

The Option Value of Municipal Liquidity: Evidence from Federal Lending Cutoffs during COVID-19

Andrew Haughwout, Ben Hyman, Or Shachar


Federal Reserve Bank of New York

July 29, 2021


NBER Summer Institute

Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, or the Federal Reserve System.

COVID-19 Effects on State & Local Budgeting




COVID-19 Effects on State & Local Budgeting




- Shutdowns induced unexpected income shock → *Decline* in Revenue & Assessments

COVID-19 Effects on State & Local Budgeting



- Shutdowns induced unexpected income shock → *Decline* in Revenue & Assessments
- Federal tax deadline extension to July 15 → *Delay* in Revenue ($Q_{STmunis}^s \uparrow$)



COVID-19 Effects on State & Local Budgeting



- Shutdowns induced unexpected income shock → *Decline* in Revenue & Assessments
- Federal tax deadline extension to July 15 → *Delay* in Revenue ($Q_{STmunis}^s \uparrow$)
- Investor flight to liquidity and quality → *Frozen* muni mrkts ($Q_{STmunis}^d \rightarrow 0$)

Muni Market Turmoil by Tenor & Credit Rating



- ST & LT yields spiked with crisis: (1) investor sell-off for liquidity; (2) illiquid positions required compensation for uncertain credit downgrade risk → both costly for new issuance



Source: Bloomberg, originally calculated in Cipriani et al. (June, 29, 2020)

Muni Market Turmoil and the Real Economy

- New primary issuance came to historical standstill, mirroring secondary market pricing before mean reverting. Public sector employment dropped sharply, but **remained low**
 - Big deal for sector with $\sim 20\text{m}$ employees, $\sim 11\%$ of GDP, $\sim \$3.8$ trillion muni debt



Source: *Left*: Bloomberg, originally calculated in Cipriani et al. (June, 29, 2020); *Right*: CES (FRED), Seasonally Adjusted through May '21

This Paper: Option Value of Municipal Liquidity

- **Research Questions:**

1. *Program Evaluation*: Did the Municipal Liquidity Facility (MLF) help restore muni market liquidity, and to what extent did this impact S&L gov. issuance and hiring (recall) decisions?
2. *Academic*: Can we learn the extent to which municipalities are liquidity vs. credit constrained by randomly providing liquidity option to differently rated issuers when distressed?
 - Neutral response across the ratings distribution \implies relaxed liquidity constraint
 - Greater response lower on distribution \implies additional credit-risk sharing channel





- **Methodology:**

- Estimate **option value of access** to Municipal Liquidity Facility (MLF) by ratings bin using lending eligibility cutoffs in **regression discontinuity**—cities >250k, counties >500k
 - Bond yield effects estimate *investor-perceived* value of last-resort lending
 - Public sector hiring effects reflect *government-perceived* value of last-resort lending

Background: 3 Key Muni Market Interventions in 2020

- **March 23:** Money Market Mutual Fund Liquidity Facility (MMLF) expands to include municipal variable rate demands note (VRDN) collateral after record muni outflows (\$45b sell-off)
- **April 9:** Municipal Liquidity Facility (MLF) announced with \$35b UST initial equity investment (appropriated via CARES) as backstop for max \$500b lending of *short-term* muni notes (TANs, RANs, TRANs, BANs) for cash flow management (13(3) Special Purpose Vehicle)
 - *Eligible issuers:* states, cities > 1m pop, counties > 2m in pop, under 2-yr maturities priced at penalty to private mkt index by rating. “Downstreaming” s.t. state legislative approval.
 - \$2.3 trillion relief package same day: PPP, Main Street Lending, Corp Credit Facilities, TALF
- **April 27:** MLF eligibility expanded to **cities > 250k** pop, **counties > 500k** pop, up to 3-yr maturities, minimum pre-COVID and at-issuance rating by issuer type, thorough Dec 31, 2020
 - *Extensions:* MLF pricing grid announced (May 11); expansion to 2 revenue bond issuers (RBIs) and 2 additional cities/counties per state (June 3); pricing grid lowered (Aug 11)

