

Research Update:

City of Greater Sudbury Ratings Affirmed At 'AA'; **Outlook Is Stable**

September 22, 2021

Overview

- Economic growth will rebound in 2021 as COVID-19 pandemic-related restrictions ease, propelled by the City of Greater Sudbury's resource sector and large public sector.
- The city's large capital plan will widen after-capital deficits through 2022 and the related debt financing will also increase the debt burden, which we expect will peak in 2022.
- We are affirming our 'AA' long-term issuer credit and senior unsecured debt ratings on Sudbury.
- The stable outlook reflects our expectation that in the next two years, the city will continue to execute its large capital program, resulting in modest after-capital deficits, but that it will continue to generate healthy operating surpluses.

Rating Action

On Sept. 22, 2021, S&P Global Ratings affirmed its 'AA' long-term issuer credit and senior unsecured debt ratings on the City of Greater Sudbury, in the Province of Ontario. The outlook is stable.

Outlook

The stable outlook reflects our expectation that in the next two years, a robust mining sector will help the economy recover from the near-term impacts of the pandemic. We also expect that the city will continue to execute its large capital program, resulting in modest after-capital deficits, but that it will continue to generate healthy operating surpluses.

Downside scenario

We could lower the rating in the next two years if Sudbury's revenues do not increase at the expected rate, resulting in large after-capital deficits greater than 10% of total revenues on a sustained basis, and requiring additional debt financing of the capital plan such that the

PRIMARY CREDIT ANALYST

Adam J Gillespie

Toronto

+ 1 (416) 507 2565 adam.gillespie @spglobal.com

SECONDARY CONTACT

Hector Cedano, CFA

Toronto

+ 1 (416) 507 2536 hector.cedano

@spglobal.com

RESEARCH CONTRIBUTOR

Ritesh S Bagmar

Pune

+ (020)42008581

Ritesh.Bagmar @spglobal.com tax-supported debt burden exceeded 60% of operating revenues.

Upside scenario

We could raise the ratings if Sudbury manages to complete its extensive capital plan and achieve an after-capital surplus while the debt burden declines to less than 30% of operating revenues.

Rationale

We expect that Sudbury's economy will rebound in 2021, buoyed by a healthy resource sector and large, stabilizing public sector. Although the city will continue to face operating challenges, its effective cost containment efforts will help ensure robust budgetary performance throughout the forecast horizon. Its ambitious capital plan will necessitate some further borrowing in the next two years, but we believe that the debt burden will be very manageable, and that liquidity will remain very strong.

Debt burden expected to peak in 2022 on borrowing for large capital plan.

Overall, Sudbury's budgetary results outperformed our estimate for 2020 on a combination of extraordinary support from senior levels of government, cost mitigation strategies implemented in response to decreased demand for certain fee-based services, and lower-than-expected capital expenditures.

Although pandemic-related impacts on revenues and expenses have continued through 2021, we expect that revenues will resume a more normal growth trajectory in 2022, allowing the city to hold healthy operating surpluses of more than 14% of operating revenues on average in 2019-2023. We also expect that Sudbury will maintain fairly high levels of capital spending in the next several years, primarily to help address infrastructure requirements, and complete several large projects, including an arena, an art gallery/library, and a new conference center. Consequently, we believe that after-capital deficits will rise in the next two years to average a modest 2.5% of total revenue in our 2019-2023 base case.

In March 2020, Sudbury issued C\$200 million of bonds to finance several large, one-time projects, including an arena and event center. Based on the current capital financing plan, we expect the city to borrow about C\$100 million in 2022 and that tax-supported debt will peak at C\$327 million. This represents a significant increase from C\$61 million in debt outstanding at the end of 2019 and will push the city's debt burden to almost 54% of our forecast operating revenue by the end of 2022, before beginning to moderate. We expect that interest costs will remain very manageable at less than 2% of operating revenues on average in 2020-2022. We do not believe that the liabilities of Sudbury's related entities, Sudbury Airport Community Development Corp. and Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc., represent a material contingent liability risk, as we believe the likelihood of the city providing extraordinary support to them in a stress scenario is low.

