

CREDIT OPINION

7 August 2020

New Issue



Contacts

Jennifer Card +1.312.706.9983
Bernhardt
Analyst
jennifer.card@moodys.com

David Levett +1.312.706.9990 VP-Senior Analyst david.levett@moodys.com

CLIENT SERVICES

Americas 1-212-553-1653
Asia Pacific 852-3551-3077
Japan 81-3-5408-4100
EMEA 44-20-7772-5454

Cook County C.C.S.D. 15 (Palatine), IL

Update to credit analysis

Summary

Cook County C.C.S.D 15 (Palatine), IL's (Aa2) credit characteristics include a sizeable tax base located in Cook County (A2 stable) with above average income levels. Financial operations are healthy, with strong reserve and liquidity levels and moderate reliance on the State of Illinois (Baa3 negative) for operating revenue. The debt burden is low, but the district has outstanding borrowing need. Like all districts in the state, there is contingent risk associated with state support for contributions to an underfunded Teachers Retirement system.

We regard the coronavirus outbreak as a social risk under our ESG framework, given the substantial implications for public health and safety. We do not see any material immediate credit risks for the district. We do not see any material immediate credit risks for the district as additional expenditures have been minimal and the district has realized savings due to the closure of district buildings. Favorably, the state of Illinois does not plan on reductions in state aid to school districts at this time. The situation surrounding the coronavirus is rapidly evolving and the longer term impact will depend on both the severity and duration of the crisis. If our view of the credit quality of the district changes, we will update our opinion at that time.

Credit strengths

- » Sizeable tax base located in the Chicago (Ba1 stable) metropolitan area
- » Healthy financial position with strong reserve and liquidity levels

Credit challenges

» Contingent risk associated with reliance on state support for pension contributions to an underfunded statewide teachers' pension plan

Rating outlook

Outlooks are generally not assigned to local government credits with this amount of debt.

Factors that could lead to an upgrade

- » Growth in available reserves and unrestricted liquidity
- » Strengthening of resident income indices

Factors that could lead to a downgrade

» Narrowing of district reserves and available liquidity

» Significant growth in the district's debt or pension burden

Key indicators

Exhibit 1

Cook County C.C.S.D. 15 (Palatine), IL	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Economy/Tax Base					
Total Full Value (\$000)	\$9,150,396	\$10,595,521	\$10,655,913	\$10,387,415	\$11,700,032
Population	119,710	119,702	119,677	119,285	119,710
Full Value Per Capita	\$76,438	\$88,516	\$89,039	\$89,332	\$86,771
Median Family Income (% of US Median)	139.0%	144.0%	143.2%	138.1%	138.1%
Finances					
Operating Revenue (\$000)	\$189,138	\$193,821	\$219,385	\$223,527	\$202,044
Fund Balance (\$000)	\$59,536	\$56,271	\$61,796	\$64,576	\$63,532
Cash Balance (\$000)	\$67,221	\$65,899	\$66,562	\$73,377	\$71,762
Fund Balance as a % of Revenues	31.5%	29.0%	28.2%	28.9%	31.4%
Cash Balance as a % of Revenues	35.5%	34.0%	30.3%	32.8%	35.5%
Debt/Pensions					
Net Direct Debt (\$000)	\$31,903	\$43,087	\$48,157	\$44,301	\$40,234
3-Year Average of Moody's ANPL (\$000)	\$82,280	\$87,521	\$103,293	\$102,915	\$97,530
Net Direct Debt / Full Value (%)	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Net Direct Debt / Operating Revenues (x)	0.2x	0.2x	0.2x	0.2x	0.2x
Moody's - adjusted Net Pension Liability (3-yr average) to Full Value (%)	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%
Moody's - adjusted Net Pension Liability (3-yr average) to Revenues (x)	0.4x	0.5x	0.5x	0.5x	0.5x

The table above reflects dated through fiscal 2019

Source: Audited financial statements; US Census Bureau, Moody's Investors Service

Profile

Located in Cook County, approximately 25 miles northwest of Chicago, the district serves a majority of the <u>Village of Palatine</u> (Aa2 negative), the City of Rolling Meadows, and small portions of five other communities. The district provides K-8 education for 11,691 students in a community of over 119,000 residents.