MLF Cutoffs: Chosen to “Prioritize Speed to Announcement and Execution”



Data: Linking MSRB Trades and QCEW to Census Populations

- **Data linking steps:**


1. Bloomberg issuer lists by gov type (city/county), including issuer name, 6-digit BaseCUSIP
2. MSRB secondary market active trades: yields, prices, issuer names; Mergent bond characteristics and untraded primary issuance (linked by 9-digit CUSIP)
3. Census Bureau populations to determine MLF-eligibility: issuer names and populations (cities: '18; counties: '19); involved cleaning for places < 50,000 population
4. S&P, Moody's, Fitch, Bb monthly bond ratings (aggregated to issuer w/ plurality rules)
5. QCEW monthly local government employees by county (May '21 revision)

- **After sample restrictions:**


- City/County Linked Yields Sample: Jan 1, 2019 to Nov 20, 2020 (full sample)
 - 2,857,105 trades, 195,926 bonds, 8,042 unique issuers
- Smallest Yields Subset (Low-rated (A & BBB) city/county, post-MLF):
 - 94,104 trades, 7,207 bonds, 758 issuers; 8.3% bonds within 100k of cutoff

Variation in City/County Yields by Ratings, 100k around Cutoff


Ratings dist:



High-Rated (AAA & AA):



Low-Rated (A & BBB):



- Stronger effects for low rated (max 100bp spread!); strongest for BBB [A vs. BBB](#) [Issuer List](#)
- Low-rated *eligible* decline mimics high-rated recovery; *ineligible* tracks agg. BBB distress
- These yields largely comprise LT bonds \implies ST to LT transmission; **how?**
 - One channel: ST notes applied to GO debt servicing if operating budget statutorily fungible

Regression Discontinuity Design around MLF Eligibility Cutoff

$$Y_{n(bi)t} = \alpha + \beta_t * \mathbb{1}(pop \geq cutoff)_i + \gamma_t * (pop - cutoff)_i + \delta_t * \mathbb{1}(pop \geq cutoff)_i * (pop - cutoff)_i + \mathbf{X}_{bit} + \varepsilon_{n(bi)t} \quad (1)$$

- $Y \in \{\text{yields, Pr(primary issuance), Pr(credit downgrade), } \Delta \text{ public sector employment}\}$
- Sample $\in \{\text{cities, counties, pooled}\} \times \{\text{High-Rated (Jan 2020), Low-Rated (Jan 2020)}\}$
- Trade n , Bond b , Issuer i , period $t \in \{\text{pre-23mar20; post-27apr20; dynamic (bi-weekly)}\}$
- 2-sided IMSE-optimal bandwidth, triangular kernel, non-param 1st order poly (Calonico et al., 2014)
- Preferred specification: state & month FEs for precision (not required for ID)
- Employment uses **differenced RD** design to overcome data limitations IMSE Simulation Kernel Weights

RD Balance Test in Placebo Period (no controls)

	Discontinuity	Standard Error	Control Mean	N (IMSE-bwdth)
Coupon Rate (b.p.)	-23.37	17.53	435.36	99,073
Security Price (per 100 par)	-1.97	1.12	109.95	109,817
Current Yield (b.p.)	-6.13	16.23	185.81	70,569
Δ Yield (Feb20-Jan20)	-0.03	0.05	-0.10	66,349
Δ Yield YoY (Jan20-Jan19)	-0.23	0.20	-0.94	54,808
Δ Yield YoY (Feb20-Feb19)	0.04	0.11	-1.01	53,284
Amount Outstanding (MM)	-19.40	191.01	474.46	90,172
Maturity Size (MM)	11.99	268.49	708.56	88,918
Tenor of Bond (Years)	0.35	0.90	12.89	111,383
Remaining Duration of Bond (Years)	-0.20	0.86	8.26	96,340
Market Share of Issuer	0.03	0.10	0.18	91,623
Number of Securities by Issuer	-29.78	43.29	228.10	129,872
Par Traded of Bond (1000s)	38.40	35.91	91.70	94,622
S&P Ratings (1-7 scale)	0.08	0.14	5.60	89,519
Moody's Ratings (1-7 scale)	0.13	0.18	5.72	87,454
Fitch Ratings (1-7 scale)	-0.03	0.17	5.69	74,930
Time of Day of Trade (minute)	10.62**	4.85	768.33	101,467



RD Effects Constrained to Low-Rated Issuers

	Discontinuity	Standard Error	Control Mean	N (IMSE-bwdth)
a. Pooled Post:				
Current Yield (Overall)	-19.26	19.51	156.77	187,976
City Only	-27.97	25.59	172.03	91,628
County Only	-15.06	23.74	134.06	53,874
High-Rated (AAA & AA)	-1.54	7.66	124.97	178,256
Low-Rated (A & BBB)	-72.28**	33.05	305.73	38,299
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):				
Current Yield (Overall)	-13.25	12.17	194.13	70,569
City Only	-9.13	12.16	196.30	32,853
County Only	-21.61	19.17	191.88	28,325
High-Rated (AAA & AA)	-6.15	7.86	177.44	67,169
Low-Rated (A & BBB)	-24.87	21.45	263.11	12,756

Effects on current yields (in b.p.), pooled in pre and post periods by subgroup. RD estimates from MSRB active trades, Jan 1 2020 - Nov 20 2020. Each row corresponds to separate regression with yield as dep. variable, and state and month FEs. Standard errors clustered by population relative to cutoff. Control Mean is value just left of relative population 0. IMSE-optimal bandwidths calculated separately on each side of cutoff with triangular kernel weights. Sample sizes vary with bandwidth. *** $p \leq 0.01$, ** $p \leq 0.05$, * $p \leq 0.1$.

Sensitivity to Controls

Yields RD Plots Over Running Variable, by Ratings




- Invariant to composition controls: GO/RB, Refi, tax-adjustment assumptions (TAXSIM), maturity size, amt outstanding, tenor length, remaining duration

Dynamic RDs


Placebo RDs

Effects on Cumulative Primary Issuance

(a) Cumulative New Issuance Overall



(b) Cumulative New Issuance, A & BBB




- Only 5 A/BBB issuers in post, but stat. significant and consistent sign w/ yields
- Secondary Mrkt LT Yields → Primary Mrkt New Issuance


[New Issue Seasonality](#)
[Shares](#)
[RD Table](#)

First Difference Modification for Employment RD Effects


(a) County-Only: Salt Lake Cnty, UT



(b) City-Only: Lincoln, NE



(c) Both: KC & Jackson Cnty, MO



- We exclude type (b) counties, compare (a) & (c) vs. neither-treated types (not shown)
- To extent that this breaks RD randomization, we focus on year-on-year first differences


RD Effects on Public Sector Employment

	Emp. (1)	Emp. (2)	Δ Emp. (3)	Δ Emp. (4)	% Δ Emp. (5)	% Δ Emp. (6)	N (fixed-bwidth)
a. Pooled Post:							
Overall Employment	-477 (1,016)	323 (1,854)	325 (239)	297 (223)	1.19 (0.96)	1.18 (0.83)	945
– Goods Employment	-42 (63)	-49 (37)	1 (5)	2 (5)	2.61 (3.85)	3.93 (4.27)	248
– Services Employment	-412 (1,134)	-666 (2,001)	422* (238)	517** (242)	1.61 (1.00)	1.69** (0.85)	711
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):							
Overall Employment	-828 (1,042)	189 (1,995)	53 (84)	58 (82)	0.23 (0.41)	0.26 (0.37)	946
– Goods Employment	-44 (64)	-51 (38)	-1 (3)	-1 (3)	-0.38 (2.23)	0.51 (2.76)	248
– Services Employment	-762 (1,128)	-896 (2,188)	41 (98)	26 (93)	0.10 (0.50)	0.04 (0.41)	712
Month FEs		X					
State FEs		X		X		X	
Control Mean (post): Overall Employment	18,835	13,346	-1,717	-1,259	-8.06	-8.13	
Control Mean (post): Goods Employment	162	127	-7	-5	-6.44	-7.16	
Control Mean (post): Services Employment	18,506	14,054	-1,674	-1,349	-7.96	-8.58	


