

Tax Supported New Issue

Miami-Dade County, Florida

Ratings

New Issues	
Transit System Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010A	AA-
Transit System Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010B (Federally Taxable — Build America Bonds — Direct Payment)	AA-
Outstanding Debt	
General Obligation Bonds ^a	AA
Public Service Tax Revenue Bonds (UMSA Public Improvements) ^a	AA
Special Obligation Bonds (Courthouse Center) ^a	AA-
Public Facilities Revenue Bonds (Jackson Health System) ^a	AA-
Professional Sports Franchise Facilities Tax Revenue Bonds ^a	A+
Special Obligation and Refunding Bonds	A+
Subordinate Special Obligation Bonds	A

^aRating Outlook revised to Negative from Stable on Aug. 13, 2010.

Rating Outlook

Stable

Analysts

Michael Rinaldi
+1 212 908-0833
michael.rinaldi@fitchratings.com

Vanessa Roy
+1 212 908-0508
vanessa.roy@fitchratings.com

New Issue Details

Sale Information: \$13,355,000 Transit System Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010A and \$203,905,000 Transit System Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010B (Federally Taxable — Build America Bonds — Direct Payment), Aug. 25 via negotiation.
Security: Special and limited obligations of the county, payable from and secured by a prior lien upon and pledge of the transit system sales surtax, less administrative expenses and distribution to cities within the county, hedge receipts, and federal direct payments.
Purpose: Fund transit and public works projects.
Final Maturity: July 1, 2040.

Rating Rationale

- The rating on Miami-Dade County's transit system sales surtax revenue bonds reflects the general creditworthiness of the county and a pledge of a one-half-cent sales tax levied throughout the county. Fitch Ratings expects stable pledged revenue performance and adequate coverage over the long term, supported by the county's growing population base and a broad, diverse, and internationally focused economy.
- The county's financial profile has weakened related to a severely stressed housing market and decline in economic activity; the potential for further fiscal deterioration exists should appropriate action not be taken to resolve a persisting budgetary imbalance.
- Debt ratios are expected to remain moderate given manageable non-enterprise fund borrowing plans. However, pressures exist associated with the implementation of a robust capital improvement program.

Key Rating Drivers

- Maintenance of adequate debt service coverage given the county's plans to issue a substantial amount of additional debt under this financing program, resulting in tighter overall margins and increased vulnerability to unanticipated reductions in pledged revenues at the present rating level.

Credit Summary

Miami-Dade County voters authorized the People's Transportation Plan (PTP) in November 2001. The PTP authorized the countywide imposition of a permanent one-half percent discretionary sales surtax for the purpose of funding specific transit and roadway improvements in Miami-Dade County and to cover a portion of Miami-Dade

Considerations for Taxable/Build America Bonds Investors

This sector credit profile is provided as background for investors new to the municipal market.

Local Government Special Tax Bonds

The unlimited taxing power of most local government general obligation pledges is the broadest security a U.S. local government can provide to the repayment of its long-term borrowing and, therefore, is the best indicator of its overall credit quality. The analysis of special tax bonds considers the rating the security itself can support, with the unlimited tax general obligation (ULTGO) bond rating generally serving as a rating ceiling. Special tax bonds with a broad, diverse pledged revenue stream and a strong additional bonds test can often achieve ratings on par with the ULTGO rating. Those with a narrow, concentrated, or volatile pledged revenue stream, such as a hotel tax or tax increment district revenues and/or a liberal additional bonds test, will likely be rated in the lower half of the investment-grade range.

The average local government general obligation rating is 'AA', with approximately 85% rated at or above 'AA-' and 1% rated 'BBB+' or below. The relatively high ratings on ULTGO bonds that provide the ceiling for special tax bonds reflect local governments' inherent strengths: the authority to levy property taxes, nonpayment of which can result in property foreclosures; additional taxing power that can include sales, utility, and income taxes; and essentiality of and lack of competition for services provided by local governments. Those with low investment-grade or below-investment-grade ratings generally have a combination of a limited or highly volatile economic base, high levels of long-term liabilities (including debt and post-employment benefits), and/or unusually limited financial flexibility. For additional information on these ratings, see "U.S. Local Government Tax-Supported Rating Criteria," dated Dec. 21, 2009, available on Fitch's Web site at www.fitchratings.com.

Related Research

For information on Build America Bonds, visit www.fitchratings.com/BABs.

