## City of Gainesville Retirement Plans Pension Obligation Bond Analysis

August 20, 2020

## Summary of Financing Results - 95\% Funding Level

| SUMMARY OF FINANCING (\$000) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Financing Plan |  | \% UAAL Funded | Balance 10/1/2020 | Deposit |
| Total Par | \$206,050.000 |  |  |  |
| Total UAL Funded | \$204,876.539 | 95.00\% | \$215,659.515 | \$204,876.539 |
| General Employees | \$158,653.192 | 95.00\% | \$167,003.360 | \$158,653.192 |
| Police \& Fire Employees | \$46,223.347 | 95.00\% | \$48,656.155 | \$46,223.347 |
| Summary Statistics | General | Police \& Fire |  | Total |
| Average Life | 12.7 years | 13.2 years |  | 12.8 years |
| All-in TIC | 3.020\% | 3.074\% |  | 3.033\% |
| PV Savings (\%) | 49.19\% | 51.76\% |  | 49.77\% |
| PV Savings | \$78,492.254 | \$24,060.908 |  | \$102,553.162 |
| Cumulative Savings | \$100,409.684 | \$32,332.354 |  | \$132,742.038 |
| Maximum Annual Debt Service | \$13,119.106 | \$4,229.269 |  | \$17,192.590 |
| Savings (First 5 Years) | \$22,299.431 | \$6,244.091 |  | \$28,543.522 |
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## Summary of Financing Results - 95\% Funding Level

- The table below provides a breakdown of savings including the 59\% of the general employee's plan attributable to GRU


## SUMMARY OF FINANCING (\$000)

|  | General Employee Fund |  | Police \& Fire Fund | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Gainesville (41\%) | GRU Contribution (59\%) | City of Gainesville | Combined |
| Total Par Amount | \$65,419.600 | \$94,140.400 | \$46,490.000 | \$206,050.000 |
| Total Pension Contribution | \$65,047.809 | \$93,605.383 | \$46,223.347 | \$204,876.539 |
| Total Debt Service | \$90,367.612 | \$130,041.197 | \$65,196.886 | \$285,605.695 |
| Maximum Annual Debt Service | \$5,378.833 | \$7,740.273 | \$4,229.269 | \$17,192.590 |
| PV Savings (\%) | 49.19\% | 49.19\% | 51.76\% | 49.77\% |
| PV Savings (S) | \$32,181.824 | \$46,310.430 | \$24,060.907 | \$102,553.162 |
| Cumulative Savings | \$41,167.970 | \$59,241.713 | \$32,332.354 | \$132,742.038 |
| Savings (First 5 Years) | \$9,142.767 | \$13,156.664 | \$6,244.091 | \$28,543.522 |
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## Summary of Financing Results - 95\% Funding Level



Note: Preliminary, subject to change; for indicative purposes only; interest rates from Bank of America as of 8/4/20 and assumes use of 10-year par call.