- *Post*: May & June; *Pre*: Jan & Feb; Control mean = mean emp. loss just left of cutoff

Employment RD Plots

(a) Δ Overall Employment Post-MLF




(b) Δ Services Employment Post-MLF




- May and June year-on-year estimates (2020 - 2019) pooled together here

RD Employment Effects by Month




- School-year effects pattern: *Education and Health Services* recalls despite shutdowns

RD Employment Effects by Month and Ratings



- School-year effects pattern: *Education and Health Services* recalls despite shutdowns
- Sustained in the long run, but only for *high* rated governments \implies over-cautious furloughs


RD Employment Effects by Month and Ratings




- School-year effects pattern: *Education and Health Services* recalls despite shutdowns
- Sustained in the long run, but only for *high* rated governments \implies over-cautious furloughs
- April 12 effects point to CARES not MLF; further supported by:
 - (1) Decomposition Test
 - (2) Yields RD at MLF-only cutoff
 - (3) Employment RD at MLF-only cutoff

MLF vs. CARES Dosage Response Decomposition: Realized Caps

(a) MLF Lending Caps (20% of OSGUR)




(b) CARES Aid CRF Allocation




OSGUR: Own-Source Generated and Utility Revenue, 2017 Census of Governments

MLF vs. CARES Dosage Response Decomposition: Counterfactual Caps

(a) MLF Lending Caps (20% of OSGUR)



(b) CARES Aid CRF Allocation



OSGUR: Own-Source Generated and Utility Revenue, 2017 Census of Governments

$$Y_{gt} = \alpha + \beta_{1t} * \mathbb{1}(pop \geq cutoff)_g + \beta_{2t} * \mathbb{1}(pop \geq cutoff)_g \widehat{OSGUR20}_g + \gamma_t * (pop - cutoff)_g \quad (2)$$

$$+ \delta_t * \mathbb{1}(pop \geq cutoff)_g (pop - cutoff)_g + \phi_t * \widehat{OSGUR20}_g + \mathbf{X}_{st} + \varepsilon_{gt}$$

Results

Robustness and Sensitivity Checks

- Credit-risk sharing mechanism:

- Asset Price Spreads Decomposition

- Placebo tests and sensitivity to controls:

- Full Baseline Summary Stats (incl. 2019)
- Dynamic RDs
- Separate Effects for A and BBB
- Yields Sensitivity Table

- Manipulation and other policies:

- Placebo RDs
- McCrary/Fransden Manipulation Tests
- CARES Act Aid Notch - Yields
- Choice of Cutoffs Quote

- Alternative specifications:

- Cumulative Primary Issuance as Share of Bonds
- Cumulative Credit Downgrades as Share of Bonds

- Composition:

- New Issue Seasonality
- GO/RB Trends
- Issuer List w/in 100k of Cutoff

Discussion and Remaining Puzzles


- Muni market outcomes likely would have been worse absent emergency liquidity interventions:
 - Improved overall market functioning (liquidity) → new debt issuance with facility access
 - Large S&L employee recalls: roughly 25% to 30% of year-on-year loss. High responsiveness during shutdowns and for least distressed → S&L over-cautious furloughs ([Sheiner, 2021](#))
- MLF-eligible credit-risk sharing “explains” aggregate LT wedge between BBB’s & high-rated. Given potential credit-risk sharing role, when is this a socially efficient policy intervention?
 - Externalities, multipliers, complementarities (e.g. public goods), welfare weights...
 - Inefficient risk sharing (home tax bias) ([Porterba \(1989\)](#); [Babina et al. \(2015\)](#); [Schwert \(2017\)](#))
- **Take-up puzzle:** Why only \$6.56b (Illinois x2 and MTA x2) of \$500b cap taken up?
 - Does high, non-linear penalty pricing incentivize lower rated issuers only? [Pricing Grid](#)

Appendix


Manipulation Tests

- McCrary (2008) tests using Cattaneo et al. (2019) local polynomial density method:

(a) City Issuers:




(b) County Issuers:




- Frandsen (2017) discrete running variable p-values: 0.967 (cities) and 0.388 (counties).

Separate Means for A and BBB-Rated Bonds

(a) A-Rated Issuers in Jan 2020:



(b) BBB-Rated Issuers in Jan 2020:



[Back](#)

[Back → Robustness](#)


Low-Rated Issuers (A/BBB) within 100k of MLF Cutoff

Issuer Name	State	Issuer Type	No. CUSIPs	MLF
Newark (1)	NJ	Local	89	1
Newark (2)	NJ	Local	8	1
Buffalo	NY	Local	81	1
Toledo	OH	Local	73	1
Irvine (1)	CA	Local	37	1
Irvine (2)	CA	Local	35	1
Reno	NV	Local	27	1
St. Paul	MN	Local	25	1
St. Louis (1)	MO	Local	22	1
St. Louis (2)	MO	Local	6	1
Reno (1)	NV	Local	16	1
Reno (2)	NV	Local	1	1
Summit County (1)	OH	County	58	1
Summit County (2)	OH	County	13	1
Lincoln	NE	Local	9	1
Montgomery County	OH	County	8	1
Pasco County	FL	County	4	1
Volusia County	FL	County	2	1
Riverside	CA	Local	1	1
Anne Arundel County	MD	County	1	1

Issuer Name	State	Issuer Type	No. CUSIPs	MLF
Providence (1)	RI	Local	15	0
Providence (2)	RI	Local	5	0
North Las Vegas (1)	NV	Local	34	0
North Las Vegas (2)	NV	Local	7	0
Shreveport	LA	Local	31	0
Lucas County	OH	County	29	0
Irving	TX	Local	28	0
Little Rock	AR	Local	10	0
Hollywood	FL	Local	9	0
Macon Bibb County	GA	Local	8	0
Overland Park	KS	Local	7	0
Escondido	CA	Local	4	0
Fontana	CA	Local	2	0
Modesto	CA	Local	2	0
Tacoma	WA	Local	2	0
Palmdale	CA	Local	1	0
Aurora	IL	Local	1	0
Pembroke Pines	FL	Local	24	0
Akron	OH	Local	22	0
Macon Bibb County	GA	Local	21	0
East Baton Rouge Parish	LA	County	20	0
Salinas	CA	Local	19	0
Cameron County	TX	County	14	0