Applicable Criteria

- [Tax-Supported Rating Criteria, Aug. 16, 2010](#)
- [U.S. Local Government Tax-Supported Rating Criteria, Dec. 21, 2009](#)

Rating History — Transit System Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds

Rating	Action	Outlook/ Watch	Date
AA–	Affirmed	Stable	8/13/10
AA–	Revised	Stable	4/30/10
A+	Affirmed	Stable	9/02/09
A+	Affirmed	Negative	6/05/08
A+	Assigned	Stable	3/28/06

Transit's (MDT) operating and maintenance costs. MDT is operated as an enterprise fund of Miami-Dade County and is the 14th largest public transit system in the U.S. and the largest transit agency in the state of Florida. MDT is responsible for the planning and provision of all public transit services in the county including but not limited to: the Metrobus fleet, connecting most areas of Miami-Dade County; Metrorail, a 22.6-mile above-ground heavy rail system; and Metromover, a 4.4-mile elevated people mover that serves the downtown central business district of Miami.

Bondholders are granted a first lien on the voter-approved transit system one-half-cent sales surtax, less an administrative fee to the state not to exceed 3% of proceeds and another 20% of proceeds distributed to cities within the county that were incorporated at the time the tax was approved. Pledged revenues are projected to grow by 0.8% in fiscal 2010 to \$139.3 million, resulting in 2.1x coverage of MADS following issuance (excluding the BABs subsidy). The county has identified approximately \$1.48 billion in additional transit financing needs through 2016 which, if issued as parity debt, would lower coverage to 1.22x by fiscal 2020 based on revenue assumptions of 1% growth in fiscal 2011, 3% in fiscal 2012, and 5% per year thereafter. Fitch views the revenue assumptions cautiously and will monitor the county's ability to manage coverage to the 1.5x additional bonds test (ABT) threshold, as the ability to scale back issuance plans is somewhat limited according to officials.

The county's financial profile has weakened since closing fiscal 2007 with an unreserved general fund balance totaling \$183.8 million, or 8.4% of spending. Net deficits aggregating \$108.1 million were reported in fiscal years 2008 and 2009, resulting in an unreserved fund balance totaling \$90.8 million, or 4.2% of spending, entering fiscal 2010. Officials anticipate drawing the unreserved fund balance to approximately \$70 million in fiscal 2010. A \$36 million cash carryover balance from fiscal 2010, which is reported as a subset of the unreserved fund balance, is appropriated into the fiscal 2011 budget. In addition, the fiscal 2011 budget relies on one-time transfers of \$25.1 million from the water and sewer utility and \$12 million from excess liability trust fund balances. The county's financial forecast identifies general fund deficits totaling \$115 million in fiscal 2012 and \$152 million in fiscal 2013. Fitch believes that budget imbalances, while more modest than prior-year gaps, will prove even more challenging to close given the magnitude of budget cuts enacted to date and the strain on financial resources related to declines in taxable value and economic activity.

Fiscal resources are largely pressured by events in the housing market and global economy. General fund revenues are budgeted at \$1.66 billion in fiscal 2011, which would represent a 3.5% decline on the year and a reduction of 13%, or nearly \$250 million, since fiscal 2007. The county is prudently proposing a 12.8% tax increase to a relatively high 8.35 mills in order to mitigate a 13.4% decline in the preliminary tax roll for fiscal 2011. Management believes the reduction in the final tax roll will not be as severe, which would produce a favorable revenue variance to the general fund. Fitch will monitor the county's ability to adopt the rollback or revenue-neutral tax rate going forward given the general fund's large dependence on property taxes and expectation for additional tax base declines. Housing sales activity has reportedly gained some momentum driven by the federal tax credit and much-improved affordability, but near-term recovery seems unlikely given that foreclosures are very high, and the number of properties filing for foreclosure continues to grow at a rate faster than the already-high state average.

The proposed fiscal 2011 budget eliminates an estimated imbalance of more than \$400 million, bringing the number of countywide budget cuts to more than \$1 billion over the past four years. Management has implemented a number of recurring expenditure reductions, including an employee contribution to the cost of the county's

health insurance program equal to 5% of pay and elimination of 2,980 positions since 2007. The number of current funded positions will decline to 27,414, the lowest figure in more than a decade. The fiscal 2010 general fund budget per capita (adjusted for inflation) was the lowest sum dating back to fiscal 1993. According to officials, the budget has been trimmed to a point that leaves little future flexibility or room to cut without impacting the level of service presently provided. Capital spending provides some latitude for management, with nearly \$200 million in pay-as-you-go spending included in the proposed fiscal 2011 budget countywide.