Detailed credit considerations

Economy and tax base: sizeable tax base located within Chicago Metropolitan Area

The coronavirus is driving an unprecedented economic slowdown. We currently forecast US GDP to decline significantly during 2020 with a gradual recovery commencing toward the end of the year. Local governments with the highest exposure to tourism, hospitality, healthcare, retail, and oil and gas could suffer particularly severe impacts. The district's employment base is closely tied the larger Chicago metropolitan economy with residents commuting throughout the metropolitan area via commuter rail service and Interstates 90, 290 and 355. As of June 2020 unemployment in Cook County had surged to 17%, which is higher than the national rate of 11% though not out of line with increases in other counties with a large urban center. The unemployment rate within the district may be significantly different given a median family income equal of 138% of the national level.

Located in Cook County, the district serves a majority of the Village of Palatine, as well as the City of Rolling Meadows, in addition to smaller portions of five other communities. The district's large \$11.7 billion tax base increased at an average annual rate of 5% over the last five years, mainly due to residential and commercial development. The base is primarily residential with minimal concentration as the top ten taxpayers comprise just 5.5% of assessed value. As of now, management reports that development is still continuing, however coronavirus is rapidly evolving and the longer-term impact will depend on both the severity and duration of the crisis.

Finances and liquidity: Healthy financial position with strong reserve levels

The district's finances are expected to remain healthy, supported by conservative practices that have led to strong reserves. For fiscal 2020 the district budgeted for a \$3 million draw across operating funds (combined education, operations and maintenance,

This publication does not announce a credit rating action. For any credit ratings referenced in this publication, please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on www.moodys.com for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

debt service, transportation, Illinois municipal retirement fund and working cash funds), but due to expenditure savings, officials estimate the year ended with balanced operations. As result of recent fiscal challenges, the state's budget weakens funding for schools including only flat funding instead of the increase called for under the state funding formula. The district has only relatively moderate dependence on state revenue, which accounts for a little over 10% of operating revenue. Therefore, despite the weakening of state funding, the budget for fiscal 2021 is expected to be balanced.

The district is currently in tier 2 under the state of Illinois' evidence based funding model which was passed in fiscal 2018. Under this model, districts in tier 1 receive the majority of any increase in state funding with tier 2 districts next in line, while tier 3 and 4 districts are unlikely to receive any significant growth in funding. The district has additional exposure to the state through pension contributions made by the state on-behalf, which was equivalent to 17% of fiscal 2019 revenues. Available operating fund balance totaled \$63.5 million for fiscal 2019, a healthy 31% of revenues.

Property taxes are the largest revenue source totaling 62% of fiscal 2019 revenue and are anticipated to have limited disruptions. The district currently levies below operating rate caps, however, the district is subject to the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL), which limits the annual growth in taxes to the lesser of 5% or percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Liquidity

The district closed fiscal 2019 with a net cash balance of \$71.8 million, or a strong 36% of revenues.

Debt and pensions modest debt profile with plans for additional borrowing

The district's debt burden may increase materially based on potential outstanding capital project, but should remain moderate given fast principal amortization and very little debt currently outstanding. The contingent risk associated with exposure to a poorly funded state pension plan is a credit challenge across the sector. Net direct debt of the district will total \$46.1 million, equal to a low 0.4% of full value and 0.2x of fiscal 2019 revenue. Going forward the district will need to address facility needs, which may include a combination of borrowing and cash financing.

The Moody's three year adjusted net pension liability (ANPL) for the district is \$97.5 million, equal to a low 0.5x operating revenue and 0.9% of full value. The modest pension liability reflects that the state currently funds the majority of teacher pensions on behalf of local school districts. The district's fixed costs, inclusive of debt service, pension and other post employment benefit (OPEB) contributions were 4.5% of fiscal 2019 operating revenue.