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

Kernel Weights for Low-Rated Yield Estimation in Post Period




Sensitivity to Controls, Effects on A/BBB Yields





	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
a. Pooled Post:												
Current Yield (Overall)	-9.88	-11.13	-11.24	-18.51	-16.17	-19.26	-20.60	-19.53	-19.97	-20.46	-21.15	-20.18
City Only	-13.26	-13.79	-13.85	-25.46	-24.38	-27.97	-30.63	-28.14	-27.13	-26.72	-25.74	-23.18
County Only	-19.81	-21.99	-21.95	-12.73	-11.11	-15.06	-12.79	-15.58	-13.69	-13.43	-15.46	-20.23
High-Rated (AAA & AA)	4.36	4.44	4.50	-1.06	0.43	-1.54	-2.97	-1.73	-1.37	-1.96	-7.77	-6.75
Low-Rated (A & BBB)	-121.90***	-121.27***	-121.06***	-69.87**	-69.78**	-72.28**	-73.81**	-72.91**	-62.92*	-64.86**	-57.04*	-53.21*
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):												
Current Yield (Overall)	-6.13	-6.81	-6.95	-14.59	-12.99	-13.25	-13.52	-14.64	-13.50	-13.61	-11.73	-11.23
City Only	-1.20	-1.31	-1.30	-8.12	-7.89	-9.13	-9.34	-10.92	-8.05	-7.89	-5.37	-4.91
County Only	-24.49	-26.48	-26.81	-24.05	-22.29	-21.61	-19.84	-19.46	-20.23	-20.42	-22.40	-24.29
High-Rated (AAA & AA)	1.68	1.85	2.16	-5.94	-5.10	-6.15	-6.66	-5.70	-5.76	-5.93	-7.11	-5.68
Low-Rated (A & BBB)	-56.58**	-54.88**	-54.90**	-21.62	-23.20	-24.87	-25.87	-31.43	-16.19	-18.88	-21.73	-20.54
Fed. Tax Adjust		X	X	X								
St. & Fed. Tax Adjust			X	X								
State FE				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Month FE						X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Revenue/GO Bond							X					
Day/Week of Trade								X				
Maturity Size									X			
Amount Outstanding										X		
Tenor Length											X	
Duration												X
Sample Restrictions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

RD Dynamic Effects on Yields

[Back](#)[Back → Robustness](#)

Yields and Employment Placebo RD Plots




Placebo period: Jan. 1 to Mar. 23, 2020

[Back → Robustness](#)

[Back → Yield RD](#)


[Back → Employment RD](#)

2019 Seasonality in Primary Issuance




RD Effects on Primary Issuance: Cumulative Shares

(a) Cumulative New Issuance Overall



(b) Cumulative New Issuance, A & BBB



- Note: imbalanced panel results in non-monotonicity increasing.

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

RD Effects on Primary Issuance Probability


	Discontinuity	Standard Error	Control Mean	N (Fixed-bwdth)
a. Pooled Post:				
Prob(CUSIP Issued in 27apr-20nov), Overall	0.08**	0.04	0.11	83,100
Prob(CUSIP Issued in 27apr-20nov), A & BBB	0.25**	0.11	-0.08	7,753
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):				
Prob(CUSIP Issued in 01jan-23mar), Overall	0.07**	0.03	0.02	45,451
Prob(CUSIP Issued in 01jan-23mar), A & BBB	0.11	0.08	-0.10	3,977

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

MLF vs. CARES Dosage Response Decomposition: Results

	YoY Level Changes			YoY Percent Changes		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Constant	-1473.0*** (200.3)	-1417.2*** (192.3)	-1412.3*** (180.0)	-10.09*** (0.715)	-9.967*** (0.665)	-9.400*** (0.538)
1(pop ≥ cutoff)	620.3* (266.3)	554.0* (272.2)	531.9* (261.2)	3.021** (0.930)	2.959** (0.933)	2.168** (0.810)
1(pop ≥ cutoff)* $\widehat{OSGUR20}$	-0.678 (1.408)			-0.0110 (0.00747)		
1(pop ≥ cutoff)* $\widehat{OSGUR20} / CARES$		39.88 (91.57)			0.143 (0.286)	
1(pop ≥ cutoff)* $\widehat{OSGUR20} / \widehat{CARES}$			36.71 (140.6)			-0.104 (0.461)
(pop - cutoff)	-3.279*** (0.681)	-3.164*** (0.670)	-3.074*** (0.644)	-0.00587** (0.00220)	-0.00548* (0.00215)	-0.00311 (0.00214)
1(pop ≥ cutoff)*(pop - cutoff)	-0.227 (1.173)	-0.218 (1.113)	-0.384 (1.102)	0.00269 (0.00353)	0.00391 (0.00327)	0.000710 (0.00334)
$\widehat{OSGUR20}$	1.135 (0.998)			0.0153* (0.00713)		
$\widehat{OSGUR20} / CARES$		0.594 (0.993)			0.0156* (0.00664)	
$\widehat{OSGUR20} / \widehat{CARES}$			41.10 (43.44)			0.674* (0.333)
N	684	684	684	684	684	684

