bonds 'A+', the lower of the two ratings. According to our criteria, if either the consolidated bond or GO bond ratings were to change, the rating on the 2011 bonds will remain one notch below the lower of the two ratings.

Finally, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its ratings on the city's various issuances where the short-term ratings are based on the liquidity support provided by various financial institutions. The outlook on the 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);
- Very strong management, with strong financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment (FMA) methodology;
- Strong budgetary performance, with balanced operating results in the general fund but a slight operating deficit, associated with capital spending, at the total governmental fund level in fiscal 2017;
- Strong budgetary flexibility, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2017 of 10.6% of operating expenditures;
- Very strong liquidity, with total government available cash at 12.5% of total governmental fund expenditures and 1.4x governmental debt service, and access to external liquidity we consider exceptional;
- Very weak debt and contingent liability profile, with debt service carrying charges at 9.1% of expenditures and net direct debt that is 87.7% of total governmental fund revenue, as well as a large pension and other postemployment benefit (OPEB) obligation and the lack of a plan to sufficiently address the OPEB; and
- Very strong institutional framework score.

Strong economy

We consider New York's economy strong. The city, with an estimated population of 8.6 million, contains the Bronx, Kings, Queens, Richmond, and New York counties, and is the central city for the New York-Newark-Jersey City MSA, which we consider to be broad and diverse. The city has a projected per capita effective buying income of 106.1% of the national level and per capita market value of $134,947. Overall, the city's market value grew by 12.4% over the past year to $1.2 trillion in 2018. The city projects employment growth to slow to about 1% by 2022, with wage growth remaining close to 3% through the financial plan.

The city's economy remains solid, serving as the engine for the Mid-Atlantic region. Its major employment sectors are trade, financial services, professional services, education, health care, and government. Despite recent economic diversification, there is still a higher-than-average reliance on the financial sector; in 2016, the financial activities and professional and business services sectors accounted for about 27% of employment, while the earnings share was approximately 45%. In the nation, these same service-producing sectors accounted for only about 20% of employment and 26% of earnings in 2016. As of June 2018, the unemployment rate in the city was 4.3%, compared with 4.6% in June 2017, based on data from the New York State Department of Labor. New York City's average annual unemployment rate fell to 4.3% in fiscal 2018, the lowest on record, and the city expects this downward trend to continue.

The city's adopted budget and accompanying financial plan do not reflect the potential economic effects of the recently enacted Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA). We believe there may be some effect on the region from these changes; however, economic and demographic shifts will likely remain gradual. We expect the city's strong management team will adjust to these potential effects should they occur over the long term. New York City receives significant funding from the federal government and the TCJA and other federal actions, including recent action on tariffs, could affect the state budget and economy, which in turn could affect the city.

Very strong management

We view the city's management as very strong, with strong financial policies and practices under our FMA methodology, indicating financial practices are strong and well embedded with a history of successful monitoring and oversight since the Financial Emergency Act. Additional monitoring and oversight of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) projections are provided by the City Comptroller, Independent Budget Office, the New York State Comptroller, and the Financial Control Board, as well as privately funded fiscal watchdogs.

New York City prepares its budget and four-year financial plan with what we view as conservative revenue and expenditure projections that are based on historical data and incorporate information from outside resources, including private economists and economic forecasting services. The financial plan is updated in November, January, April, and upon adoption in June. Monthly financial plan statements and cash flows identify major variances from the financial plan.

The city publicly reports on cash balances and investments at least quarterly and has a formal investment policy. Its three-tiered capital planning process is comprehensive and regularly updated with funding sources identified, and its ability to issue debt is limited by both the Financial Emergency Act and the New York State Constitution.

Finally, we note the city is particularly engaged with international and national risks to its economic and financial position, given its role as an international center of business, and as such consistently reviews its exposure to cybersecurity risks, climate change risks, and state and federal regulatory risks, and incorporates these concerns into its management and planning.

Strong budgetary performance

New York City's budgetary performance is strong in our opinion. The city's budgetary performance reflects our adjustments to account for recurring transfers out of the general fund, notably transfers into the GO and nonmajor debt service funds. In addition, we adjust total governmental expenditures for reimbursements to the city for GO and Transitional Finance Authority (TFA) capital expenditures. Following these adjustments, New York City had balanced operating results in the general fund, but a slight deficit result across all governmental funds of 1.0% in fiscal 2017, related to a slight deficit in the capital projects fund. General fund operating results have been stable over the past three years. The city derives its revenue stream largely locally; it projects local "city funds" revenue (including real estate-based taxes, personal income and sales tax receipts, user charges, and miscellaneous revenues) will provide about 73% of total revenues in fiscal 2018, with state aid at 17% and federal funds at 10%. New York City projects $89.6 billion in expenses and revenues for fiscal 2018, which we believe supports increased near-term flexibility by including a set-aside of $4.6 billion in the budget stabilization reserve. We expect fringe benefits ($10 billion) to make up a larger share of expenses than pensions ($9.63 billion) in fiscal 2018, a trend we expect to continue.

