



2018 Update of the Long-Term Financial Planning Process and Debt Affordability Model

Presented to County Commission on November 27, 2018

Contents

- ▶ General Introduction
- ▶ Review of the County's Long-Term Financial and Capital Planning
- ▶ Discussion of Current Financial/Debt Model
- ▶ Rating Impact
- ▶ Summary of Current Financial/Debt Model
- ▶ Closing Comments/Questions

General Introduction

- ▶ County began long-term financial and capital planning in 2005 in view of significant capital and operating needs
- ▶ Retention of the long-term financial plan and debt affordability essential to continuing strong management
 - ▶ Driving force of the County's enviable financial results
 - ▶ Essential to maintaining the highest level of future financial performance
- ▶ DEC Associates advisor since 2005
 - ▶ Current financial update one of many in the past
 - ▶ Both to the County Commissioners and the public

General Introduction

- ▶ County is highly rated and continues to manage on a prudent financial basis based upon rating agency assessment
 - ▶ Current ratings of Aa1 from Moody's and AAA from Standard & Poor's
 - ▶ Standard & Poor's upgrade on October 14, 2014 to AAA
 - ▶ Moody's upgrade on October 17, 2014 to Aa1
 - ▶ Ratings were confirmed as Stable by both agencies as part of the July 2018 LOBs Issuance
 - ▶ County is a classic "Management" rating
- ▶ Following presentation will look to the future plan
 - ▶ Ability to maintain strong financial performance
 - ▶ Resulting high credit ratings

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

▶ Importance of Financial Planning

- ▶ Provides a road map
- ▶ Sets policies and achievement objectives
- ▶ Measures achievement
- ▶ Provides for annual review and can change as needed
- ▶ Provides for greater financial alternatives
- ▶ Provides tool to match needs with County priorities
- ▶ Sets the stage for improving financial standing and resulting credit ratings

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

▶ Building a Debt/Capital Capacity Analysis

▶ What is it anyway?

- ▶ A blending of available resources/revenues
- ▶ A definition of needed capital facilities and prioritization
- ▶ A snapshot of potential debt structures
- ▶ A statistical analysis to define capacity to meet the capital needs

▶ What does it include?

- ▶ Assumptions on growth, cost, timing, etc.
- ▶ Analysis of various funding scenarios and structures
- ▶ “What if” analysis

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

▶ Debt Affordability Model Development

- ▶ Identifying and continually update current resources
 - ▶ Multiple resources used to for capital/debt
 - ▶ Ad Valorem, lottery funds, miscellaneous revenue, etc
- ▶ Current debt service and other costs are layered to give a picture of resources needed until all current debt is paid off
- ▶ New contemplated capital projects are added to identify when/if/how resources need to be adjusted to meet new additional debt service
- ▶ From there, strategies can be analyzed to temper spikes in additional resources needed for new capital projects
 - ▶ Dedicated capital fund; change timing of projects; change scope or size of projects

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

► Current Outstanding Financings since 2006

When	Project	Amount
July 2009	Private Placement – Library & Siler City CC	\$17,050,000
July 2010	QSCBs - Schools	\$4,396,129
April 2012	LOBs (Refunding) – Northwood High	\$6,725,000
January 2013	LOBs – Jail Facility	\$15,495,000
April 2013	USDA RDL – Judicial Facility	\$21,940,000
November 2014	LOBs – Agricultural Center & Joint Bus Garage	\$19,175,000
November 2014	LOBs (Refunding) – Schools	\$26,270,000
July 2015	LOBs (Refunding) – Schools	\$21,655,000
July 2018	LOBs – Multiple Projects	\$117,730,000

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

► Issuances since 2006 that have been Refunded:

Project	Refunded by
2006 COPs – Schools, Business Park, DSS	2014 & 2015 LOBs
2008 Private Placement – Northwood High	2012 LOBs
2009 Private Placement – Briar Chapel	2015 LOBs

Review of Long-Term Financial Planning

- ▶ In 2005 the County had the following metrics:
 - ▶ Outstanding Long-Term Debt \$21,002,000 - \$363 per capita
 - ▶ Debt Funded CIP of Approximately \$133,000,000
 - ▶ Per Capita Appraised Value of \$87,277
 - ▶ Ratings - Moody's: A1 S&P: AA-
- ▶ Current Metrics
 - ▶ Outstanding Long-Term Debt \$210,000,000 – \$2,905 per capita
 - ▶ Debt Funded CIP of Approximately \$163,000,000
 - ▶ Per Capita Appraised Value of \$142,180
 - ▶ Ratings - Moody's: Aa1 S&P: AAA
- ▶ Considerable change, coupled with future needs

Rating Impacts

- ▶ Credit Rating Considerations – Current Plan Needs and Rating Metrics
 - ▶ County management and elected board “buy in” to the Capital Plan/Debt Affordability
 - ▶ Continue to follow the model and keep contributing as necessary
 - ▶ Wealth levels and other financial metrics
 - ▶ Moody’s General Government Criteria
 - ▶ Economy/Tax Base 30%
 - ▶ Finances (Liquidity) 30%
 - ▶ Management 20%
 - ▶ Debt/Pensions 20%

Rating Impacts

- ▶ Credit Rating Considerations – Current Plan Gives Some “Pause”
 - ▶ Soundness of the financial plan
 - ▶ Needs are present and the County has properly/prudently timed its debt issuance to date
 - ▶ Equally important to do so in the future
 - ▶ Does the Capital Plan meet projected County needs?
 - ▶ Especially for growth counties like Chatham
 - ▶ Current plan is “large” and creates significant increase to per capita debt and need to dedicate more resources
 - ▶ Strong growth in the County will aid in producing new resources
 - ▶ Timing is critical with potential need to evaluate lengthening the current timing

Discussion of Current Financial Model

► Future Projects to be Issued (current cost estimates)

When	Project	Amount
FY 2020	School Central Office/Radio Replacement/EOC	\$32,780,000
FY 2025	Elementary School	\$50,000,000
FY 2028	Government Annex Complex	\$80,000,000
	Total:	\$162,780,000

Summary of Current Financial Model

- ▶ Current model 56f is achievable with conservative assumptions, timing, and sizing of projects – Need for additional revenues
- ▶ Per capita debt \$3,197 after issuance of all planned debt in FY2028
- ▶ Issuance of additional debt above current plan level and/or earlier issuance
 - ▶ Must be reviewed and planned prudently
 - ▶ Measured by increased debt levels and revenue needs
 - ▶ Measured by potential for rating impacts and LGC scrutiny

Closing Comments/Questions

► Questions?