Sudbury's credit profile is bolstered by what we view as an exceptional liquidity position and satisfactory access to external liquidity to meet financing needs. At the end of 2020, the city still held most of the proceeds from its most recent debt issue in short-term investments. Although we expect liquidity will decline as the related projects are completed in the next several years, we estimate that the city will maintain about C\$450 million of free cash in the next 12 months, sufficient to cover almost 20x the estimated debt service requirements.

A sizable public-sector presence helps offset exposure to the resource sector while strong financial management practices bolster the rating.

We believe Sudbury's economy will begin to recover over the next two years as vaccination rates rise and pandemic-related restrictions ease. Despite the material impact that the pandemic has had on the city's economy, we believe Sudbury still demonstrates characteristics of a strong economy, with high median incomes and estimated GDP per capita about in line with that of the national economy at about US\$52,900. Sudbury's economy has been diversifying from its historical dependence on nickel mining and is now the major retail, health, and educational center for northeastern Ontario. The public sector (health care, school boards, higher education, and municipal and provincial administration) is a stabilizing force, in our view, and has become an important contributor to the local economy. Nevertheless, the resource sector, primarily nickel mining as well as related support services, remains a major contributor to the economy and accounts for about 20% of total local employment. We believe that the regional economy's relatively high reliance on mining, and in particular its exposure to the volatility of nickel prices, could affect Sudbury's revenue growth and expenditure needs in the future, and partially constrains our assessment of the economic profile.

In our view, Sudbury's financial management practices are strong, and largely in line with those of similarly rated peers. The city provides transparent, easy-to-access disclosure of pertinent information and prepares robust operating and capital budgets. Its annual operating and capital budgets reflect the broad goals outlined in the 10-year financial plan, which contains what we view as realistic assumptions. Similar to its Canadian peers, Sudbury can issue debt only to finance capital expenditures, and we believe it has prudent and conservative policies as well as a stable and well-qualified management team to govern its debt and liquidity management.

We believe Sudbury, like other Canadian municipalities, benefits from a very predictable and well-balanced local and regional government framework that has demonstrated a high degree of institutional stability. Although provincial governments mandate a significant proportion of municipal spending, they also provide operating fund transfers and impose fiscal restraint through legislative requirements to pass balanced operating budgets. Municipalities generally have the ability to match expenditures well with revenues, except for capital spending, which can be intensive. Operating surpluses typically fund capital expenditures and future liabilities (such as postemployment obligations and landfill closure costs) through reserve contributions.

Key Statistics

Table 1

City of Greater Sudbury -- Selected Indicators

Yea	r ended Dec. 31
2020	2021bc

(Mil. C\$)	2019	2020	2021bc	2022bc	2023bc	
Operating revenues	560	581	589	611	636	
Operating expenditures	492	485	502	522	540	
Operating balance	68	96	86	89	96	
Operating balance (% of operating revenues)	12.1	16.6	14.7	14.5	15.0	
Capital revenues	41	27	43	52	45	
Capital expenditures	104	134	149	182	155	

Table 1

City of Greater Sudbury -- Selected Indicators (cont.)

	Year ended Dec. 31				
(Mil. C\$)	2019	2020	2021bc	2022bc	2023bc
Balance after capital accounts	5	(11)	(20)	(41)	(15)
Balance after capital accounts (% of total revenues)	0.9	(1.7)	(3.1)	(6.2)	(2.1)
Debt repaid	4	8	9	12	11
Gross borrowings	0	200	0	98	0
Balance after borrowings	1	181	(29)	45	(26)
Direct debt (outstanding at year-end)	61	256	243	327	312
Direct debt (% of operating revenues)	10.9	44.1	41.2	53.6	49.0
Tax-supported debt (outstanding at year-end)	61	256	243	327	312
Tax-supported debt (% of consolidated operating revenues)	10.9	44.1	41.2	53.6	49.0
Interest (% of operating revenues)	0.5	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.5
National GDP per capita (single units)	61.466	58.016	65.195	67.992	69.683

The data and ratios above result in part from S&P Global Ratings' own calculations, drawing on national as well as international sources, $reflecting \, S\&P \, Global \, Ratings' \, independent \, view \, on \, the \, time liness, \, coverage, \, accuracy, \, credibility, \, and \, usability \, of \, available \, information. \, The \, coverage \, cove$ main sources are the financial statements and budgets, as provided by the issuer. bc--Base case reflects S&P Global Ratings' expectations of the most likely scenario.