Legal security

The district's outstanding debt is secured by the district's GOLT pledge that is supported by a dedicated property tax levy that is unlimited as to rate, but limited by the district's DSEB.

Debt structure

All debt is fixed rate, with 100% of principal scheduled to be repaid in ten years. GOLT debt is secured by the debt service extension base (DSEB) which totals just over \$6.1 million for fiscal 2021. The MADS is \$6.4 million slightly higher than the current DSEB of \$6.1 million. Assuming no growth the shortfall would be \$276,000 while under 1.5% growth projected there would be no shortfall. If there were shortfalls, the district would utilize available reserves.

Debt-related derivatives

The district is not a party to any derivative agreements.

Pensions and OPEB

The state currently assumes responsibility for funding the majority teacher pensions on behalf of local school districts. Given the large unfunded liabilities for teacher pensions across the state, a reduction in this support by the state represents a contingent risk for all local school districts. District teachers participate in the Teachers Retirement System (TRS) of Illinois, while other staff participate in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund (IMRF), an agent multiple-employer plan. Very high unfunded pension liabilities are a significant drag on the state's credit quality, and TRS represents a material portion of the state's total pension burden.

Like its other pension systems, the State of Illinois contributes to TRS using a very back loaded and annually rising payment schedule. These rising costs have played a significant role in the state's ongoing budget challenges. Certain state legislators and the past two governors have considered shifting pension costs to Illinois schools and universities for a number of years, but to date have shown no

inclination toward forcing local districts to pay for accumulated unfunded liabilities. Typically the proposals call for shifting current year benefit accruals to local districts, called "normal cost" or "service cost," over the course of anywhere between the next four years to over a decade.

OPEB obligations do not represent a material credit risk for the district. The district operates a single-employer retiree medical plan. The district's net OPEB liability at the close of fiscal 2019 was \$98 million. Moody's adjusted net OPEB liability, which is similar to our adjustments to pension liabilities, totals \$90.2 million equivalent to 2.2x operating revenue. The district made a \$1.3 million pay-as-you-go contribution in fiscal 2019, equal to 0.7% of operating revenue.

ESG considerations

Environmental

Environmental considerations are a modest factor in the district's credit profile at this time. According to data of Moody's affiliate, Four Twenty Seven, the district, is located in an area at high risk for heat stress. The firm measures heat stress as the relative change in both the frequency and severity of hot days, as well as average temperature. The biggest impact of heat exposure for most Midwest issuers will be to agriculture based economies. Cook County also has relatively high exposure to extreme rainfall events compared to counties nationally. Flooding throughout the county will be relieved by the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) currently underway through the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (Aa2 stable).

Social

Social considerations impact the district's credit profile. We regard the coronavirus outbreak as a social risk under our ESG framework, given the substantial implications for public health and safety. The district's tax base is large and benefits from it favorable location within the Chicago metropolitan area as detailed in the Economy and Tax Base section. Overall district demographics are above average, and unemployment rates are above both the state and median averages. The district is in the process of determining whether students will return to school full-time in the fall with safety measures and restrictions, or continue remote learning. For fiscal 2021 the district estimates there could be an additional \$1 million in expenses related to staff. The district received \$1.6 million in CARES Act funding, which it expects may absorb some of these additional costs.

Governance

The district's management practices are strong with conservative budgeting practices and forward looking planning. The district does not have a formal fund balance but maintains a target of minimum of 25% fund balance as a percentage of expenditures.

Illinois school districts have an institutional framework score ¹ of "A", which is moderate. School districts have moderate revenue-raising ability since they are subject to tax caps, but districts can seek voter approval for additional local property tax funding. Revenue predictability is disparate across the state: revenue for property tax dependent districts are very stable, while revenue for state aid dependent districts are less stable. Strong public sector unions somewhat limit districts' expenditure reduction ability. Still, districts have some cost-cutting ability given manageable fixed costs which are primarily debt service expenditures, as the state currently assumes most pension costs for most Illinois public school districts. Expenditures consist primarily of personnel costs, which are highly predictable.

