Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

Fitch Disagrees with Moody's Legal Analysis on Chicago Public Schools.

Fitch Ratings-New York-01 February 2017: Moody's Investor Services (Moody's) has issued a report discussing:

–Legal options available to the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to address its operating deficit, suggesting CPS can divert state aid to support operations to get around a restriction on a certain tax levy; and
–Bondholder protections provided by CPS' dedicated capital improvement tax bonds series 2016 (CIT bonds), minimizing the special revenue status while crediting a 'lock box' device as a real enhancement.

Fitch Ratings disagrees with Moody's on both points.

State Aid Not Available for Budget Relief

Moody's report "Chicago Public Schools, IL Frequently Asked Questions", released on Jan. 12, states "the district could elect to use unrestricted [general state aid] GSA for operations instead of debt service" on alternate bonds issued under the Illinois Local Government Debt Reform Act (the Act). Unless by 'elect' Moody's is referring to a successful ballot referendum, a plain reading of the Act indicates this is not the case. Section 15(e) of the Act clearly indicates that CPS must apply available alternate revenues {state aid} to debt service. As there is no option in the law to apply alternate revenues to operations, Fitch believes any attempt to do it would draw a successful challenge in litigation opposing an attempt to levy taxes while alternate revenues were available for debt service.

The law (Section 15(e)) is pretty clear in our opinion, as it states: "[t]he …revenue source ..shall be in fact pledged to the payment of the alternate bonds; and the governing body shall covenant, to the extent it is empowered to do so, to provide for, collect AND APPLY [emphasis added] such …revenue source …to the payment of the alternate bonds." It further states "The pledge …as provided in this Section for alternate bonds, shall constitute a continuing obligation of the governmental unit … and a continuing appropriation of the amounts received. All covenants relating to alternate bonds and the conditions and obligations imposed by this Section are enforceable by any bondholder of alternate bonds affected, any taxpayer of the governmental unit, and the People of the State of Illinois acting through the Attorney General … The intent is that such revenue source, shall be …applied to the payment of debt service on such alternate bonds so that taxes need not be levied, or if levied need not be extended, for such payment."

Alternate Bonds Not Same as Other ULTGOs

Fitch believes this constraint on extending property taxes absent a referendum is consistent with the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL), which limits growth in the property tax extension to the lesser of 5% or CPI in the prior calendar year unless the increase is approved by voters. Debt service is limited to the "debt service extension base", which is based on the 1994 property tax extension for debt service, increased annually at the lesser of 5% or CPI, unless approved by voters.

The Act exempts alternate bonds from this limitation. If an entity could readily opt to extend the property tax instead of paying debt service from the identified revenue source (GSA, in this case) despite the availability of the alternate source, the PTELL's constraint on the rate of property tax growth for debt service would be ineffective. Fitch believes that the only way CPS could extend the ad valorem tax for debt service would be an insufficiency of pledged state aid revenues, which of course would create other serious financial challenges.

Lockbox Does Not Enhance Credit Quality

Unlike Moody's, Fitch does not give rating uplift for the presence of a third-party lockbox structure absent other legal considerations. A lock box is a simple security device that loses its effectiveness upon a bankruptcy filing as a consensual lien on revenues generally does not continue once bankruptcy begins. There are two exceptions: bonds secured by pledged special revenues and bonds secured by a statutory lien. In a Chapter 9 bankruptcy, Fitch does not believe such a structure would insulate ordinary pledged revenues from an automatic stay. Therefore bonds utilizing that structure but not secured by pledged 'special revenues' as defined under section 902(2) of the code or by a statutory lien on pledged revenues could not be rated above the Issuer Default Rating (IDR).

No Statutory Lien Under Bankruptcy Code

Fitch also does not agree that the CIT bonds are secured by a statutory lien, which is defined in Section 101(53) of the Code as a lien arising automatically, by force of statute, on specified circumstances or conditions. This lien is in contrast to a consensual lien (or security interest [defined in Section 101(51) of the Code]), in which a lien is created by agreement, where both parties to a financing agree to a certain security structure and document that agreement in an indenture or loan document. The Debt Reform Act does not provide a statutory lien for bondholders as defined in the bankruptcy code. It gives effect to a consensual lien without any further requirement for filing or notice and is a protection against other lien holders.