Ratings Score Snapshot

Table 2

City of Greater Sudbury -- Ratings Score Snapshot

Key rating factors	Score
Institutional framework	2
Economy	2
Financial management	2
Budgetary perfomance	2
Liquidity	1
Debt burden	2
Stand-alone credit profile	aa
Issuer credit rating	AA

S&P Global Ratings bases its ratings on non-U.S. local and regional governments (LRGs) on the six main rating factors in this table. In the "Methodology For Rating Local And Regional Governments Outside Of The U.S.," published on July 15, 2019, we explain the steps we follow to derive the global scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale: 1 is the strongest and 6 is a scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale foreign currency rating on each LRG. The institutional framework is assessed on a six-point scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for each LRG. The institutional framework is a scale for eacthe weakest score. Our assessments of economy, financial management, budgetary performance, liquidity, and debt burden are on a five-point scale, with 1 being the strongest score and 5 the weakest.

Key Sovereign Statistics

Sovereign Risk Indicators, July 12, 2021. An interactive version is available at http://wwspratings.com/sri

Related Criteria

- Criteria | Governments | International Public Finance: Methodology For Rating Local And Regional Governments Outside Of The U.S., July 15, 2019
- General Criteria: Principles Of Credit Ratings, Feb. 16, 2011

Related Research

- Economic Outlook Canada Q3 2021: Growth Setback In The Spring Will Give Way To Summer Boom, June 25, 2021
- Institutional Framework Assessments For International Local And Regional Governments, Feb. 8, 2021
- S&P Global Ratings Definitions, Jan. 5, 2021
- Public Finance System: Canadian Municipalities, May 12, 2020
- Guidance: Methodology For Rating Local And Regional Governments Outside Of The U.S., July 15, 2019
- Guidance: Sovereign Rating Methodology, Jan. 22, 2019

In accordance with our relevant policies and procedures, the Rating Committee was composed of analysts that are qualified to vote in the committee, with sufficient experience to convey the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding of the methodology applicable (see 'Related Criteria And Research'). At the onset of the committee, the chair confirmed that the information provided to the Rating Committee by the primary analyst had been distributed in a timely manner and was sufficient for Committee members to make an informed decision.

After the primary analyst gave opening remarks and explained the recommendation, the Committee discussed key rating factors and critical issues in accordance with the relevant criteria. Qualitative and quantitative risk factors were considered and discussed, looking at track-record and forecasts.

The committee's assessment of the key rating factors is reflected in the Ratings Score Snapshot above.

The chair ensured every voting member was given the opportunity to articulate his/her opinion. The chair or designee reviewed the draft report to ensure consistency with the Committee decision. The views and the decision of the rating committee are summarized in the above rationale and outlook. The weighting of all rating factors is described in the methodology used in this rating action (see 'Related Criteria And Research').

Ratings List

Greater Sudbury (City of)					
					Issuer Credit Ra
Greater Sudbury (City of)					
Senior Unsecure	ed AA				

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 $criteria.\ Please\ see\ Ratings\ Criteria\ at\ www.standard and poors.com\ for\ further\ information.\ Complete\ ratings$ 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.



Copyright © 2021 by Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. 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, 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. Rating-related publications may be published for a variety of reasons that are not necessarily dependent on action by rating committees, including, but not limited to, the publication of a periodic update on a credit rating and related analyses.

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 acknowledgment 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 non-public 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 (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.

STANDARD & POOR'S, S&P and RATINGSDIRECT are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC.