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## Background

- PFM was asked to review and analyze a refinancing of NIFA debt tied to the Authority's 2008B bonds, which have a 2020 maturity of \$75,325,000 callable at any time
- The bonds are variable rate demand obligations with interest rates presently reset weekly
- The refinancing is part of a plan to eliminate the projected $\$ 385$ million FY2020 budget gap brought on by Covid-19
- Within recent months other municipalities have executed similar deferrals to mitigate the effects of Covid-19
- The current low interest rate environment would allow for a cost-effective financing while providing immediate debt service relief
- NIFA provides the greatest structural flexibility as it is not constrained by NYS Local Finance Law


## Goals

- Generate $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ in savings for FY2020 by refinancing the 2008B sinking fund payment
- Ensure that future NIFA restructurings, targeting \$210M of savings in FY2021 and \$150M of savings in FY2022, are not hindered
- Avoid issuance of NIFA debt in 2020
II. Options


## Option 1: Municipal Liquidity Facility

- Established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve to enhance the liquidity of the primary short-term municipal securities market
- Eligible Notes must be duly authorized and meet the same statutory requirements of publicly issued notes: the County is still subject to the Local Finance Law with respect to repayment requirements
- Use of MLF does not meet the goal of reducing the County's FY2020 expense by $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$
- Specifically structured to not displace a functioning municipal market:
MLF interest rates carry a substantial premium to current market rates

| MLF Rates as of August 3, 202 LOAN TERM | 6M | 1 Y | $2 Y$ | $3 Y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AAA/Aaa - Applicable to NIFA | 1.56 | 1.53 | 1.49 | 1.48 |
| AA+/Aa1 | 1.76 | 1.73 | 1.69 | 1.68 |
| AA/Aa2 | 1.81 | 1.78 | 1.74 | 1.73 |
| AA-/Aa3 | 1.96 | 1.93 | 1.89 | 1.88 |
| A+/A1 | 2.46 | 2.43 | 2.39 | 2.38 |
| A/A2-Applicable to County | 2.56 | 2.53 | 2.49 | 2.48 |
| A-/A3 | 2.71 | 2.68 | 2.64 | 2.63 |
| BBB+/Baa1 | 3.31 | 3.28 | 3.24 | 3.23 |
| BBB/Baa2 | 3.46 | 3.43 | 3.39 | 3.38 |
| BBB-/Baa3 | 3.86 | 3.83 | 3.79 | 3.78 |
| Below Investment Grade | 5.96 | 5.93 | 5.89 | 5.88 |

The MLF is not a viable option as debt issued through the MLF must be redeemed using FY2020 revenues

## Option 2: Short-Dated Refinancing

## Plan

- Refund the $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ sinking fund payment with a taxable fixed-rate bond maturing in FY2021


## Steps

- Issue a fixed-rate taxable refunding bond
- Bond matures on November 15, 2021


## Results

- The $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ payment is delayed to FY2021
- The bond can be currently refunded on a tax-exempt basis within 90 days of its maturity date and could ultimately be restructured

NIFA Debt Service


- Requires transaction with associated issuance costs
- Requires new issuance for NIFA in 2020


## Option 3: Five-Year Refinancing

## Plan

- Refund the $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ sinking fund payment with taxable fixed-rate bonds maturing on or before November 2025


## Steps

- Issue fixed-rate taxable refunding bonds
- Bonds mature on November 15, 2023 through November 15, 2025


## Results

- The $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ payment is delayed to FY2023-25
- The bonds are structured to wrap around
 existing NIFA debt to achieve more level overall debt service
- Requires transaction with associated issuance costs
- Requires new issuance for NIFA in 2020


## Option 4: 2008B Tender and Conversion

## Plan

- Modify the 2008B Bond to eliminate the required 2020 sinking fund payment


## Steps

- Get approval from the liquidity provider (Sumitomo) and Remarketer (Citigroup) to eliminate the sinking fund requirement
- If necessary, liquidity provider and/or remarketer can be replaced
- Obtain sign-off from NIFA's bond counsel (Norton Rose)