Yields Robustness to CARES Aid: Cities Only (MLF cutoff only)



RD Effects on Public Sector Employment: City Cutoff (MLF Only)

	Emp. (1)	Emp. (2)	Δ Emp. (3)	Δ Emp. (4)	% Δ Emp. (5)	% Δ Emp. (6)	N (fixed-bwidth)
a. Pooled Post:							
Overall Employment	-948 (694)	-1,045 (781)	-52 (94)	-49 (94)	-1.21 (0.89)	-0.56 (0.72)	29,609
– Goods Employment	-87** (35)	-113*** (41)	-1 (3)	0 (3)	-4.55 (5.00)	-2.29 (4.35)	5,370
– Services Employment	1 (826)	-597 (943)	-98 (124)	-62 (120)	-1.01 (1.03)	0.37 (0.74)	19,669
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):							
Overall Employment	-740 (725)	-867 (819)	54** (24)	52** (23)	1.04*** (0.40)	1.14*** (0.33)	29,643
– Goods Employment	-83** (35)	-110*** (42)	-1 (2)	-1 (2)	0.22 (3.12)	-3.06 (2.56)	5,260
– Services Employment	281 (880)	-229 (966)	69** (28)	65** (28)	0.86** (0.42)	1.20*** (0.39)	19,606
Month FEs		X					
State FEs		X		X		X	
Control Mean (post): Employment	10,067	9,487	-779	-730	-6.64	-7.09	
Control Mean (post): Goods Employment	154	134	-5	-4	-5.28	-4.92	
Control Mean (post): Services Employment	8,555	8,022	-701	-653	-6.94	-7.75	

Back



Back → Robustness

Baseline Summary Statistics (01jan2019-23mar2020)

	MLF Eligible		MLF Ineligible		MLF Eligible - Ineligible
	Mean/SD (1)	# Observations (2)	Mean/SD (3)	# Observations (4)	Δ /SE (5)
A. MSRB-Bloomberg Trade-Level Data					
Coupon Rate (b.p.)	430.3 [135.1]	669,311	384.2 [116.6]	844,395	46.2*** (0.21)
Security Price (per 100 par)	108.0 [8.95]	671,659	105.8 [7.45]	844,500	2.23*** (0.014)
Current Yield (b.p.)	203.0 [83.2]	620,560	209.6 [80.3]	825,352	-6.68*** (0.14)
Δ Yield (Feb20-Jan20)	-0.066 [1.21]	281,596	-0.14 [0.95]	153,899	0.078*** (0.0033)
Δ Yield YoY (Jan20-Jan19)	-0.89 [4.28]	262,725	-1.11 [1.17]	124,523	0.22*** (0.0090)
Δ Yield YoY (Feb20-Feb19)	-1.00 [1.56]	242,935	-1.07 [1.07]	110,336	0.074*** (0.0045)
Amount Outstanding (MM)	2328.8 [2982.3]	671,659	144.5 [224.1]	844,500	2184.3*** (3.65)
Maturity Size (MM)	3542.0 [4209.3]	671,659	215.7 [305.5]	844,500	3326.2*** (5.15)
Tenor of Bond (Years)	14.8 [7.64]	671,464	13.2 [6.98]	844,500	1.55*** (0.012)
Remaining Duration of Bond (Years)	9.22 [7.02]	671,464	8.72 [6.74]	844,500	0.51*** (0.011)
Market Share of Issuer	0.95 [1.06]	671,659	0.064 [0.11]	844,500	0.89*** (0.0013)
Number of Securities by Issuer	306.4 [210.6]	671,659	123.0 [107.5]	844,500	183.3*** (0.28)
Par Traded (1000s)	290.9 [1915.2]	671,659	95.4 [579.9]	844,500	195.5*** (2.42)
S&P Ratings (1-7 scale)	5.67 [0.86]	575,172	5.83 [0.65]	624,205	-0.16*** (0.0014)
Moody's Ratings (1-7 scale)	5.78 [0.90]	557,662	5.88 [0.92]	474,590	-0.099*** (0.0018)
Fitch Ratings (1-7 scale)	5.65 [1.03]	424,063	5.63 [0.79]	149,058	0.018*** (0.0026)
Time of Day of Trade (minute)	770.6 [131.7]	671,659	776.1 [132.2]	844,500	-5.53*** (0.22)
B. QCEW Month-County Loc. Gov. Emp. Data					
Δ Employment	627.8 [861.7]	228	19.9 [99.5]	5,250	607.9*** (57.1)
Δ Goods Employment	9.77 [35.4]	130	0.20 [8.89]	2,402	9.57*** (3.11)
Δ Service Employment	1509.8 [10905.4]	228	23.1 [414.9]	5,250	1486.7** (722.2)

