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January 24, 2019

Honorable Donna Soucy<br>President of the Senate<br>Honorable Stephen Shurtleff<br>Speaker of the House

Dear Senator Soucy and Speaker Shurtleff:
Attached is the debt affordability study for fiscal year 2018 prepared by the State Treasury and Public Resources Advisory Group, the State's financial advisor. In developing this year's study, we have examined the impact of projected debt issuance and revenue performance on the State's net tax-supported debt ratios. Please note that this study accounts for net tax-supported (General Fund ["GF"] unrestricted) debt outstanding, but not bonding repaid with Highway Funds or other self-supporting debt with a dedicated revenue source for repayment. As noted in our report last year, the ratio of net tax-supported debt service to General Fund unrestricted revenues for fiscal year 2017 fell below $7 \%$ for the first time since 2011 , reaching $6.8 \%$. This debt affordability statistic is the "bellwether" metric monitored by the credit rating agencies. Please note that from 2000 to 2010, the debt service ratio averaged $6.1 \%$, a level that the Base Case is projected to reach in fiscal year 2023 using the modestly reduced net tax-supported debt authorization projections and the revenue assumptions described below. I am pleased to report that due to unexpectedly robust revenue performance in fiscal year 2018. combined with continued adherence to measured bonding authorization/issuance, the ratio declined further to $6.4 \%$.

The Base Case presented on page 3 of the study reflects the actual bonds issued in the current biennium (approximately $\$ 130$ million), followed by a reduction of $\$ 5$ million in biennial capital project General Obligation bonding beginning with the 2020-21 biennium and maintained at that level thereafter. Therefore this report maintains the assumptions included in the studies prepared the previous two years by projecting the following biennial authorizations: 2020-21 (\$120 million), 2022-23 (\$120 million), and 2024-25 ( $\$ 120$ million). As a starting point for our analysis, we have used fiscal year 2019 budgeted revenue to calculate the ratio of net tax-supported debt service to GF unrestricted revenue. Subsequent to 2019, the Base Case assumes revenue declines of $2 \%$ for fiscal year 2020, $1.5 \%$ for 2021 , and $1 \%$ for 2022. Fiscal year 2023 projects no revenue growth, followed by $1 \%$ growth in both 2024 and 2025. Each percentage change in forecasted revenues uses the prior year as the base (for perspective, $1 \%$ on the 2019 base equals $\$ 15.3$ million). We have used conservative revenue assumptions for the following reasons: 1 ) strong revenue outperformance versus plan in fiscal years 2015-2018 cannot be sustained indefinitely; 2) more specifically, fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019-to-date revenue performance both appear to have been substantially driven by federal income tax reform in December 2017, with that effect expected to diminish over the next 12-18 months; 3) the current period of national economic recovery/expansion, second longest in U.S. history, is entering its $11^{\text {di }}$ year (average is 7 years), and; 4) the economic outlook for the state government sector calls for increasing pressure on revenue performance.

The projected amounts of new net tax-supported debt in fiscal years 2020 through 2025 would include new HB25 authorizations for capital needs to be bonded and paid from GF unrestricted revenues. Also reflected in the attached analysis are the continued effect of the issuance of $\$ 131$ million in school
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building aid debt in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 (debt service funded by an allocation of Meals \& Rooms Tax revenues to the Education Trust Fund).

Sensitivity 1, found on page 11 of the study, assumes the same debt issuance as in the Base Case but doubles the annual revenue declines from fiscal years $2020-22(4 \%, 3 \%$, and $2 \%$ respectively), followed by flat revenue in 2023-24 and a $1 \%$ increase in 2025. The purpose of this alternative scenario is to examine how a more severe reversal of recent revenue outperformance might impact the State's borrowing capacity and debt ratios. Sensitivity 2 on page 13 of the study assumes the same debt issuance and revenue performance assumed in the Base Case but increases the bond interest rate by one percentage point to $6 \%$ beginning in fiscal year 2020. Both of these sensitivity analyses project that the State's debt service to revenue ratio is expected to remain near or below $7 \%$ beyond fiscal year 2018, well below the $10 \%$ statutorily prescribed limit (RSA 6-C:2) and rating agency warning threshold.

