

# RatingsDirect®

---

## Summary:

# Brady, Texas; General Obligation

### **Primary Credit Analyst:**

Alexander P Rawlings, Dallas (1) 214-765-5862; alexander.rawlings@standardandpoors.com

### **Secondary Contact:**

Jim Tchou, New York (1) 212-438-3821; jim.tchou@standardandpoors.com

## Table Of Contents

---

Rationale

Outlook

Related Criteria And Research

## Summary:

# Brady, Texas; General Obligation

### Credit Profile

#### Brady

*Unenhanced Rating*

AA-(SPUR)/Stable

Upgraded

Many issues are enhanced by bond insurance.

## Rationale

Standard & Poor's Ratings Services raised its underlying rating (SPUR) on Brady, Texas' series 2012 general obligation (GO) refunding bonds to 'AA-' from 'A+'. The outlook is stable.

The upgrade is based on the city's improving credit conditions. These include Brady's very strong debt profile, with all of its GO debt fully supported by the enterprise funds, strong budgetary performance, and the ongoing maintenance of very strong financial reserves.

The city's ad valorem tax pledge secures the bonds.

The city can assess, levy, and collect continuing, direct ad valorem tax on all taxable property. This tax is sufficient to provide for the payment of, principal of, and interest on all ad valorem tax debt, within the limit prescribed by law. Article XI, Section 5 of the Texas Constitution is applicable to the city and limits the maximum ad valorem tax rate of the city to \$2.50 per \$100 taxable assessed valuation (AV) for all city purposes; however, the Texas Attorney General has adopted an administrative policy that prohibits municipalities such as Brady from issuing debt if debt issuance produces debt service requirements exceeding what the city can pay from \$1.50 of the foregoing \$2.50 maximum tax rate, as calculated at the time of issuance. The city currently levies a total ad valorem tax of 30 cents per \$100 of AV.

The 'AA-' rating reflects our assessment of the city's:

- Very weak economy, with market value per capita of \$40,818 and projected per capita effective buying income at 84.6% of the national level;
- Adequate management, with "standard" financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment methodology;
- Strong budgetary performance, with an operating surplus in the general fund and balanced operating results at the total governmental fund level;
- Very strong budgetary flexibility, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2014 of 26% of operating expenditures;
- Very strong liquidity, with total government available cash of 1.9x total governmental fund expenditures and 30.6x governmental debt service, and access to external liquidity we consider strong;
- Very strong debt and contingent liability profile, with no net direct debt but debt service carrying charges of 6.1% of expenditures and rapid amortization with 79.9% of debt scheduled to be retired in 10 years; and
- Strong institutional framework score.

### **Very weak economy**

We consider Brady's economy very weak. The city, with an estimated population of 5,500, is located in McCulloch County. The city has a projected per capita effective buying income of 84.6% of the national level and per capita market value of \$40,818. Overall, the city's market value grew by 7.0% over the past year to \$224.5 million in 2015. The county unemployment rate was 4.3% in 2014.

The city is about 135 miles northwest of Austin, and it is the surrounding area's principal commercial center. The principal economic drivers include wool and mohair processing, sand mining, furniture and appliance manufacturing, oil field equipment, ranching, and tourism.

### **Adequate management**

We view the city's management as adequate, with "standard" financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment methodology, indicating the finance department maintains adequate policies in some but not all key areas.

Key practices include monthly budget updates to the city council with formal amendments performed as needed, a formalized investment policy that follow state guidelines with monthly reports on holdings and performance to the council, revenue and expenditure assumptions based on a minimum three years of historical data, a formalized reserve policy of maintaining a minimum two months' operating expenditures, and a five-year capital improvement plan with funding identified for some of the out-year projects. The city currently lacks formal long-term financial and debt management policies.

### **Strong budgetary performance**

Brady's budgetary performance is strong in our opinion. The city had surplus operating results in the general fund of 2.1% of expenditures, and balanced results across all governmental funds of 0.3% in fiscal 2014.

For fiscal 2015, management has indicated that it expects balanced operations on the year and does not anticipate any unusually large outlays. As such, we anticipate that the city's budgetary performance will remain at a level we consider to be strong within the near term.

### **Very strong budgetary flexibility**

Brady's budgetary flexibility is very strong, in our view, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2014 of 26% of operating expenditures, or \$1.5 million.

Management's estimates indicate that the city will end fiscal 2015 with an available general fund balance of \$1.5 million. This equals 21.8% of 2015's budgeted general fund expenditure, which we consider very strong. Although this would represent a 4% loss in reserves relative to expenditures, we believe that Brady's assumptions are likely conservative and anticipate that the reserve level for fiscal 2015 will be in compliance with the city's 25% reserve policy and could continue the fund balance's growth trend of 14.8% in fiscal 2012.

### **Very strong liquidity**

In our opinion, Brady's liquidity is very strong, with total government available cash of 1.9x total governmental fund expenditures and 30.6x governmental debt service in 2014. In our view, the city has strong access to external liquidity if necessary.

Our belief that the city has strong access to external liquidity is based on Brady's historical issuance of GO debt. We also view the city's investments as conservative, consisting entirely of short-term certificates of deposit.

### **Very strong debt and contingent liability profile**

In our view, Brady's debt and contingent liability profile is very strong. Brady does not have any net direct debt outstanding, but total governmental fund debt service is 6.1% of total governmental fund expenditures. Approximately 79.9% of the direct debt is scheduled to be repaid within 10 years, which is in our view a positive credit factor.

