

## SPECIAL COMMENT

Rate this Research



# Century Bonds Create Opportunities and Challenges for US Public Infrastructure Issuers

---

**Table of Contents:**

MANDATED PROJECTS MAKE ULTRA LONG-TERM DEBT ATTRACTIVE TO SOME INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUERS	2
CENTURY BONDS TRADE NEAR-TERM DEFERRAL OF RATE INCREASES AND RECOVERY OF CAPITAL INVESTMENT COSTS FOR GREATER LONG-TERM DEBT COSTS	2
CENTURY BONDS ISSUANCE RARE AMONG INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUERS BUT HAS SEEN GREATER USE IN CORPORATE AND HIGHER EDUCATION SECTORS	3
MOODY'S RELATED RESEARCH	4

---

**Analyst Contacts:**

NEW YORK	+1.212.553.1653
----------	-----------------

Nicholas Samuels	+1.212.553.7121
<i>Vice President - Senior Credit Officer</i>	
nicholas.samuels@moodys.com	

Timothy Blake	+1.212.553.0849
<i>Managing Director - Public Finance</i>	
timothy.blake@moodys.com	

---

US public sector infrastructure agencies create near-term opportunities and long-term credit challenges when issuing bonds with maturities as long as 100 years, known as “century bonds”. These issuers oversee substantial long-lived infrastructure assets such as water/sewer systems, bridges and roads and generate predictable cash flow but typically have modest balance sheets. Century bonds can provide near-term operating flexibility by pushing out debt repayment costs but in the long-term increase overall debt costs and weaken other debt metrics. Only a few infrastructure issuers have borrowed at such long maturities, but historically low long-term interest rates provide opportunity for more to do so. Other types of issuers with different credit profiles, such as universities and global corporations, more regularly issue century bonds.

- » **A few infrastructure issuers have used century bonds and others may be attracted to the concept of matching long-lived assets with similarly long-dated debt.** The District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water, Aa2/stable) and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Aa3/stable) have issued century bonds. Other infrastructure issuers financing large capital projects, perhaps resulting from regulatory mandates, may find spreading the costs over as long as 100 years especially appealing.
- » **Infrastructure issuers using century bonds defer user fee increases and delay recovery of capital costs compared to traditional debt structures.** These issuers face public scrutiny when raising user fees, so they may be challenged to generate sufficient revenue to sustain debt service coverage and recoup costs for large capital programs within traditional recovery periods. By issuing century bonds they can spread the cost of long-lived assets over a much longer period compared to traditional 30 year bonds. This has near-term benefits for debt service coverage but increases overall debt costs and skews other credit measures such as debt to revenue and debt payout ratio. The credit impact on an infrastructure issuer will likely be modest when century bonds are a small share of total debt.
- » **Century bonds issuance has been greater among universities and corporations.** Universities with substantial endowments have issued the most century bonds in recent years, taking advantage of their ultra-long investing horizon and ability to service debt from balance sheet earnings without resorting to operating cash flow. Large corporations with global brands and perceived staying power, have also issued century bonds.

## Mandated projects make ultra long-term debt attractive to some infrastructure issuers

The capital spending needs of certain infrastructure sectors, especially the water/sewer sector, can be driven by regulatory mandates. The long-term capital spending plans of these issuers may include projects agreed to as part of consent decrees reached with a regulatory body to settle environmental regulatory disputes. These legal settlements resolve litigation between a regulated entity and a regulator seeking to enforce environmental rules. Depending on their size and scope, mandated projects can reflect the majority of an issuer's capital spending; this is sometimes true for a period of years because consent decrees often require that projects be completed within a certain timeframe.

The added costs of these projects and in some cases their unique nature has led some issuers to seek innovative ways to finance them to mitigate their financial impact. One recent example is DC Water. In July, it sold a \$350 million century bond to help finance a part of the \$2.6 billion consent decree mandated Clean Rivers Project, a series of tunnels designed to capture combined sewer overflows (CSOs) during storms or other periods of flooding and hold them until DC Water's Blue Plains Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant has the capacity to treat them. Storing the CSOs will help reach the goal of the consent decree: preventing them from being discharged into the Potomac and Anacostia rivers during times when the Blue Plains plant is above capacity.

Mandated projects reflect 41% of DC Water's capital plan, and the tunnel project is different from DC Water's typical repair and replacement capital needs. The authority's engineers and an independent engineering study showed the tunnels are designed for at least a 100-year useful life. DC Water sought to both match the useful life of the asset with the debt and to reduce its near-term financing costs by issuing the century bonds, which pay interest only for 90 years and then sinking fund deposits in the final ten years. Ample investor demand allowed DC Water to both increase the deal's size from the planned \$300 million and reduce the bonds' yield from its original assumptions.