The city adopted its fiscal 2019 budget on June 14, 2018. Overall, the adopted budget continues the city's recent trend of adding to reserves against a backdrop of favorable economic trends and ongoing expenditure growth driven by fixed costs and city agency spending, particularly for education and homeless services. Uncertainty remains over continued downshifting of costs from New York State, the medium-term effects of federal tax reform, and federal policy shifts for social services and health care. Budget gaps in the out years, inclusive of $1.375 billion in rolling reserves in fiscal 2019 ($1.25 billion for fiscal 2020 and out-years), as a share of budget are lower than the historical trend, though they are likely to tick up in response to recent contract settlements. Assumptions driving the gaps include healthy increases in property values and a 1% increase in the labor reserve set-aside, the latter of which remains a risk to the financial plan, requiring offsets through negotiated fringe benefit savings to realize current personnel service spending projections. We believe that New York City's historically strong and proactive management will remain an important component of balancing operations as it implements its fiscal 2019 budget. (For further discussion of fiscal 2019, see "New York City Turns Inward With 2019 Budget," published June 25, 2018, on RatingsDirect.)

Our view of the city's budgetary performance and potential widening of out-year gaps in the near term is informed by its most recent labor agreement with its largest collective bargaining unit, District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (DC-37), which makes up about a quarter of the workforce. The tentative settlement runs through May 25, 2021, with a 2% retroactive increase to Sept. 26, 2017, 2.25% effective Sept. 26, 2018, and 3% effective Oct. 26, 2019. The agreement, which covers about a quarter of the city's workforce, is the first major collective bargaining agreement extended through fiscal 2019 and may provide a pattern for future settlements. If the pattern were to hold across all bargaining units, the gross cost in fiscal 2022 would be $3.4 billion, offset by $2.1 billion from the city's 1% labor reserve and health care savings contractually enforceable through arbitration, for a net cost of $1.3 billion, or about 1.3% of total revenues forecast. The most recent version of the adopted financial plan does not include the projected costs from the settlement or updated salary and wage expectations; however, we believe potential increases in out-year gaps remain manageable, given the city's conservative revenue projections and strong management oversight and controls.

We believe the plan reflects New York City's generally cautious approach for financial projections. Out-year gaps are manageable, even with the new contract, when compared to the city's financial plan gaps over the past 20 years. The financial plan projects gaps of $2.0 billion or less for 2020 through 2022, net of capital-stabilization and general reserves, and an increase to salaries and wages following the DC-37 pattern would increase the gap to about 3.4% of revenues in 2022. Out-year financials rely on increasing property tax values and conservative income and sales tax increases. We also believe debt service costs are conservative based on the city's interest rate assumptions.

Other risks to the city's financial plan include support for H&H, which faces continued uncertainty from potential federal health care changes. The inclusion of funds for the Metropolitan Transportation Authority Subway Action Plan also highlights reliability concerns regarding New York City's transit infrastructure. Other areas of risk include increased spending associated with the recent passage of "Raise the Age" legislation and pupil tuition rates for charter schools. Finally, the financial plan does not reflect potential effects of New York State's response to the recently enacted TCJA, which the city continues to monitor in considering the effects on its revenue base.

Similar risks exist to continued support for the New York City Housing Authority and the agency's upgrade and remediation efforts. However, the city recently agreed to terms with the federal government to address a consent decree involving the New York City Housing Authority. The order, which is not final until accepted by the federal court, requires a minimum investment of $1.2 billion, with a potential investment of $2.2 billion over 10 years should the decree remain in place. The adopted budget includes the first investment of $1 billion over four years. Following the initial $1 billion, the city is required to provide $200 million in annual capital improvements until the order is considered "fulfilled." We believe the capital investment will likely augment the city's capital plan, particularly given the soft "fulfillment" end date. In light of the federal order, the state suspended its requirement for a separate emergency manager, which we view favorably. Other fiscal obligations related to the order may arise and remain unclear, but the city's recurring support for the housing authority has grown in recent years.

