

# RatingsDirect®

---

## Summary:

# Foxborough, Massachusetts; General Obligation

### **Primary Credit Analyst:**

Christina Marin, Boston 617-530-8312; christina.marin@standardandpoors.com

### **Secondary Contact:**

Timothy W Little, New York (212) 438-7999; timothy.little@standardandpoors.com

## Table Of Contents

---

Rationale

Outlook

Related Criteria And Research

## Summary:

# Foxborough, Massachusetts; General Obligation

### Credit Profile

Foxborough Twn GO

*Long Term Rating*

AA+/Stable

Affirmed

## Rationale

Standard & Poor's Ratings Services has affirmed its 'AA+' long-term rating on Foxborough, Mass.' debt outstanding. The outlook is stable.

The town's full faith and credit secures existing bonds.

The rating reflects our opinion of the town's:

- Very strong economy, with access to a broad and diverse metropolitan statistical area (MSA);
- Strong management, with "good" financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment methodology;
- Strong budgetary performance, with slight operating surpluses in the general fund and at the total governmental fund level;
- Very strong budgetary flexibility, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2014 of 19% of operating expenditures;
- Very strong liquidity, with total government available cash of 31.2% of total governmental fund expenditures and 7.3x governmental debt service, and access to external liquidity we consider strong;
- Very strong debt and contingent liability position, with debt service carrying charges of 4.3% of expenditures and net direct debt that is 33.9% of total governmental fund revenue and low overall net debt at less than 3% of market value and rapid amortization with 74.2% of debt scheduled to be retired in 10 years; and
- Strong institutional framework score.

### Very strong economy

We consider Foxborough's economy very strong. The town, with an estimated population of 17,309, is located in Norfolk County in the Boston-Cambridge-Newton, Mass., MSA, which we consider to be broad and diverse. The town has a projected per capita effective buying income of 150% of the national level and per capita market value of \$156,129. Overall, the town's market value fell by 3.1% over the past year to \$2.7 billion in 2015. The county unemployment rate was 5.0% in 2014.

Foxborough serves as home to the New England Patriots football team and the New England Revolution soccer team, which play out of Gillette Stadium, a 68,000-seat stadium on the northeast end of town. The Kraft Group, which owns the stadium and teams, has proposed a technology office park complex across the street from the stadium, which could add as much as \$200 million to the town's commercial property base or an estimated \$2.9 million in annual tax revenue. Two new hotels are under development, one near the stadium and one on the other side of town, which will increase excise tax revenue.

The town's largest employer, Invensys, was acquired by French multinational Schneider Electric in January 2014. The company had just initiated \$30 million in renovations to existing facilities in Foxborough, and Schneider executives have committed to maintaining operations in Foxborough.

In June 2015, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation purchased a commercial freight line that runs through Foxborough. Transportation officials plan on investing in track and signal improvements to introduce an express train from Foxborough to Readville to Boston, which could come online as soon as 2017.

The town's tax base is diverse, in our view, with the 10 leading taxpayers accounting for 15.4% of assessed value.

### **Adequate management**

Standard & Poor's revised its assessment of the town's financial policies and practices to "good" from a "standard," indicating financial practices exist in most areas, but that governance officials might not formalize or monitor all of them on a regular basis. The budget process starts with a detailed line-by-line development of revenue projections. Proposed expenses are reviewed with each department head. Historical trend analysis is performed and a regular effort is made to determine if trends are deviating from past performance. Budget-to-actuals are presented monthly to the board and town management generally has the flexibility to transfer funds as needed. Investment statements are reviewed monthly by the treasurer and finance director, and upon request from any other interested parties. The town uses a third-party investment management firm for other postemployment benefit (OPEB) investments and reviews statements quarterly with the firm. Foxborough maintains an investment policy and has an informal reserve policy to maintain a stabilization fund balance of 5% of annual operating expenditures. Town management is working to adopt a more formal debt management and reserve policy. Foxborough relies on a capital improvement and a long-range financial plan to guide budget planning from year-to-year.

### **Strong budgetary performance**

Foxborough's budgetary performance is strong in our opinion. The town had slight operating surpluses of 0.6% in the general fund and 0.8% across all governmental funds in fiscal 2014. General fund operating results of the town have been stable over the last three years, with a result of 2.2% in 2013 and a result of 2.3% in 2012.