## Century bonds trade near-term deferral of rate increases and recovery of capital investment costs for greater long-term debt costs

The issuance of ultra long-dated debt such as century bonds by infrastructure issuers defers rate increases or cost reductions in the near to medium term, which runs counter to a key credit strength of infrastructure enterprises: the ability and willingness to raise rates to recover costs of operating and investing in the system. From an operating perspective, a century bond issuer gains flexibility by deferring debt service costs far into the future. Delaying or reducing the size of rate increases also provides political relief from rate payers weary of consecutive years of higher charges.

From a longer-term perspective, adding century bonds to a debt portfolio can weaken an issuer's flexibility and raise long-run costs. Compared to a traditional 30-35 year amortization for an infrastructure issuer, a 100-year structure more than triples the total debt service costs. Depending on the amount of ultra-long dated debt issued, the impact on annual coverage ratios can be minimal. However, the adverse affect on other flexibility metrics such as debt to revenue and debt payout ratio is more significant since century bonds generally are issued as interest only until late in the debt service schedule.

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](http://www.moodys.com) for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

Our analysis includes comparison of existing debt service coverage and estimated coverage if the proposed century bond was issued with a traditional amortization. Borrowers with larger proportions of their outstanding debt issued as century bonds gain more debt service relief (see Exhibit). Examining the impact on coverage if that debt was issued with a shorter maturity indicates the extent to which the issuer's near-term financial position is strained by their capital needs. Because management will turn over many times during the life of a century bond, we also consider the issuer's overall management and governance, its debt policies and how they address long-dated debt. Broader use of century bonds by an infrastructure issuer could indicate decreased ability and willingness to raise rates to meet expenditure needs, even with good debt management policies in place.

## EXHIBIT 1

**Century Bonds Create Opportunities and Challenges for US Public Infrastructure Issuers**

	90% Amortizing/10% Century Bonds	100% Amortizing/0% Century Bonds	70% Amortizing/30% Century Bonds
Debt Service Coverage	1.20x	1.12x	1.52x

### Century bonds issuance rare among infrastructure issuers but has seen greater use in corporate and higher education sectors

Only two US infrastructure enterprises have issued century bonds to date: DC Water this year and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in 1994. The US higher education sector has issued century bonds more frequently, with approximately \$3.8 billion sold since 1996. Leading institutions in the higher education sector, such as Yale University (Aaa/stable) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Aaa/stable), possess large endowments far in excess of their debt obligations. The investment horizon of these large endowment is ultra long-term, effectively seeking to maintain their balance sheets and services in perpetuity. They are also perceived to have strong national and global reputations that will maintain demand for their services over the long-term. Their strong balance sheets are not a typical feature of infrastructure issuers. Recently, the Cleveland Clinic Health System (Aa2/stable) issued a \$400 million century bond, the first one for a US not-for-profit healthcare issuer.

Century bonds have also been issued in the US by the Coca-Cola Company (Aa3/stable), the Walt Disney Company (A2/stable), Norfolk Southern Corp. (Baa1/stable) and a number of other corporate issuers. The relatively broader use of century bonds by these issuers demonstrates strong appetite among institutional investors for ultra-long term bonds for well-known industry leaders perceived as strong and stable credits.

## Moody's Related Research

### Credit Focus:

- » [Cleveland Clinic: Reputation and Investments Mitigate Risks of Century Bonds, September 2014 \(175252\)](#)

### Special Comments:

- » [US Universities Capitalize on Credit Strengths and Low Yields with Century Bonds, July 2013 \(156746\)](#)
- » [Most US Sewer Utilities Can Weather Costs of Federal EPA Consent Decrees, June 2014 \(171695\)](#)

To access any of these reports, click on the entry above. Note that these references are current as of the date of publication of this report and that more recent reports may be available. All research may not be available to all clients.

Rate this Research



Report Number: 176188

**Author**  
Nicholas Samuels

**Production Associate**  
Masaki Shiomi

© 2014 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. ("MIS") AND ITS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S 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. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S 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. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT 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 AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO CONSIDER MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS IN MAKING ANY 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 WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

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 the Moody's 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 SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, 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 MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at [www.moody.com](http://www.moody.com) under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

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 61 003 399 657 AFSL 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 clients. It would be dangerous for "retail clients" to make any investment decision based on MOODY'S credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.