Strong budgetary flexibility

New York City's budgetary flexibility is strong, in our view, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2017 of 10.6% of operating expenditures, or $8.8 billion. We anticipate this figure will improve to more than $9.3 billion by the end of fiscal 2018, as a result of a nearly $400 million year-over-year increase in prepayments and a $100 million discretionary deposit into the city's retiree health benefit trust.

The Financial Emergency Act limits the 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, New York 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, and adjust our reserve calculation accordingly. The city also funds a discretionary reserve for retirees' health insurance costs, and we view this amount as available for operations, if necessary, based on historical use of these funds in previous years. Combined, the fiscal 2017 unrestricted budget stabilization contribution and prepayments ($4.18 billion) and the reserve for retirees' health insurance costs ($4.65 billion, which includes a $400 million prepayment) represented 10.6% of adjusted general fund expenditures.

Very strong liquidity

In our opinion, New York's liquidity is very strong, with total government available cash at 12.5% of total governmental fund expenditures and 1.4x governmental debt service in 2017; this includes unrestricted U.S. government securities and agencies due within a year. In our view, the city has exceptional access to external liquidity if necessary, based on the frequency and variety of issuance the city engages in.

The average cash balance for fiscal 2017 stood at $9.51 billion, which we consider high. Furthermore, the city has a cash forecasting system that predicts its daily cash balances. The last quarterly cash report issued by the city comptroller notes the ending third-quarter balance (March 31, 2018) was $9.953 billion. The city has not issued short-term obligations to finance projected cash flow needs since fiscal 2004. In addition, it regularly reviews its cash position and the need for short-term borrowing. The financial plan does not reflect expected issuance of short-term obligations.

The city's net direct debt includes about 12% of variable-rate debt, including state-supported debt, much of which is issued by the TFA. We believe the city's debt management team proactively manages this portion of the portfolio to alleviate interest rate and counterparty risk. As of June 30, 2018, New York City's total notional amount of interest rate exchange agreements was $1.18 billion, with a total marked-to-market value of negative $58.7 million. In addition, DASNY entered into interest rate agreement for the city's court facilities revenue bonds series 2005A and B with a notional amount of $125.5 million, with a marked to market value of negative $20.8 million. The city's largest counterparty is JPMorgan Chase Bank followed by Wells Fargo. We do not view this as a significant liquidity risk and note that there are no restrictive covenants in the interest rate exchange agreements.

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 9.1% of total governmental fund expenditures, and net direct debt is 87.7% of total governmental fund revenue. Our calculation of debt service includes $1.08 billion in lease payments, $576 million in state aid-supported Building Aid Revenue Bond (BARB) debt service, and $170 million in state aid-supported Sales Tax Asset Receivable Corp. (STARC) debt service. We consider BARB and STARC bonds to be state-supported and secured by state building aid payable to the city and state sales tax revenues from New York Local Assistance Corporation, respectively; therefore, we exclude these amounts from our net direct debt calculation.

New York City functions as a combined city, county, and school district, which results in a relatively larger debt profile when compared with that of other large cities. Because of this unique profile, overlapping debt is limited to debt outstanding associated with the Hudson Yards Infrastructure Corp. The city's financing program projects an estimated $14.64 billion of GO and TFA bonds to be issued in fiscal years 2019 and 2020; with more than half this amount amortized over the same period. About $825 million of New York City's GO debt and $893 million of TFA debt is in private placements with a number of financial institutions; however, we believe there are no risks of acceleration associated with provisions or restrictive covenants in the loan documents.

In our opinion, a credit weakness is the city's large pension and OPEB obligation, and the lack of a plan we think will sufficiently address the OPEB liability. The combined required pension and actual OPEB contributions totaled 14.8% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2017. Of that amount, 11.3% represented required contributions to pension obligations, and 3.5% represented OPEB payments, which includes the $400 million prepayment; however, excluding the OPEB prepayment, the total is 3.0%. New York City made its full annual required pension contribution in 2017. The funded ratio of the largest pension plan is 68.3%.

New York City has been paying its full legally required pension contribution, defined to be the actuarially determined contribution with a one-year lag, for many years and plans to continue doing so. In addition, the unfunded liability will be paid off by 2034 if all actuarial assumptions are met. The actuarial assumptions used in calculating the pension and OPEB contribution recommendations appear to be up-to-date and conservative. While adverse experience is always possible, we do not expect any large increases to the actuarial recommendation in the near future.

The city's primary pension funds are New York City Employees' Retirement System, 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. Collectively, the plans have a $195.2 billion pension liability (71.2% funded), while the TRS has the largest single liability at $71.6 billion (68.3% funded). Preliminary figures from the New York City Comptroller's Office estimate the rate of return across the city's pension systems was 8.7% in fiscal 2018.