Town officials believe that fiscal 2015 will end in a surplus for the town, allowing Foxborough to increase its reserves by as much as \$2.18 million. The surplus is driven largely by expenses coming in under budget and revenues tracking ahead of forecasts. The fiscal 2016 budget is balanced and includes a 4.6% increase over the previous year. Property taxes make up 60% of revenues, followed by state aid, which comprises 25% of revenues.

In 2014, Foxborough bought its share of a joint sewer system with Mansfield and Norton. Previously, Mansfield owned the system and the other two towns were customers. The purchase enables the shared system to expand capacity. The town is aiming to purchase and upgrade the sewer system to be self-supporting with both current and new rate payments.

### **Very strong budgetary flexibility**

Foxborough's budgetary flexibility is very strong, in our view, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2014 of 19% of operating expenditures, or \$12.7 million. The town has an informal policy to maintain its stabilization fund at 5% of expenditures, to which it has historically adhered.

Management has indicated a desire to increase the fund balance in the coming years through conservative budgeting and new growth. Foxborough has an informal policy to maintain its stabilization fund at 5% and is currently in excess of this. The town is considering formalizing this policy in the next six months.

### **Very strong liquidity**

In our opinion, Foxborough's liquidity is very strong, with total government available cash of 31.2% of total governmental fund expenditures and 7.3x governmental debt service in 2014. In our view, the town has strong access to external liquidity if necessary.

The majority of the town's investments are in highly liquid certificates of deposit and treasuries. Foxborough has no variable-rate or direct purchase debt. We expect the town's liquidity profile to remain very strong.

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

In our view, Foxborough's debt and contingent liability profile is very strong. Total governmental fund debt service is 4.3% of total governmental fund expenditures, and net direct debt is 33.9% of total governmental fund revenue.

Overall net debt is low at 0.9% of market value and approximately 74.2% of the direct debt is scheduled to be repaid within 10 years, which are in our view positive credit factors.

Total direct debt is \$36 million, approximately \$11 million of which we consider self-supporting via water and sewer rate payments. Management is anticipating a bond placement in January 2016 for a \$7 million upgrade of the town hall. It is also planning for a school project, but does not expect this to begin for several years. The pending sale of surplus town properties will reduce the amount borrowed for the school project. The water fund will also be borrowing as much as \$15 million by 2020 to be paid for by water rates.

The town's combined pension and OPEB contributions totaled 6.0% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2014. Of that amount, 3.5% represented contributions to pension obligations and 2.5% represented OPEB payments. Foxborough made its full annual required pension contribution (ARC) in 2014.

Foxborough is part of the Norfolk County Contributory Retirement System, a cost-sharing, multiple-employer, defined benefit pension plan, which covers almost all of town employees except for public school teachers and certain school administrators who are members of the Massachusetts Teachers' Retirement System (MTRS). The town does not contribute to MTRS. Instead, the state made a \$5.6 million payment on behalf of Foxborough in 2014. The town's 2014 contribution to the Norfolk County Contributory Retirement System was \$2.6 million, which represents its ARC. The system was 56% funded as of Jan. 1, 2014.

The town contributes to OPEB expenses on a pay-as-you-go basis. As a result of proactive funding, Foxborough's OPEB unfunded actuarial accrued liability dropped from \$62.2 million in fiscal year 2009 to \$30.9 million in 2013. In addition, the town has \$4.58 million in an OPEB Trust. The board of selectmen recently adopted a policy to stream revenues from a new meal tax toward non-operating uses such as funding the OPEB liability. In fiscal 2015, the town committed \$600,000 of the meal tax toward the OPEB liability. Foxborough is increasing its yearly funding toward OPEB until it reaches its ARC. In fiscal 2014, contributions represented 73% of the ARC.

## **Strong institutional framework**

The institutional framework score for Massachusetts municipalities is strong.

## **Outlook**

The stable outlook reflects our expectation that the town's financial position will remain at a level we consider strong. Accordingly, we do not expect to change the rating within the two-year horizon of the outlook. While unlikely, we could lower the rating if performance were to become imbalanced, pressuring reserves. We could raise the rating with the formalization (and subsequent integration) of the town's reserve and debt policies, which would give us evidence they can sustain existing strong financial performance. We believe the regional economy's strength, specifically the deep and diverse employment base with access to interstates 95 and 495, and strong wealth levels provides credit stability.

## **Related Criteria And Research**

### **Related Criteria**

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

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 acknowledgement 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).