Lastly, we have presented on page 14 a scenario to highlight the impact of state guaranteed debt combined with the more severe Sensitivity 1 revenue declines beginning in fiscal year 2020. In the very worst case (and unlikely) scenario in which the State would be required to assume all guarantee liabilities in a poorly performing revenue environment, the debt service to revenue ratio would remain below $8 \%$ through 2025. The debt affordability ratios are clearly impacted by accounting for guaranteed debt in this scenario, a sensitivity worth evaluating for credit strength purposes. However based on our communications with the rating agencies, the level of guaranteed debt does not presently impact the State's credit rating, due in part to the demonstrated success of State bond guarantee programs.

The general funded debt service to unrestricted General Fund revenues ratio is the metric most closely monitored by the rating agencies and policymakers as the best barometer of debt affordability levels. This analysis indicates that the State's debt service to unrestricted revenue ratio, while slightly elevated above recent historical levels (2000-2010) at this time, remains manageable under the Base Case scenario and is trending in the right direction, while projecting to return to those recent historical levels using the baseline assumptions presented here. The primary benefits of maintaining lower bonding levels are: 1) budgetary flexibility to address unanticipated operating or borrowing needs; 2 ) the rating agencies consistently praise the State's debt levels and debt management practices (both are responsive budgetary policies) as conservative, and; 3) better financial positioning to absorb potential debt service associated with State debt guarantees made in support of local economic expansion.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this analysis.
Respectfully,

William F. Dwyer
State Treasurer
Attachment: Fiscal Year 2018 Debt Affordability Memorandum and Study (20 pages)
Cc: Honorable Christopher T. Sununu, Governor
Representative Mary Jane Wallner, Chair, House Finance Committee
Representative John Cloutier, Chair, House Public Works and Highways
Senator Lou D'Allesandro, Chair, Senate Finance Committee
Senator David Watters, Chair, Senate Capital Budget Committee
Charlie Arlinghaus, Commissioner, Department of Administrative Services
Michael W. Kane, Legislative Budget Assistant
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The Honorable William Dwyer
Treasurer
State of New Hampshire
Public Resources Advisory Group ("PRAG")
Debt Affordability Study Update
January 23, 2019

As requested, we have updated the debt affordability study for the State of New Hampshire. This study analyzes General Fund unrestricted revenue for fiscal year 2018 and net tax-supported General Fund debt outstanding at June 30, 2018. The school building aid bonds are included in the study, with an adjustment made to include in General Fund unrestricted revenue the portion of Education Trust Fund meals and rooms tax revenue dedicated to pay that debt service. The rating agencies opine that "New Hampshire's debt position will remain favorable owing to conservative debt policies." Debt ratios are below Moody's 2017 50-state medians. (Moody's Investors Service report dated December 6, 2018); "The state's overall debt burden (including capital leases) is moderate on a per capita basis... but low [per]... personal income. Amortization is rapid..." (Standard \& Poor's report dated November 28, 2018), and; "New Hampshire’s long-term liabilities, including debt and pension liabilities... are low... and are expected to remain a low burden on resources." (Fitch Ratings report dated November 29, 2018). Thus, the credit rating agencies recognize the State's fiscal prudence in regard to debt.

In this debt affordability study update, the term "Sensitivities" refers to the changes in assumptions related to General Fund unrestricted revenue growth and increased borrowing costs (Sensitivity 1 and 2, respectively). The term "Cases" refers to alternate scenarios in the event that the State is required to take on debt guarantees, as presented on pages 4 and 5 of this memorandum.

## Assumptions

The following assumptions were used in preparing the base case analysis that projects the State's future debt ratios:

