## **Debt Capacity Appendix**



## **GO BANS Variable Interest Rate Assumption – The Components**

|  | 2018          | 2019          | 2020          | 2021  | 2022         | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| GO BANs - Variable Interest Rate       |               |               |               |       |              |       |       |       |
| a. 70% of 1-Month LIBOR                | 1.14%         | 1.66%         | 2.01%         | 2.10% | 2.10%        | 2.10% | 2.10% | 2.10% |
| b. Spread: GO BANs vs. 70% of LIBOR    | 0.51%         | 0.51%         | 0.51%         | 0.51% | 0.51%        | 0.51% | 0.51% | 0.51% |
| c. Factor Adjustment - New Legislation | 0.35%         | 0.47%         | 0.54%         | 0.56% | 0.56%        | 0.56% | 0.56% | 0.56% |
| = (a + b + c)                          | 2.00%         | <b>2.64%</b>  | 3.07%         | 3.17% | 3.17%        | 3.17% | 3.17% | 3.17% |
|  |               |               |               |       |              |       |       |       |
|  | 2018          | 2019          | 2020          | 2021  | 2022         | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|  |               |               |               |       |              |       |       |       |
| GO BANs - Variable Interest Rate       | <b>2.00</b> % | <b>2.64</b> % | <b>3.07</b> % | 3.17% | 3.17%        | 3.17% | 3.17% | 3.17% |
|  |               |               |               |       |              |       |       |       |
| Prior                                  | 1.46%         | 1.74%         | <b>1.97%</b>  | 2.06% | <b>2.19%</b> | 2.27% | 2.27% | 2.27% |

# Additional Notes/Sensitivity Analysis on Capacity Calculation

### Sales Tax Growth

• Recession, negative changes in consumer spending patterns, or changes by NC General Assembly, would result in downward adjusting of sales tax assumptions, reducing capacity, or require increase in property tax

#### Federal Tax Law Changes

• All debt has been modeled as tax-exempt debt. Changes in the tax exemption status for local government OR further changes in the corporate tax rate might impact County's cost of short-term debt and impact calculated capacity

### Size of Building Programs Requested by WCPSS and WTCC

• If seven year CIP programs from WCPSS and WTCC are reduced, calculations of capacity and cost of debt and capital will change

#### **Deviation from Debt Management Practices**

 Rating agencies all report that rating is sensitive to shifts in fundamental credit characteristics, including deterioration of County's reserve and liquidity or deviation from strong financial management and debt practices



