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Credit Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US$23.995 mil lse rev bnds (Los Angeles Cnty) 2020 ser A due 12/01/2022</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty ICR</td>
<td>AAA/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Action

S&P Global Ratings revised its outlook to negative from stable and affirmed its 'AAA issuer credit rating (ICR) on Los Angeles County, Calif., and its 'AA+' long-term rating and underlying rating (SPUR) on the county's existing appropriation debt. At the same time, S&P Global Ratings assigned its 'AA+' long-term rating to the Los Angeles County Capital Asset Leasing Corp.'s (LACCAL) 2020 series A lease revenue bonds (LRBs).

The 2020 series A LRBs are secured by semiannual lease payments made by the county to LACCAL. The leased assets are sufficient to support debt service on the 2020 series A bonds. Lease payment are payable from all available funds of the county and are subject to annual appropriation. The county is not funding a debt service reserve for the bonds; however, the debt service payments are well after the beginning of the county's fiscal year, mitigating the risk of nonappropriation due to late budget adoption. Lease payments are subject to abatement in the event of loss of, damage to, destruction of, or theft of the leased equipment, and the county covenants to maintain 24 months of rental interruption insurance to offset abatement risk.

The ICR reflects our view of the county's general creditworthiness and does not incorporate the features of any particular debt instrument.

Our issue ratings are based on our view that the county's general creditworthiness is above that of the U.S. sovereign. This reflects our view that the county would not default in a stress scenario likely to accompany a sovereign default given autonomy from sovereign intervention. We view the county as exhibiting relatively low funding interdependency with the federal government, as local taxes represent the vast majority of total governmental funds revenue. However, consistent with our view that U.S. state and local governments are moderately sensitive to country risk, we would be unlikely to set ratings on the county's obligations more than two notches above the U.S. sovereign rating.
Credit overview
The negative outlook reflects our view of the county's challenges as it addresses financial pressures driven by the COVID-19 pandemic and associated recession. In particular, the county's budget for fiscal 2021 includes significant draws on reserves in the general fund as well as in the Department of Health Services (DHS) fund, which we believe indicates weakening financial performance and flexibility as the county adjusts to a starkly different future than just a few months ago. Although S&P Global Economics believes that the U.S. economy has already reached the bottom of the recession, we anticipate the pace of the recovery will be slow as people demonstrate a reluctance to return to their normal activities, which could in turn lead to slow rehiring and a prolonged period with a county unemployment rate above 10%. We believe that the trajectory forward is also highly uncertain given the lack of an effective vaccine, and the recent rise in the number of COVID-19 cases reported across the country that threatens to slow or halt the reopening of local economies.

For more information on the coronavirus' effect in U.S. Public Finance, please see our reports titled "The COVID-19 Outbreak Weakens U.S. State And Local Government Credit Conditions" (April 2, 2020) and "The U.S. Faces A Longer And Slower Climb From The Bottom" (June 25, 2020).

The ratings further reflect our view of the county's:
• Strong economy, with access to a broad and diverse metropolitan statistical area (MSA);
• Very strong management, with strong financial policies and practices under our Financial Management Assessment (FMA) methodology;
• Adequate budgetary performance, with a projected operating deficit in the general fund for both fiscal 2020 and 2021;
• Strong budgetary flexibility, with an available fund balance in fiscal 2019 of 17% of operating expenditures, but that we anticipate may fall below 15% as the county deploys reserves as it transitions into a lower revenue environment;
• Very strong liquidity, with total government available cash at 38.8% of total governmental fund expenditures and 33.7x governmental debt service, and access to external liquidity that we consider exceptional;
• Strong debt and contingent liability profile, with debt service carrying charges at 1.2% of expenditures and net direct debt that is 7.4% of total governmental fund revenue, as well as low overall net debt at less than 2.4% of market value, but a large pension and other postemployment benefit (OPEB) obligation and the lack of a plan to sufficiently address the obligation; and
• Strong institutional framework score.

Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors
We analyzed the county's ESG risks relative to its economy, management, financial measures, and debt-and-liability profile. Our ratings incorporate our view regarding the health and safety risks posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Although wildfires have affected California, we do not consider fire within the county an immediate risk. Absent the implications of COVID-19, we consider the county's ESG risk to be in line with our view of the sector standard.
Negative Outlook

Downside scenario
Should the county's operations significantly deteriorate, with a weakening of both budgetary performance and flexibility, we could lower the ratings. We could also lower the ratings if the county's hospital and medical center operations deteriorate, weakening general fund performance. Pension and OPEB increases without corresponding increases in revenues or expenditure reductions could also pressure the ratings.

Return to stable scenario
We may revise the outlook to stable if the county is able to return to budgetary balance without significantly drawing down reserves in the general fund and DHS fund as projected, such as if the recovery from the pandemic and recession is quicker than projected or if the county receives substantial state or federal aid that offsets the need for reserve draws.

