

# **RatingsDirect**<sup>®</sup>

### Summary:

# Kyle, Texas; General Obligation

Primary Credit Analyst: Omar M Tabani, Dallas (1) 214-871-1472; omar.tabani@standardandpoors.com

Secondary Contact: Edward R McGlade, New York (1) 212-438-2061; edward.mcglade@standardandpoors.com

# **Table Of Contents**

Rationale

Outlook

Related Criteria And Research

# Summary: Kyle, Texas; General Obligation

Credit Profile			
US\$1.86 mil tax nts ser 2014 dtd 04/16/2014 due 02/15/2021			
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	New	
Kyle GO			
Long Term Rating	AA-/Stable	Upgraded	

## Rationale

Standard & Poor's Ratings Services raised its long-term rating and underlying rating (SPUR) on Kyle, Texas' general obligation (GO) debt one notch to 'AA-' from 'A+' based on Standard & Poor's local GO criteria, published Sept. 12, 2013, on RatingsDirect. The outlook is stable.

In addition, Standard & Poor's assigned its 'AA-' long-term rating and stable outlook to the city's series 2014 tax notes.

An ad valorem tax, levied within the limits prescribed by law, on all taxable property within the city secures the series 2014 tax notes. Officials intend to use note proceeds to fund police department and public works improvement projects.

The rating reflects our opinion of the following factors for the city, including its:

- Adequate economy,
- Very strong budgetary flexibility,
- Adequate budgetary performance,
- Very strong liquidity,
- Strong management conditions,
- Very weak debt and contingent liabilities, and
- Strong Institutional Framework.

#### Adequate economy

Kyle, with a population estimate of 34,000, is in Hays County, roughly 20 miles south of Austin along Interstate 35. Despite its access to Austin and subsequent economic growth, we consider the economy adequate due to below-average income and wealth. Per capita effective buying income equals 88% of the national level. Market value equals \$52,385 per capita. County unemployment equaled 5.2% in August 2013.

Kyle's location and affordability compared to the greater Austin-Round Rock metropolitan statistical area (MSA) have resulted in healthy commercial and residential development in the city. Therefore, taxable assessed value (AV) has increased by 23% over the past five fiscal years to \$1.55 billion in fiscal 2014. Citywide sales tax collections increased by 54% since fiscal 2009 to \$4.01 million in fiscal 2013. City officials expect recent sales tax trends to continue due to ongoing commercial and residential development.

#### Very strong budgetary flexibility

In our opinion, budgetary flexibility is very strong. After consecutive years of general fund operating surpluses, the fiscal year-end 2012 general fund balance of \$4.5 million equaled 39% of expenditures. Unaudited fiscal 2013 results indicate a \$6.04 million fiscal year-end general fund balance, or 46% of expenditures.

#### Adequate budgetary performance

Despite recent general fund surpluses, we consider budgetary performance adequate due to total governmental funds results. Kyle reported a 14% general fund operating surplus and a 2.8% total governmental funds deficit, net of transfers and nonrecurring expenses, in fiscal 2012. Unaudited fiscal 2013 results indicate a 12% general fund surplus. The fiscal 2014 adopted budget reflects a very minor increase to fiscal year-end general fund balance. Management, however, expects that favorable budget variance could result in a fiscal year-end general fund balance increase of \$500,000-\$800,000 compared with previous-year results.

#### Very strong liquidity

What we consider very strong liquidity supports Kyle's finances with total government available cash, net of restricted cash and unspent bond proceeds, equal to roughly 50% of expenditures and 185% of annual debt service. We believe Kyle has, what we consider, strong access to external liquidity, indicated by its frequent GO debt issuances over the past decade.

#### Strong management conditions

We view Kyle's management conditions as strong due, in large part, to a Financial Management Assessment methodology of "good" under our methodology, indicating financial practices exist in most areas but that governance officials might not formalize or regularly monitor all of them. Key practices include management's:

- Formal policy of maintaining 90 days' expenditures in the general fund, which it is currently exceeding;
- Formal debt management policy;
- Long-range capital planning; and
- Quarterly financial updates to elected officials.

#### Very weak debt and contingent liabilities profile

In our opinion, Kyle's debt and contingent liabilities profile is very weak. Fiscal 2012 debt service carrying charges equaled 27% of total governmental funds expenditures, and net direct debt equaled roughly 350% of fiscal 2013 total governmental fund revenue. Including all overlapping entities, overall debt equals more than 10% of fiscal 2014 AV. We understand officials will likely issue the remainder of the \$30.48 million GO bond authorization for streets in periodic installments over the next six to eight years.

Kyle provides pension benefits to eligible employees through the Texas Municipal Retirement System, a multiemployer, defined-benefit pension plan. It has made the annual required contribution (ARC) over the past several years; the ARC equaled \$533,000 in fiscal 2012. As of the most recent actuarial valuation, the pension plan was 83% funded. Kyle also provides other postemployment benefits (OPEB) for retirees; it has made the ARC to both OPEB plans over the past several fiscal years, which equaled roughly \$88,000 in fiscal 2012. The combined fiscal 2012 pension and OPEB contribution was roughly 3% of total governmental fund expenditures.

#### Strong Institutional Framework

We consider the Institutional Framework score for Texas cities strong.

### Outlook

The stable outlook reflects Standard & Poor's opinion that Kyle will likely continue to benefit from its access to the Austin-Round Rock MSA, allowing for continued tax revenue growth. The outlook also reflects our opinion that Kyle will likely maintain, what we consider, its strong financial profile but that its debt profile will likely remain very weak due to ongoing growth-related capital pressure. While we do not expect it to occur within the two-year outlook period, we could raise the rating if continued economic growth and diversification were to result in improved wealth and income. Conversely, we could lower the rating if the city's finances were to deteriorate.

# **Related Criteria And Research**

#### **Related Criteria**

USPF Criteria: Local Government GO Ratings Methodology And Assumptions, Sept. 12, 2013

#### **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

Ratings Detail (As Of March 11, 2014)		
Kyle GO (AGM)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Upgraded
Kyle GO (ASSURED GTY)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Upgraded
Kyle GO (BAM)		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Upgraded
Kyle GO		
Unenhanced Rating	AA-(SPUR)/Stable	Upgraded
Many issues are enhanced by bond insurance.		

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

Copyright © 2014 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 (free of charge), and www.ratingsdirect.com and www.globalcreditportal.com (subscription) and 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.