The utility fund supports all of the city's GO debt and, therefore, the city does not levy property tax for debt-service purposes. We expect that this will continue for the foreseeable future, given the current strength of the coverage. City officials have indicated that they plan on issuing GO debt for water-related projects within the next 24 months; however, we anticipate that this debt will also be fully supported by the utility funds.

Brady's combined pension and other postemployment benefits (OPEB) contributions totaled 5.2% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2014. The city made its full annual required pension contribution in 2014.

The city provides pension benefits for all of its eligible employees through a non-traditional, joint contributory, hybrid defined benefit plan in the statewide Texas Municipal Retirement System (TMRS), a multiple-employer public employee retirement system. Brady also participates in the cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit group-term life insurance plan operated by TMRS, known as the Supplemental Death Benefits Fund.

### **Strong institutional framework**

The institutional framework score for Texas municipalities is strong.

## **Outlook**

The stable outlook reflects our expectation that Brady will maintain its strong financial performance while the local economy remains a limiting factor within the medium term. Although a substantial expansion of the economy, particularly the wealth levels as measured by market value per capita, could lead to a higher rating, we don't view this as likely within the next two years. Conversely, substantial deterioration in the city's budgetary performance that leads to degradation in the financial reserves would likely cause a downgrade. We also view this as unlikely within the two-year outlook horizon and don't anticipate a rating change within that timeframe.

## **Related Criteria And Research**

### **Related Criteria**

- USPF Criteria: Local Government GO Ratings Methodology And Assumptions, Sept. 12, 2013
- USPF Criteria: Financial Management Assessment, June 27, 2006
- USPF Criteria: Debt Statement Analysis, Aug. 22, 2006
- USPF Criteria: Limited-Tax GO Debt, Jan. 10, 2002
- USPF Criteria: Assigning Issue Credit Ratings Of Operating Entities, May 20, 2015
- Criteria: Use of CreditWatch And Outlooks, Sept. 14, 2009

**Related Research**

- S&P Public Finance Local GO Criteria: How We Adjust Data For Analytic Consistency, Sept. 12, 2013
- Institutional Framework Overview: Texas Local Governments

Complete ratings information is available to subscribers of RatingsDirect at [www.globalcreditportal.com](http://www.globalcreditportal.com). All ratings affected by this rating action can be found on Standard & Poor's public Web site at [www.standardandpoors.com](http://www.standardandpoors.com). Use the Ratings search box located in the left column.

Copyright © 2015 Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC, a part of McGraw Hill Financial. All rights reserved.

No content (including ratings, credit-related analyses and data, valuations, model, software or other application or output therefrom) or any part thereof (Content) may be modified, reverse engineered, reproduced or distributed in any form by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC or its affiliates (collectively, S&P). The Content shall not be used for any unlawful or unauthorized purposes. S&P and any third-party providers, as well as their directors, officers, shareholders, employees or agents (collectively S&P Parties) do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, timeliness or availability of the Content. S&P Parties are not responsible for any errors or omissions (negligent or otherwise), regardless of the cause, for the results obtained from the use of the Content, or for the security or maintenance of any data input by the user. The Content is provided on an "as is" basis. S&P PARTIES DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR USE, FREEDOM FROM BUGS, SOFTWARE ERRORS OR DEFECTS, THAT THE CONTENT'S FUNCTIONING WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED, OR THAT THE CONTENT WILL OPERATE WITH ANY SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE CONFIGURATION. In no event shall S&P Parties be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental, exemplary, compensatory, punitive, special or consequential damages, costs, expenses, legal fees, or losses (including, without limitation, lost income or lost profits and opportunity costs or losses caused by negligence) in connection with any use of the Content even if advised of the possibility of such damages.

Credit-related and other analyses, including ratings, and statements in the Content are statements of opinion as of the date they are expressed and not statements of fact. S&P's opinions, analyses, and rating acknowledgment decisions (described below) are not recommendations to purchase, hold, or sell any securities or to make any investment decisions, and do not address the suitability of any security. S&P assumes no obligation to update the Content following publication in any form or format. The Content should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. S&P does not act as a fiduciary or an investment advisor except where registered as such. While S&P has obtained information from sources it believes to be reliable, S&P does not perform an audit and undertakes no duty of due diligence or independent verification of any information it receives.

To the extent that regulatory authorities allow a rating agency to acknowledge in one jurisdiction a rating issued in another jurisdiction for certain regulatory purposes, S&P reserves the right to assign, withdraw, or suspend such acknowledgement at any time and in its sole discretion. S&P Parties disclaim any duty whatsoever arising out of the assignment, withdrawal, or suspension of an acknowledgment as well as any liability for any damage alleged to have been suffered on account thereof.

S&P keeps certain activities of its business units separate from each other in order to preserve the independence and objectivity of their respective activities. As a result, certain business units of S&P may have information that is not available to other S&P business units. S&P has established policies and procedures to maintain the confidentiality of certain nonpublic information received in connection with each analytical process.

S&P may receive compensation for its ratings and certain analyses, normally from issuers or underwriters of securities or from obligors. S&P reserves the right to disseminate its opinions and analyses. S&P's public ratings and analyses are made available on its Web sites, [www.standardandpoors.com](http://www.standardandpoors.com) (free of charge), and [www.ratingsdirect.com](http://www.ratingsdirect.com) and [www.globalcreditportal.com](http://www.globalcreditportal.com) (subscription) and [www.spcapitaliq.com](http://www.spcapitaliq.com) (subscription) and may be distributed through other means, including via S&P publications and third-party redistributors. Additional information about our ratings fees is available at [www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees](http://www.standardandpoors.com/usratingsfees).