Credit Opinion

Strong economy
We consider the county's economy generally strong although currently experiencing reduced activity levels and high unemployment driven by social distancing and local business closures. With an estimated population of 10.3 million, Los Angeles County is in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, Calif. MSA, which we consider broad and diverse. The county has a projected per capita effective buying income of 102% of the national level and per capita market value of $159,230. The county's market value grew 6.7% during the past year to $1.6 trillion in 2020. However, the county's unemployment rate was 20.3% for April 2020, which is substantially elevated when compared with the annual unemployment rate of 4.4% in 2019. During the prior recession, unemployment rose to 11.5% in 2009 and remained above 10% through 2012. We understand that the county utilizes the UCLA Anderson Forecast, which predicts that the county's unemployment rates will remain above 10% for 2020 and 2021 before declining to 9% in the second quarter of 2022.

Los Angeles is the largest county in the U.S., by population. Assessed value (AV) has grown since fiscal 2011, with a 5.3% increase projected for fiscal 2021. The county experienced only a relatively minor dip in AV during the most recent recession: a reflection of its large and mature property tax base coupled with Proposition 13 limitations on AV growth.

Similar to other large coastal areas of California, the county's housing prices and lack of affordable housing are a continuous concern. There are some indications that although the housing market is not retracting, growth is slowing. Management indicates that some slowdown may be beneficial to the county, as more residents are able to purchase homes; additionally, a large number of homes are assessed under 1975 valuations due to Prop 13, and therefore any turnover will be beneficial to county revenue.

The county has a large and growing technology sector known as the Silicon Beach, with more than 500 technology startup companies and major employers such as Google, Yahoo!, YouTube, BuzzFeed, Facebook, Salesforce, AOL, and
Electronic Arts. The county also has a very large entertainment industry with major movie studios, television networks, recording studios, video game developers, publishers, and artists.

**Very strong management**
We view the county's management as very strong, with strong financial policies and practices under our FMA methodology, indicating financial practices are strong, well embedded, and likely sustainable.

The county uses state economic data and actual historical trends in revenue forecasting and reviews expenditures and revenue against budget monthly. It prepares a five-year revenue and expenditure forecast, as well as a seven-year long-term capital plan. The county has adopted a debt management plan and a written investment policy and prepares monthly investment performance reports that it submits to the county board. While it has set a goal of building 10% of locally generated revenues in a "rainy day" and economic reserve, officials report that the county is not currently meeting the goal, and intend to draw on this reserve in fiscal 2020. Management has a policy of setting aside 5%-10% of its discretionary revenue for contingencies, and has set aside about 10% for the past several years; however, the county does not intend to do so in fiscal 2020.

**Adequate budgetary performance**
Los Angeles County's budgetary performance is adequate, in our opinion. While the county has produced consistent surplus operating results in the general fund and across all governmental funds during the past three audited fiscal years, we anticipate that it will likely report operating deficits for fiscal 2020 and 2021.

The county's budgets tend to be conservative, underestimating tax growth and overestimating expenditures. However, the fiscal 2021 budget is not structurally balanced and relies on $786 million of one-time funds to pay for expenditures. The county's fiscal 2021 general budget includes a $981 million, or 3.5%, reduction when compared with the fiscal 2020 adopted budget. The fiscal 2021 budget projects 5.3% AV growth, less than the actual 6.3% growth experienced in fiscal 2020. In addition, the budget includes a 25% reduction in sales tax revenue reflecting reduced purchases during the "safer at home" period. This reduction in sales tax revenue is driving a need for significant cost reductions, and we understand that the county plans to eliminate 2,818 budgeted positions with 404 potential layoffs. County officials generally focus on balancing ongoing revenue with ongoing expenditures, and in 2017 received voter approval for a 10-year, 25-cent dedicated sales tax to fund homelessness initiatives.

We also anticipate that changes to federal health care spending could pressure operations, given the size of the county's health services department. The 2021 budget does not anticipate an increase in net county cost to subsidize the DHS fund; however, a significant federal overhaul in the next few years of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) could result in a cut to state and federal support for health services, which would be a challenge for the county. Since the advent of ACA, uninsured inpatient visitors fell below 10% as compared to about 25% prior to the implementation of ACA. This risk was somewhat mitigated, by the county's buildup of reserves in the DHS fund to $1.1 billion; however, we understand that the county plans to draw down $437 million and $454 million of these reserves in fiscal 2020 and 2021, respectively. In recent years, management has restructured DHS from a hospital-based to an integrated ambulatory care system, which we believe could position the county better than many to minimize the cost of adapting to changes in health care funding.

General fund and governmental fund revenue and expenditures were adjusted to account for recurring transfers to and
from the county's hospital funds. In addition, the general fund expenditures were adjusted to account for recurring transfers to the library and various debt service funds. Taxes (primarily property taxes) represented 31% of the audited fiscal 2019 general fund revenue. The county's other major revenue streams were intergovernmental revenue from the federal government (20%) and state government (32%). Charges for services represented another 13%. Other smaller revenue sources included fines and forfeitures.