Bankruptcy Protection Arises from Special Revenue Designation

Fitch believes that the pledged CIT revenues would be considered 'pledged special revenues' in the event of a CPS bankruptcy. As Moody's points out, one of the differences between the alternate and CIT bond structures is that the former are "ultimately a general obligation of the district, which pledged its full faith and credit to their repayment." The CIT bonds are "payable from the CIT tax levies only." Fitch believes that this distinction is precisely the reason the CIT bonds can be considered to be secured by special revenues under 902(2)(E) of the code. As stated in Fitch's rating action commentary discussing our 'A' rating/Outlook Stable on the bonds: "Fitch sets a high bar for considering local government tax-supported debt to be secured by special revenues, which provide security that survives the filing of a municipal bankruptcy (in preservation of the lien) and benefit from relief from the automatic stay provision of the bankruptcy code. We give credit to special revenue status only if, in our view, the overall legal framework renders remote a successful challenge to the status of the debt as secured by special revenues under Section 902 (2)(E) of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

"Fitch has identified a number of elements we consider sufficient to reduce the incentive to challenge the special revenue status given the definitions outlined in the bankruptcy code. These include clear statutory restrictions on the use of pledged revenues to finance identified projects and clear separation from the entity's operations. Fitch has undertaken an extensive review of the statutory provisions that govern the use of the CIT. Those provisions, along with the legal documents governing the bond issuance, and related bankruptcy opinions provide sufficient strength for Fitch to rate the CIT bonds higher than the IDR.

“The bonds are secured by a first priority lien on CIT revenues. The board is authorized under the Illinois School Code to levy the CIT on all taxable property within the district, which is coterminous with the city of Chicago. State statute limits the permitted uses of CIT revenues to include construction, acquisition and equipping of school and administrative buildings, and site improvements. The board has identified specific capital projects in the bond resolution that may be funded either by bond proceeds or by residual CIT revenues. Any amendments to the project list must be passed by board resolution. The revenues legally cannot be used for general operations of the board.”

CIT Bonds Not Same as Detroit’s DSA Bonds

Revenue ownership is crucial. Moody’s likens the CIT bonds to Detroit’s distributable state aid (DSA) bonds, as in both cases the trustee receives the pledged revenues directly from a third party. However, Fitch views as a crucial distinction that the DSA revenues were not property of the city of Detroit, thus not included in the city’s bankruptcy estate. In the case of CPS, however, the CIT revenues are clearly property of the district. Were they not, Fitch’s rating would have been based on the credit quality of Cook County, which collects the revenues and remits them to the trustee. Fitch’s IDR on Cook County of ‘A’/Stable Outlook, does not cap the CPS rating.

Contact:

Amy Laskey
Managing Director
+1-212-908-0568
Fitch Ratings, Inc.
33 Whitehall Street
New York, NY 10004

Arlene Bohner
Senior Director
+1-212-908-0554

Media Relations: Elizabeth Fogerty, New York, Tel: +1 (212) 908 0526, Email: elizabeth.fogerty@fitchratings.com.

Additional information is available at ‘www.fitchratings.com’

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS. IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY’S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM. PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH’S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.
Copyright © 2017 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or

retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings and in making other reports (including forecast information), Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third- party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings and reports should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating or a report will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings and its reports, Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings and forecasts of financial and other information are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings and forecasts can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating or forecast was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind, and Fitch does not represent or warrant that the report or any of its contents will meet any of the requirements of a recipient of the report. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion and reports made by Fitch are based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings and reports are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating or a report. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at any time for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US$1,000 to US$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US$10,000 to US$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any

particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.
For Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and South Korea only: Fitch Australia Pty Ltd holds an Australian financial services license (AFS license no. 337123) which authorizes it to provide credit ratings to wholesale clients only. Credit ratings information published by Fitch is not intended to be used by persons who are retail clients within the meaning of the Corporations Act 2001

ENDORSEMENT POLICY – Fitch's approach to ratings endorsement so that ratings produced outside the EU may be used by regulated entities within the EU for regulatory purposes, pursuant to the terms of the EU Regulation with respect to credit rating agencies, can be found on the EU Regulatory Disclosures page. The endorsement status of all International ratings is provided within the entity summary page for each rated entity and in the transaction detail pages for all structured finance transactions on the Fitch website. These disclosures are updated on a daily basis.

Copyright © 2026 Bond Case Briefs | bondcasebriefs.com