## Summary of Cash Flow Savings - 95\% Funding Level

| SUMMARY OF CASH FLOWS SAVINGS (\$000) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Current UAAL | Unfunded UAAL | POB Debt Service | Annual Cash Flow Savings | GRU Portion of Annual Cash Flow Savings |
| 2021 | \$15,999.108 | (\$799.955) | (\$9,490.595) | \$5,708.557 | \$2,631.653 |
| 2022 | 17,184.205 | (859.210) | $(10,618.031)$ | 5,706.964 | 2,631.529 |
| 2023 | 17,608.944 | (880.447) | $(11,019.374)$ | 5,709.122 | 2,631.658 |
| 2024 | 18,044.217 | (902.211) | $(11,433.814)$ | 5,708.192 | 2,630.400 |
| 2025 | 18,490.287 | (924.514) | $(11,855.086)$ | 5,710.686 | 2,631.425 |
| 2026 | 18,947.422 | (947.371) | $(12,293.020)$ | 5,707.031 | 2,631.347 |
| 2027 | 19,415.898 | (970.795) | $(12,737.506)$ | 5,707.598 | 2,630.334 |
| 2028 | 19,895.998 | (994.800) | $(13,194.400)$ | 5,706.797 | 2,630.507 |
| 2029 | 20,388.010 | $(1,019.400)$ | $(13,660.363)$ | 5,708.247 | 2,630.586 |
| 2030 | 20,892.230 | $(1,044.612)$ | $(14,137.955)$ | 5,709.664 | 2,632.521 |
| 2031 | 21,408.964 | $(1,070.448)$ | $(14,630.030)$ | 5,708.486 | 2,631.529 |
| 2032 | 21,938.522 | $(1,096.926)$ | $(15,129.385)$ | 5,712.211 | 2,632.416 |
| 2033 | 22,481.223 | $(1,124.061)$ | $(15,643.986)$ | 5,713.176 | 2,632.731 |
| 2034 | 23,037.395 | $(1,151.870)$ | $(16,176.123)$ | 5,709.403 | 2,630.945 |
| 2035 | 23,024.088 | $(1,151.204)$ | $(16,162.809)$ | 5,710.075 | 2,631.574 |
| 2036 | 22,328.827 | $(1,116.441)$ | $(15,503.530)$ | 5,708.856 | 2,632.670 |
| 2037 | 22,926.653 | $(1,146.333)$ | $(16,068.038)$ | 5,712.282 | 2,632.036 |
| 2038 | 22,738.108 | $(1,136.905)$ | $(15,892.974)$ | 5,708.228 | 2,629.932 |
| 2039 | 24,105.478 | $(1,205.274)$ | $(17,192.590)$ | 5,707.614 | 2,631.574 |
| 2040 | 21,554.752 | $(1,077.738)$ | $(14,765.802)$ | 5,711.213 | 2,632.191 |
| 2041 | 10,074.240 | (503.712) | $(3,858.686)$ | 5,711.842 | 2,632.036 |
| 2042 | 10,368.108 | (518.405) | $(4,141.600)$ | 5,708.103 | 2,630.583 |
| 2043 | 3,277.741 | (163.887) | - | 3,113.854 | 1,349.537 |
| 2044 | 1,002.612 | (50.131) | - | 952.482 | - |
| 2045 | 1,114.484 | (55.724) | - | 1,058.759 | - |
| 2046 | 1,347.537 | (67.377) | - | 1,280.160 | - |
| 2047 | 770.983 | (38.549) | - | 732.434 | - |
| Total | \$440,366.034 | (\$22,018.302) | (\$285,605.695) | \$132,742.038 | \$59,241.713 |
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## Sensitivity Analysis

- The tables to the right highlight how a successful pension bond financing may still lead to future additional UAAL payments if investment returns do not meet the expected annual return assumption of $7.9 \%$
- In the bottom table to the right, we summarize the simulation and stress test under a $95 \%$ UAAL funding, assuming a base case expected return of $7.9 \%$ and annual volatility of $12.19 \%$ based on AndCo Consulting "Asset Allocation Analysis" report, dated August 2020
- In the event the City's pension funds miss the target annual return of $7.9 \%$ by 100 basis points, the City can expect an additional \$22.2 million of UAAL, but still achieve present value benefit of $\$ 47.4$ million from this bond financing
- The General Employee's Plan 25year annualized return has been $10.5 \%$ and the P\&F Plan's 25-year annualized return has been 9.6\%

SIMULATION ANALYSIS (\$000)

| Assumptions |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\quad$ Expected Annual Return | $12.900 \%$ |
| Annual Volatility | $88.50 \%$ |
| Results | $\$ 69,423.609$ |
| Probability of Success |  |
| Average Present Value Benefit | (\$12,396.826) (5\% of outcomes lower than) |
| Percentiles | $\$ 19,296.040$ (25\% of outcomes lower than) |
| P5 | $\$ 51,191.784$ (Median) |
| P25 | $\$ 97,009.692$ (25\% of outcomes greater than) |
| P50 | $\$ 214,556.079$ (5\% of outcomes greater than) |
| P75 |  |
| P95 |  |


| SUMMARY OF STRESS TEST (\$000) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base Case | Stress Test 1 | Stress Test 2 | Stress Test 3 | Stress Test 4 |
|  | $7.9 \%$ Annual Return | $\begin{gathered} -25 \% \text { Year } 1 \\ \text { (7.9\% After) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.9 \% \\ \text { Annual Return } \end{array}$ | $5.9 \%$ Annual Return | $3.0 \%$ Annual Return |
| PV Benefit | \$69,651.690 | \$8,822.180 | \$47,431.528 | \$29,967.519 | (\$1,372.526) |
| PV Benefit (\% of Par) | 33.8\% | 4.3\% | 23.0\% | 14.5\% | -0.67\% |
| PV Future UAALs Due to Actuarial Losses | - | (\$60,813.570) | (\$22,213.767) | (\$39,672.744) | (\$71,003.727) |
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## Sensitivity Analysis

|  | SUMMARY OF SIMULATION RESULTS (\$000) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Results | $88.50 \%$ |
| Probability of Success | $\$ 69,423.609$ |
| Average Present Value Benefit |  |
| Percentiles | $(\$ 12,396.826)$ (5\% of outcomes lower than) |
| P5 | $\$ 19,296.040$ (25\% of outcomes lower than) |
| P25 | $\$ 51,191.784$ (Median) |
| P50 | $\$ 97,009.692$ (25\% of outcomes greater than) |
| P75 | $\$ 214,556.079$ (5\% of outcomes greater than) |
| P95 |  |