**Strong budgetary flexibility**
In our view, the county's budgetary flexibility is strong. While the county was able to prudently set aside funds into reserves during the past several years, management plans to use $316 million and $471 million of one-time trust accounts and one-time reserves, respectively, to balance the fiscal 2020 budget, and $352 million of one-time trust accounts to balance the budget in fiscal 2021. Although the county ended fiscal 2019 with $3.4 billion of reserves, equivalent to 17% of general fund expenditures, we expect that these planned uses of reserves will reduce the balance below 15% of general fund expenditures.

Management plans to draw from the rainy day fund this year and does not plan to make a transfer under the county's ongoing revenues policy. We believe the county remains exposed to potential significant reductions in federal and state support for medical and health services, which could further reduce flexibility in the short term if they should materialize.

**Very strong liquidity**
In our opinion, Los Angeles County's liquidity is very strong, with total government available cash at 38.8% of total governmental fund expenditures and 33.7x governmental debt service in 2019. In our view, the county has exceptional access to external liquidity if necessary.

Supporting our view of the county's exceptional access to liquidity is the fact that the county has issued various types of debt in the past 15 years, including LRBs, commercial paper (CP), assessment debt, and tax and revenue anticipation notes. In April 2019, the county restructured the LACCAL Lease Revenue Note Program, which consists of four separate bank letter of credit and reimbursement agreements authorizing the issuance of separate series of notes by each bank up to a maximum aggregate principal amount of $600 million. The county has $324.8 million of CP outstanding under this program.

While the state allows for what we consider permissive investments, the county's own adopted investment policy is more conservative, and its current portfolio consists primarily of investments that we consider low risk, such as U.S. Agency securities, certificates of deposit, and CP with an 'A-1' rating.

**Strong debt and contingent liability profile**
In our view, Los Angeles County's debt and contingent liability profile is strong. Total governmental fund debt service is 1.2% of total governmental fund expenditures, and net direct debt is 7.4% of total governmental fund revenue. Overall net debt is low at 2.4% of market value, which is in our view a positive credit factor.

The county currently plans to issue about $425 million in additional debt during fiscal 2021 to finance a replacement facility for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Given the county's large size and rapid amortization, we do not expect that this will weaken its debt metrics.
In our opinion, a credit weakness is Los Angeles County's large pension and OPEB obligation, without a plan in place that we think will sufficiently address the obligation. Los Angeles County's combined required pension and actual OPEB contributions totaled 10.5% of total governmental fund expenditures in 2019. Of that amount, 7.0% represented required contributions to pension obligations, and 3.5% represented OPEB payments. The county made its full annual required pension contribution in 2019. The funded ratio of the pension plan is 77.2%.

County employees participate in the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Assn., a cost-sharing multiple-employer plan that includes six employers, including the county and the Los Angeles Superior Court. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board funded ratio is 77.2%, which we consider adequate, and is based on a discount rate of 7.38%, which is higher than the 7.25% national average.

We expect retirement liabilities to be a growing cost pressure due largely to a high discount rate, which puts pressure on investment returns to reduce annual contributions and could add volatility and budgetary strain. The county's actuarially determined contribution (ADC) is based on a 30-year, layered, level 3.25% of payroll amortization method, which we consider very aggressive. This method creates negative amortization, which means unfunded liabilities will likely grow in the near to medium term before large deferred contributions begin to pay it down.

We believe management is addressing the rising cost of retiree benefits. The county has been prefunding an OPEB trust for the past five years, but not at full ADC levels. The plan is under 5% funded, and the county expects to fully fund its OPEB ADC by fiscal 2028, which should increase funding over time. Until the ADC is funded, costs will continue to be deferred. Management has a multiyear plan to address the county's OPEB unfunded liability, including nominal ad hoc contributions in the past as well as liability management. After negotiations regarding new employees in 2018, dependents will no longer be included in retiree health benefits, which should reduce costs significantly, although affordability is still questionable given the continuing rapid increase to health care costs.

**Strong institutional framework**
The institutional framework score for California counties required to submit a federal single audit is strong.

**Related Research**
- Through The ESG Lens 2.0: A Deeper Dive Into U.S. Public Finance Credit Factors, April 28, 2020
- 2019 Update Of Institutional Framework For U.S. Local Governments
### Ratings Detail (As Of June 29, 2020) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty (Multi Cap Proj II)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty (MLK Hosp Proj)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Facs Inc, California</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Facs Inc (Los Angeles Cnty) (Vermont Corridor Cnty Admin Bldg)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Pub Wks Fing Auth, California</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Pub Wks Fing Auth (Los Angeles Cnty) (Master Rfdg Proj)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Pub Wks Fing Auth (Los Angeles Cnty) (Multi Cap Proj I)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Cnty Pub Wks Fing Auth (Los Angeles Cnty) (Multi Cap Proj I)</td>
<td>AA+/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenblick-Del Rio El Monte Asset Lse Corp, California</td>
<td>AA+(SPUR)/Negative</td>
<td>Outlook Revised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Many issues are enhanced by bond insurance.*

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.standardandpoors.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.