## Moody's

Moody's U.S. Local Government GO Scorecard - Wake County 6/30/17

| Criteria                               | Wainka | Aaa = 1             | Aa = 2                   | A - 2                   | Wake County<br>Value               | Wake County<br>Score |
|--|--------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
|  | Weight | Aaa – 1             | Aa - 2                   | A = 3                   | Value                              | Score                |
| Economy/Tax Base (30%)                 | 100/   |                     | 610D 61 (D               | \$1 (D \$2)(0) \$       | 61.41P                             |                      |
| Tax Base Size: Full Value              | 10%    | > \$12B             | \$12B > n > \$1.4B       | \$1.4B > n > \$240M     | \$141B                             | 1                    |
| Full Value Per Capita                  | 10%    | > \$150,000         | \$150,000 > n > \$65,000 | \$65,000 > n > \$35,000 | \$141B/1,046,791 = \$135,090       | 2                    |
| Median Family Income                   | 10%    | > 150% of US median | 150% to 90% of US median | 90% to 75% of US median | 128.6% per Moody's                 | 2                    |
| Finances (30%)                         |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Fund Balance as % of Revenues          | 10%    | > 30%               | 30% ≥ n ≥ 15%            | 15% > n > 5%            | 33.7%                              | 1                    |
| 5-Year Dollar Change in Fund           |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Balance as % of Revenues               | 5%     | > 25%               | 25% > n > 10%            | 10% > n > 0%            | 5.8%                               | 3                    |
| Cash Balance as % of Revenues          | 10%    | > 25%               | 25% > n > 10%            | 10% > n >5%             | 28.9%                              | 1                    |
| 5-Year Dollar Change in Cash           |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Balance as % of Revenues               | 5%     | > 25%               | 25% > n > 10%            | 10% > n 0%              | 5.9%                               | 3                    |
| Management (20%)                       |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Institutional Framework (legal ability | 10%    | Very strong         | Strong                   | Moderate                | Very strong                        | 1                    |
| to match resources with spending)      |        |                     | 2                        |                         |                                    |                      |
| Operating History: 5-Year              |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Average of Operating Revenues/         |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Operating Expenditures                 | 10%    | > 1.05x             | 1.05x > n > 1.02x        | 1.02x > n > 0.98x       | 101.2%                             | 3                    |
| Debt/Pensions (20%)                    |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Net Direct Debt/Full Value             | 5%     | < 0.75%             | 0.75% < n < 1.75%        | 1.75% < n < 4.00%       | 1.5%                               | 2                    |
| Net Direct Debt/Operating Revenues     | 5%     | < 0.33x             | $0.33x \le n \le 0.67x$  | $0.67x \le n \le 3.00x$ | 1.7x                               | 3                    |
| 3-Year Average of Moody's              |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Adjusted Net Pension Liability/        |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Full Value                             | 5%     | < 0.90%             | 0.90% < n < 2.10%        | 2.10% < n < 4.80%       | 0.2% per Moody's                   | 1                    |
| 3-Year Average of Moody's              |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    | -                    |
| Adjusted Net Pension Liability/        |        |                     |                          |                         |                                    |                      |
| Operating Revenues                     | 5%     | < 0.40x             | $0.40x \le n \le 0.80x$  | 0.80x < n < 3.60x       | 0.2% per Moody's                   | 1                    |
| Operating revenues                     | 370    | ~ V.TVA             | 0.402 < 11 < 0.002       | 0.00X < II < 0.00X      | 0.270 per Moody's                  | 1                    |
| Overall weighted average score         |        | 0.50 to 1.50        | 1.50 to 1.83             | 1.83 to 2.17            | Overall weighted average score     | 1.75                 |
| <u> </u>                               |        |                     |                          |                         | Credits for institutional presence |                      |
|  |        |                     |                          |                         | and regional economic center       | -0.33                |
|  |        |                     |                          |                         | Adjusted score                     | 1.42                 |

Aaa=1 Aa=2 A=3

## **Standard and Poor's**

#### S&P Rating Matrix for Wake County

| Factor                             | Score | Weight             | Score x<br>Weight   |
|------------------------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1 40101                            |       | weight             | weight              |
| 1. Institutional framework         | 1     | 10%                | 0.10                |
| 2. Economy                         | 1     | 30%                | 0.30                |
| 3. Management                      | 1     | 20%                | 0.20                |
| 4. Budget flexibility              | 1     | 10%                | 0.10                |
| 5. Budgetary performance           | 2     | 10%                | 0.20                |
| 6. Liquidity                       | 1     | 10%                | 0.10                |
| 7. Debt and contingent liabilities | 3     | 10%                | 0.30                |
|                                    |       | Indicative rating  | 1.30 (1 - 1.64 = AA |
|                                    |       | Overriding factors | N/A                 |

0

Final GO rating AAA

S&P utilizes a scoring matrix for each category:

- Institutional Framework: autonomous control of major revenues, LGC oversight
- Management: board governance and policies
- Economy: market value per capita and per capita effective buying income
- Budgetary Flexibility: fund balance as a % of expenditures
- Budgetary Performance: net gov't funds and net general funds (revenues as % of expenditures)
- Liquidity: cash as a % of debt service and cash as a % of governmental funds expenditures
- Debt & Contingent Liabilities: debt as a % of gov't revenues and debt services as a % of gov't expenditures



|    | Reven  | ue Framework               |
|----|--------|----------------------------|
| ch | Growt  | h propects for revenues    |
|    | aaa    | Strong - Growth in line    |
|    | aa     | Solid - Growth below U     |
|    | а      | Slow - Growth in line w    |
|    | Indepe | endent legal ability to ra |
|    | aaa    | High - Maximum rever       |
|    | aa     | Sunstantial - Maximun      |
|    | а      | Satisfactory - Maximur     |
|    | Other  | Third-party funding ris    |
|    | Expend | diture Framework           |
|    | Natura | al pace of spending grov   |
|    |        | al                         |

| Revenu  | ie Framework   | Metric                               |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Growt   | n propects for revenues without revenue-raising measures   | 10-year performance of               |
| aaa     | Strong - Growth in line with or above the level of U.S. economic performance                                   | general fund revenues in             |
| aa      | Solid - Growth below U.S. economic performance but above the level of inflation                                | comparison to growth in              |
| a       | Slow - Growth in line with the level of inflation  | national GDP and inflation*          |
| Indepe  | ndent legal ability to raise operating revenues without external approval                                      |                                      |
| aaa     | High - Maximum revenue increase of 3x the decline in revenue caused by a 1% decline in GDP                     | No legal limitations                 |
| aa      | Sunstantial - Maximum revenue increase of 2x the decline in revenue caused by a 1% decline in GDP              | on revenues                          |
| а       | Satisfactory - Maximum revenue increase equal to the decline in revenue caused by a 1% decline in GDP          |                                      |
| Other   | Third-party funding risk; unusually concentrated or volatile revenue base                                      |                                      |
| Expend  | liture Framework   | Metric                               |
| Natura  | l pace of spending growth relative to expected revenue growth  | Time series data reviewed,           |
| aaa     | Slower to equal  | but mainly Fitch's analysis          |
| aa      | In line with to marginally above   | of and expectations for              |
| а       | Above  | main spending areas                  |
| Flexibi | ity of main expenditure items  | (DS+pension ARC+OPEB contr)/expend   |
| aaa     | Ample ability to cut spending throughout the economic cycle  | Carrying costs <10% aaa              |
| aa      | Solid ability to cut spending throughout the economic cycle  | Carrying costs <20% aa*              |
| а       | Adequate ability to cut spending; limits to budget management may result in cuts to core services              | Carrying costs <25% a                |
| Other   | Potential funding pressures including litigation, internal service fund liabilities and contingent obligations |                                      |
| _       | erm Liability Burden   | Metric                               |
| Combi   | ned burden of debt and unfunded pension liabilities  | Overall debt/income                  |
| aaa     | Low liability burden in relation to resource base  | Liab-to-income <10% aaa*             |
| aa      | Moderate liability burden in relation to resource base   | Liab-to-income <20% aa               |
| a       | Elevated (but still in the moderate range) liability burden in relation to resource base                       | Liab-to-income <40% a                |
| Other   | Derivatives exposure, short-term debt, variable-rate debt, bullet maturity debt, large OPEB liability          | Direct debt/governmental rev         |
| Operat  | ing Performance  | Metric                               |
| Financi | al resilience through downturns  | Scenario analysis results            |
| aaa     | Exceptionally strong gap-closing capacity; high level of flexibility during economic downturns                 |                                      |
| aa      | Very strong gap-closing capacity; adequate level of flexibility during economic downturns                      |                                      |
| а       | Strong gap-closing capacity; financial operations challenged during economic downturns                         |                                      |
| Budget  | management during economic recovery  | Historical and expected budgeting    |
| aaa     | Rapid rebuilding of financial flexibility; no material deferral of required spending                           | practices. Dollar difference between |
| aa      | Consistent efforts in support of financial flexibility; limited to no deferral of required spending            | pension ARC/ADEC and actual funding  |
| a       | Some deferral of required spending   | as % of spending.                    |
| Other   | Liquidity or market acess concerns; third party risk to operations; exceptional taxpayer dissatisfaction       |                                      |
| *See M  | letrics.   |                                      |