Fitch also notes potential expenditure pressure related to the Public Health Trust (the trust). The trust is an enterprise fund of the county responsible for the operation, governance, and maintenance of several primary care centers and clinics, most notably the Jackson Memorial Hospital. The trust is experiencing significant financial strain as it struggles to balance its mission as a safety net hospital against declining resources resulting from the deterioration of the economy and an increase in nonpaying patients and bad debts. The county's legal financial commitment is defined and currently manageable. The proposed fiscal 2011 budget includes a maintenance of effort (MOE) contribution to the trust totaling \$132.7 million, or approximately 8% of spending. The county does not expect to extend any additional financial support to the trust; however, further fiscal deterioration of the trust could exacerbate the county's current budget problems and will be monitored closely by Fitch.

Fitch expects debt levels will remain moderate. Management continues to respond to the downturn in the economy and weakened revenue environment by revising its capital plans, though future needs remain significant. The fiscal 2011–2016 capital improvement plan (CIP) totals \$21.1 billion. Debt is identified as the funding source for more than 80% of the CIP, though a total of \$8.8 billion has already been funded from prior year's issuances. Furthermore, a large portion of the CIP is dedicated to various self-supporting enterprise fund units, with manageable additional non-enterprise fund borrowing anticipated.

The county plans to issue \$2.2 billion in authorized unissued GO bonds associated with the Building Better Communities bond program, approved by voters in 2004, over the next 13 years, including approximately \$200 million in fiscal 2011.

Miami-Dade County is the leading center of trade in the southeastern U.S., benefiting from an extensive transportation network and proximity to the Caribbean, Mexico, and Central and South America. The recovery of Latin American economies could potentially provide a boost to trade, tourism, and retail sales in the region. Trade activity and jobs are down since the onset of the recession, but the sector is still viewed as a long-term source of sustainable economic activity for the region. The Port of Miami and Miami International Airport (MIA) are major cargo and transportation hubs. Recent passenger traffic trends at MIA are notably impressive given the reduction in traffic and capacity seen at many other U.S. airports since the middle of 2008. Capital expansions and renovations are underway that should enhance the overall competitive profile of each facility. The Miami Intermodal Center is a massive ground transportation hub located

Debt Statistics

(\$000)

This Issue	217,260
Outstanding Tax-Supported and Non-Ad Valorem Debt	4,150,165
Direct Debt	4,367,425
Overlapping Debt	2,560,495
Overall Net Debt	6,927,920

Debt Ratios

Direct Debt Per Capita (\$) ^a	1,747
As % of Market Value ^b	1.4
Overall Debt Per Capita (\$) ^a	2,770
As % of Market Value ^b	2.2

^aPopulation: 2,500,625 (2009). ^bMarket value: \$316,832,474,000 (estimated fiscal 2010). Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

next to MIA and scheduled for completion in 2012 that will provide interconnectivity throughout the South Florida region and relieve traffic congestion. At the Port of Miami, construction of a \$600 million tunnel, expected to be complete by spring 2014, will improve access to and from the port, linking with the MacArthur Causeway and I-395. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Miami-Dade employment base grew by 0.8%, or more than 9,000 jobs, during the 12 months ended May 2010, led by gains in the education and health services sector. However, the rate of job growth has not kept pace with labor force gains; as a result, the unemployment rate continues to rise, reaching a high 12.3% in May. Wealth levels are below average when compared to those of the state and nation, and the county has an above-average number of individuals living below the poverty line.

General Fund Financial Summary

(\$000, Audited Years Ended Sept. 30)

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Property Taxes	1,110,992	1,286,643	1,223,371	1,262,973
Other Taxes	220,662	232,582	193,207	175,936
Licenses and Permits	94,609	80,856	112,950	106,217
Fines and Forfeits	13,078	14,357	12,066	11,877
Charges For Services	265,114	261,639	237,373	233,607
Intergovernmental	227,416	224,229	230,478	204,635
Other Revenue	85,847	114,882	107,494	97,867
Total General Fund Revenue	2,017,718	2,215,188	2,116,939	2,093,112
Total General Fund Expenditures	1,465,987	1,628,967	1,645,169	1,637,145
Net Transfers and Other	(458,886)	(550,097)	(512,786)	(523,013)
Net Income/(Deficit)	92,845	36,124	(41,016)	(67,046)
Total General Fund Balance	369,415	404,889	365,187	300,168
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out, and Other Uses	18.8	18.4	16.8	13.8
Unreserved General Fund Balance	158,525	183,838	124,723	90,756
As % of Expenditures, Transfers Out, and Other Uses	8.1	8.4	5.7	4.2

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: [HTTP://FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](http://FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS). IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM. PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE.

Copyright © 2010 by Fitch, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. One State Street Plaza, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion is based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at anytime for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of Great Britain, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.