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

Composition Sensitivity: GO and RB Trends


[Back → Robustness](#)


RD Effects on Probability Credit Rating Downgraded

	Discontinuity	Standard Error	Control Mean	N (Fixed-bwidth)
a. Pooled Post:				
Pr(Downgrade), Overall (27apr-20nov)	-0.03	0.04	0.06	139,479
Pr(Downgrade), A & BBB (27apr-20nov)	0.06	0.16	0.16	11,756
Number of Downgrades, Overall (27apr-20nov)	-0.03	0.04	0.06	139,479
Number of Downgrades, A & BBB (27apr-20nov)	0.05	0.16	0.16	11,756
b. Pooled Pre (Placebo):				
Pr(Downgrade), Overall (01jan-23mar)	-0.02	0.01	0.02	119,200
Pr(Downgrade), A & BBB (01jan-23mar)	-0.05	0.05	0.05	10,046
Number of Downgrades, Overall (01jan-23mar)	-0.02	0.01	0.02	119,200
Number of Downgrades, A & BBB (01jan-23mar)	-0.05	0.05	0.05	10,046


[Back](#)[Back → Robustness](#)

RD Effects on Credit Downgrades: Cumulative Shares

(a) Cumulative New Downgrades Overall



(b) Cumulative New Downgrades, A & BBB



- Note: balanced panel issues mean not monotonically increasing.

[Back](#)
[Back → Robustness](#)

Unlikely manipulated... rather a result of speed to market

*We had to undertake very quickly to enter into the market, and our four principles that were guiding us in terms of our design were: speed to announcement and execution—**do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good**; ensure that State and local governments had access to liquidity for operating cash—this is what we heard overwhelmingly from individual issuers and associations like GFOA; restore market confidence and stability given the unprecedented liquidity crisis in the market; and finally, to your point, to design a uniformly applicable, transparent, easy-to-administer facility*


—Kent Hiteshow, Federal Reserve Board Deputy Associate Director for Financial Stability, Congressional Oversight Commission, Sept 17, 2020

[Back](#) → Robustness


Credit-Risk Sharing Mechanism

- Yields respond to MLF access lower on credit-rating distribution. Did crisis induce greater downgrade and/or default uncertainty? Did MLF potentially share credit risk? Two tests:

(a) Cumulative Downgrades Overall




(b) Default-Liquidity Decomposition



MLF Pricing Grid

MLF Penalty-Inclusive Prices by Rating



Back