Histogram of Potential POB Outcomes (PV Benefit, \$ Million)
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## Anti-Dilution Test

- Based on preliminary analysis, the City is expected to meet both Anti-Dilution tests
- Aggregate Maximum Annual Debt Service is expected to remain below 50\% of Fiscal Year 2019 non-ad valorem revenues legally available to pay debt service
- Aggregate Average Annual Debt Service coverage is expected to exceed 2 x

| ANTI-DILUTION TEST (\$000) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| MADS Test |  |
| Non-Ad Valorem Revenues Available to Pay Debt Service* | $\$ 101,772.563$ |
| Maximum Annual Debt Service | $\$ 28,942.538$ |
| Coverage Ratio | 3.5 x |
| MADS as \% of Revenues (must be less than $50 \%$ ) | $28.4 \%$ |


| AADS Test |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Non-Ad Valorem Revenues Available to Pay Debt Service* | $\$ 101,772.563$ |
| Average Annual Debt Service | $\$ 21,284.952$ |
| Coverage Ratio (must exceed 2x) | 4.8 x |
| AADS as \% of Revenues | $20.9 \%$ |
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## Credit Ratings

- The City's outstanding covenant to budget and appropriate non ad valorem revenue debt is rated Aa3 by Moody's Investors Service and AA- by Fitch Ratings
- The City asked PFM to outline what impact, if any, the issuance of the pension obligation bonds (POBs) might have on these rating
- To address this question, we first outline the various factors that contribute to an underlying credit rating. While the factors vary somewhat between the rating agencies, the main factors include: (i) economy/tax base, (ii) finances (particularly fund balance and cash balances) and (iii) long term liabilities (debt and pensions).
- Of these factors, perhaps the most important factor and one that is most likely to impact ratings, higher or lower, is fund balance levels. The rating agencies look favorably on local governments that consistently achieve structurally balanced operations (annual revenues that meet or exceed annual expenses) and maintain sound fund balance levels.
- When reviewing the City's credit rating for the POBs, we expect the rating agencies will focus on the following two areas, in addition to their standard rating factors: (i) fiscal impacts of and responses to the pandemic and (ii) how the POB is expected to reshape the City's pension funding obligations.
- In general, the rating agencies are typically neutral in their view of POBs if structured appropriately. When POB proceeds add to a system's assets, they effectively replace one long-term liability with another and, thus, have a minimal net impact on the total liability burden.
- POBs that spread prospective savings more evenly over the life of the bonds (and the remaining liability amortization schedule) are viewed more favorably.
- Alternatively, using proceeds for budget relief by offsetting an annual pension contribution previously made from budgetary resources (or not made at all) is viewed negatively. Also, extending the final maturity of the bonds materially beyond the expected UAAL amortization date will also be viewed critically.
- Given the above, PFM is of the opinion the issuance of a pension obligation bond, in and of itself, should not have a negative impact on the City's underlying credit rating, if structured appropriately.


[^0]:    Note: Preliminary, subject to change; for indicative purposes only; interest rates from Bank of America as of 8/4/20 and assumes use of 10-year par call. Present value figures are discounted at the All In TIC on the bonds.

[^1]:    Note: Preliminary, subject to change; for indicative purposes only; interest rates from Bank of America as of 8/4/20 and assumes use of 10-year par call. Present value figures are discounted at the All In TIC on the bonds.

[^2]:    Note: Preliminary, subject to change; for indicative purposes only; interest rates from Bank of America as of 8/4/20 and assumes use of 10-year par call.

[^3]:    Note: Annual expected return of $7.9 \%$ based on City's projections; annual volatility of $12.19 \%$ based on AndCo Consulting "Asset Allocation Analysis," August 2020 . Source: Bank of America

[^4]:    Note: Annual expected return of 7.9\% based on City's projections; annual volatility of 12.19\% based on AndCo Consulting "Asset Allocation Analysis," August 2020. Source: Bank of America

[^5]:    *Revenue estimate based on FY19 Non-Ad Valorem Revenues plus FY21 GRU pro-forma DS payment.

[^6]:    Note: Preliminary, subject to change; for indicative purposes only; interest rates from Bank of America as of 8/4/20 and assumes use of 10-year par call.