Rating methodology and scorecard factors

The US Local Government General Obligation Debt methodology includes a scorecard, a tool providing a composite score of a local government's credit profile based on the weighted factors we consider most important, universal and measurable, as well as possible notching factors dependent on individual credit strengths and weaknesses. Its purpose is not to determine the final rating, but rather to provide a standard platform from which to analyze and compare local government credits.

Cook County C.C.S.D. 15 (Palatine), IL

Control of the contro		
Scorecard Factors and Subfactors	Measure	Score
Economy/Tax Base (30%) [1]		
Tax Base Size: Full Value (in 000s)	\$11,700,032	Aa
Full Value Per Capita	\$97,736	Aa
Median Family Income (% of US Median)	138.1%	Aa
Finances (30%)		
Fund Balance as a % of Revenues	31.4%	Aaa
5-Year Dollar Change in Fund Balance as % of Revenues	2.4%	Α
Cash Balance as a % of Revenues	35.5%	Aaa
5-Year Dollar Change in Cash Balance as % of Revenues	0.9%	Α
Management (20%)		
Institutional Framework	А	Α
Operating History: 5-Year Average of Operating Revenues / Operating Expenditures	1.0x	Α
Debt and Pensions (20%)		
Net Direct Debt / Full Value (%)	0.4%	Aaa
Net Direct Debt / Operating Revenues (x)	0.2x	Aaa
3-Year Average of Moody's Adjusted Net Pension Liability / Full Value (%)	0.8%	Aaa
3-Year Average of Moody's Adjusted Net Pension Liability / Operating Revenues (x)	0.5x	Aa
Notching Factors: ^[2]		
Other Scorecard Adjustment Related to Debt/Pensions: Contingent risk associated with state pension support		Down
	Scorecard-Indicated Outcome	Aa3
	Assigned Rating	Aa2

^[1] Economy measures are based on data from the most recent year available.

Endnotes

1 The institutional framework score assesses a municipality's legal ability to match revenues with expenditures based on its constitutionally and legislatively conferred powers and responsibilities. See <u>US Local Government General Obligation Debt (July 2020)</u> methodology report for more details.

^[2] Notching Factors are specifically defined in the US Local Government General Obligation Debt methodology dated July 29, 2020.

^[3] Standardized adjustments are outlined in the latest GO Methodology Scorecard Inputs publication.

Source: Issuer's audited financial statements; US Census Bureau

© 2020 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND/OR ITS CREDIT RATINGS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE
CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MATERIALS, PRODUCTS, SERVICES AND INFORMATION PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S
(COLLECTIVELY, "PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE SUCH CURRENT OPINIONS. MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY
NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT OR IMPAIRMENT. SEE
MOODY'S RATING SYMBOLS AND DEFINITIONS PUBLICATION FOR INFORMATION ON THE TYPES OF CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS ADDRESSED BY MOODY'S
INVESTORS SERVICE CREDIT RATINGS. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR
PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS, NON-CREDIT ASSESSMENTS ("ASSESSMENTS"), AND OTHER OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS
OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR
COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. AND/OR ITS AFFILIATES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT
AND DO NOT PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT
AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND
PUBLICATIONS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR FLOAT HAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY
AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE. HOLDING. OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS, AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS OR PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER. ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOFVER BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing its Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY CREDIT RATING, ASSESSMENT, OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,000 to approximately \$2,700,000. MCO and Moody's Investors Service also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of Moody's Investors Service credit ratings and credit rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold credit ratings from Moody's Investors Service and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moodys.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY125,000 to approximately JPY250,000,000.

MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.

REPORT NUMBER 1240697

CLIENT SERVICES

 Americas
 1-212-553-1653

 Asia Pacific
 852-3551-3077

 Japan
 81-3-5408-4100

 EMEA
 44-20-7772-5454