## Results

- The $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ payment is delayed to FY2021
- Bond remains callable at any time
- Restructure again for 2021 gap

- Not a reissuance so transaction costs will be limited to counsel fees
- Preserves market capacity for future NIFA new issues
III. Comparison


## NIFA Debt as a Portion of County Debt Outstanding

- NIFA Debt accounts for 35\% of County debt service in FY2020 and decreases to 8\% by FY2025



## NIFA Projected Debt Service Schedule ${ }^{1}$

- All financing options provide lower debt service on a PV basis than NIFA's existing debt service
- Option 4, the Tender and Conversion scenario, offers the lowest PV debt service

| FY | Current | 1-Year Refinancing | 5-Year Refinancing | 2008B Tender and |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conversion |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | $133,195,788$ | $57,431,915$ | $57,431,915$ | $57,920,788$ |
| 2021 | $101,499,579$ | $177,663,412$ | $102,250,364$ | $177,118,347$ |
| 2022 | $86,745,427$ | $86,745,427$ | $87,414,444$ | $86,745,427$ |
| 2023 | $64,586,813$ | $64,586,813$ | $70,525,829$ | $64,586,813$ |
| 2024 | $49,111,387$ | $49,111,387$ | $70,526,675$ | $49,111,387$ |
| 2025 | $20,295,682$ | $20,295,682$ | $70,523,496$ | $20,295,682$ |
| Total $^{2}$ | $455,434,676$ | $455,834,636$ | $458,672,724$ | $\mathbf{4 5 5 , 7 7 8 , 4 4 3}$ |
| PV Total $^{3}$ | $447,783,670$ | $447,462,403$ | $447,703,498$ | $447,361,278$ |

${ }^{1} 1$ and 5-year refinancings use PFM's taxable NIFA scale; Tender and Conversion assumes NIFA's current variable rate plus a $25 b p s$ cushion on the \$75M portion of Series 2008B
${ }^{2} 1$ and 5-year refinancings assume COI and UWD of \$3/bond; tender and conversion scenario assumes cost of \$50,000
${ }^{3}$ Discounted at 5-year TIC of 0.96\%

## Advantages and Considerations

|  | Advantages | Considerations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Year <br> Refinancing | - Eliminates $\$ 75$ million principal payment due in November 15, 2020 | - Increase in debt service for FY 2021 <br> - NPV savings are approximately net neutral (0.24\%) <br> - Higher COI than Option 4 |
| 5-Year Refinancing | - Eliminates $\$ 75$ million principal payment due in November 15, 2020 - Reduces impact of balloon payment over 3 years | - Furthest extension of debt service <br> - Increase in debt service 2021-2025 <br> - NPV savings are approximately net neutral (0.30\%) <br> - Higher COI than Option 4 |
| 2008B Tender \& Conversion | - Eliminates $\$ 75$ million principal payment due in November 15, 2020 <br> - No new bonds <br> - Minimal transaction costs <br> - Maintenance of variable rate for continued flexibility <br> - Remains tax-exempt <br> - Lowest total debt service (gross and PV) from FY2020-FY2025 | - All 2008B bonds must be tendered to renegotiate sinking fund structure with liquidity provider <br> - NPV savings are approximately net neutral <br> - Increase in debt service for FY 2021 |

IV. Conclusion

## Conclusion

- PFM encourages the County to explore a refinancing to address the 2020 budget gap resulting from Covid-19
- Uncertain economic outlook could create continued gaps in the out years, so further remediation of the NIFA debt should be a consideration

Options 2 \& 3 provide immediate relief from the FY 2020 principal payment but do not provide the level of savings nor the future flexibility of Option 4

- Option 4 - Tender and conversion:
$\checkmark$ Lowest projected short-term debt service
$\checkmark$ Lowest projected debt service on a PV basis
$\checkmark$ Lowest projected COI
$\checkmark$ Continued flexibility for future refinancings

[^0]
[^0]:    Based on PFM's analysis, Option 4 provides the greatest current benefit to the County by lowering short-term debt service costs and providing the most flexibility for the future