New York City implemented GASB Statements No. 74, 75, 80, and 82 for fiscal year-end 2017. The adoption resulted in a restatement of the city's fiscal 2016 governmentwide financial statements to reflect a $4.7 billion increase to the net OPEB liability (NOL). In addition, the single discount rate increased, fueled by the S&P Municipal Bond 20-year High Grade Rate Index. This resulted in a $9.0 billion decrease in the NOL for fiscal year-end 2017; participation assumption changes accounted for the remaining $1.9 billion decrease. Combined with other changes, this resulted in a net decrease to the NOL of $6.1 billion at fiscal year-end 2017. As of June 30, 2017, the NOL stood at $88.4 billion.

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 New York City's very weak debt and contingent liability profile--will be stable during the two-year outlook horizon.

Upside scenario

If the city addresses needed infrastructure improvements without unduly increasing the debt profile, coupled with maintenance of strong economic conditions supporting healthy revenues keeping pace with expenditures, we could raise the rating. However, given the high debt position and weak contingent liability profile, this is unlikely to happen over the two-year outlook horizon.

Downside scenario

In our view, New York City's projected budget gaps in fiscal years 2020-2022 are manageable relative to historical amounts if favorable economic conditions continue. However, should economic conditions significantly deteriorate, we believe the city could face difficulties 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, leading to a lower rating.

Related Criteria And Research

- S&P Public Finance Local GO Criteria: How We Adjust Data For Analytic Consistency, Sept. 12, 2013
- Alternative Financing: Disclosure Is Critical To Credit Analysis In Public Finance, Feb. 18, 2014
- Incorporating GASB 67 And 68: Evaluating Pension/OPEB Obligations Under Standard & Poor's U.S. Local Government GO Criteria, Sept. 2, 2015
- Local Government Pension And Other Postemployment Benefits Analysis: A Closer Look, Nov.8, 2017
- 2017 Update Of Institutional Framework For U.S. Local Governments

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018)		
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

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds fiscal (Adj Rte Bnds) ser 2018B-5 due 10/01/2046		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds fiscal (Tax-exempt) 2018 ser E-1 due 03/01/2045		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds fiscal 2005 ser M dtd 04/28/2005 due 04/01/2007-2026 2030 2035		
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	Affirmed
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 (Adjusted Rate Bnds) ser 2018 E-5 dtd 03/13/2018 due 03/01/2048		
Long Term Rating	AAA/A-1+	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO bnds fisal rmkt 10/17/2017 ser 2012D-3A due 10/01/2039		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1+/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-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO fiscal (Taxable Bnds) 2018 ser E-2 due 03/01/2028		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO fiscal (Taxable Bnds) 2018 ser E-3 due 03/15/2030		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO rmktd to index rate FRN bnds		
Long Term Rating	AA/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
New York City GO var adj rate bnds Fiscal 2017 ser A-5 due 08/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO var adj rate bnds Fiscal 2017 ser A-4 due 08/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO var adj rate bnds Fiscal 2017 ser A-6 due 08/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO var adj rate bnds Fiscal 2017 ser A-7 due 08/01/2044		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-2	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/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-1/Stable	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	NR(SPUR)	
New York City GO Bnds fiscal (Adj Rte Bnds) ser 2018 B-4 due 10/01/2046		
Long Term Rating	AA/A-1/Stable	Affirmed
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 (ASSURED GTY) (SEC MKT)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
New York City GO (BAM) (SEC MKT)		
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/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

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
New York City GO		
Long Term Rating	AA+/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-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
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/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

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
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
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	AA+/A-1	Affirmed
Unenhanced Rating	AA(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)

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 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		
Dorm Auth of the St of New York (New York City) lse rev bnds (City of New York) (Mun Hlth Fac Imp Prog) ser 2018-1 due 01/15/2032		
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Affirmed
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

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
New York St Dorm Auth (NYC) (Mun Hlth Fac Imp Prog)		
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
New York Liberty Development Corporation, New York		
4 World Trade Center LLC, Delaware		
New York Lib Dev Corp (4 World Trade Ctr)		

Ratings Detail (As Of August 3, 2018) (cont.)		
Unenhanced Rating	A+(SPUR)/Stable	Affirmed
Long Term Rating	A+/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.capitaliq.com. All ratings affected by this rating action can be found on S&P Global Ratings' public website at www.standardandpoors.com. Use the Ratings search box located in the left column.