1. General obligation debt of $\$ 63.41$ million issued in fiscal year 2019 (New Money 2018 Series A Bonds in December 2018).
2. $\$ 60$ million of tax-exempt general obligation debt to be issued in each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025. Each issue is assumed to be amortized over 20 years and bear an interest rate of $5.00 \%$, with $60 \%$ of principal amortized in equal annual installments over the first ten years and $40 \%$ in equal annual installments over the remaining ten years. Future net taxsupported general obligation debt issuance includes the biennial authorizations for the University System of New Hampshire ("USNH"), however, this analysis does not attempt to separately estimate specific USNH authorization amounts for fiscal years 2020 through 2025.
3. As noted above, General Fund Unrestricted Revenues reflect actual revenues for fiscal year 2018, with the Education Trust Fund portion of meals and room tax revenues designated for the debt service of school building aid included; budgeted revenues for fiscal year 2019 and,
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based on guidance you have provided to us, General Fund Unrestricted Revenues in fiscal years 2020 through 2022 are assumed to decline by $2 \%, 1.5 \%$ and $1 \%$, respectively, with no growth assumed in fiscal year 2023 and $1 \%$ growth assumed in each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.
4. Total personal income is based on the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis 2017 figure of $\$ 80,122$ million and is projected to grow at an average annual rate of $2.7 \%$.
5. Population is based on the U.S. Census Bureau 2017 figure of $1,343,000$ and is projected to grow at an average annual rate of $0.2 \%$ per year.

We have also projected the State's debt ratios including certain State guaranteed debt. In doing so, we have made the following assumptions:

1. State guaranteed debt consists of debt issued for local Superfund sites, Business Finance Authority ("BFA"), and Pease Development Authority ("PDA"). The analysis excludes State guaranteed debt issued for water pollution control, local schools (but does not exclude QSCBs) and local landfills.
2. Based on maximum amounts authorized in statute, future issuances of State guaranteed debt total $\$ 134.2$ million and are assumed to be issued as follows (page 9 of the Appendix):

Expected Issuances of State Guaranteed Debt

| Fiscal Year |  | Dollar Amount |  | Purpose |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $\$ 36,060,000$ |  | Superfund, BFA, Pease |
| 2021 |  | $36,060,000$ |  | Superfund, BFA, Pease |
| 2022 |  | $35,960,000$ |  | Superfund, BFA, Pease |
| 2023 |  | $13,060,000$ |  | BFA |
| 2024 |  | $13,060,000$ | BFA |  |

3. New State guaranteed debt is assumed to be taxable, with level debt service over 20 years at an average interest rate of $6.00 \%$.
4. An analysis of each case is contained in the Appendix to this report.

## Effect of General Obligation Debt Issuance on Debt Ratios

The Base Case (page 3 of the Appendix) shows the effect on the State's debt ratios, based on the above assumptions, including the issuance of $\$ 60$ million in each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025. Combining these issuances and repayments of outstanding debt, the total issuance is approximately $\$ 61.91$ million less than retirements over the fiscal years 2019 through 2025, causing the State's net general fund debt to decrease from $\$ 618.996$ million at June 30, 2018 to $\$ 557.090$ million at June 30, 2025, a total decrease of $\$ 61.906$ million or $10.00 \%$.

Presently, New Hampshire's ratios of debt to personal income and debt per capita are significantly below the 2018 Moody's medians for states. New Hampshire's net general fund debt service to revenues ratio at $6.4 \%$ for fiscal year 2018 was higher than the median of $4.2 \%$ but well below the level that credit analysts use as a warning sign of excessive debt service burden of $10.0 \%$, which is also the State's statutorily prescribed limit (RSA 6-C:2). By issuing general obligation debt over this period in the amounts identified above, New Hampshire's debt ratios are projected to remain well below the 2018 Moody's medians for states, with the exception of the debt service to revenues ratio, as summarized in the following chart:
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| Summary of Debt Ratios for Net General Fund Debt |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moody's Median |  | New Hampshire |  |
|  | 2018 |  | June 30, 2018 | June 30, 2025 Est. |
|  | $2.3 \%$ |  | $0.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Debt to Personal Income | $\$ 987$ |  | $\$ 460$ | $\$ 408$ |
| Debt Per Capita | $4.2 \%^{*}$ |  | $6.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |
| Debt Service to Revenues |  |  |  |  |

* Ten percent is rule of thumb used by rating agency analysts as a warning level that should not be exceeded, as a greater relative amount would place too heavy a fixed cost burden on the budget, thereby limiting fiscal flexibility.

As can be seen, the ratio of debt service to revenues is projected to decrease to $6.1 \%$ at June 30 , 2025. Debt to personal income would decline over the period from $0.8 \%$ at June 30, 2018 to $0.6 \%$ at June 30,2025 and debt per capita would decline from $\$ 460$ to $\$ 408$. These ratios relative to Moody's medians form the basis for an assessment of the weight of the State's debt position.

## Sensitivity Analyses: Effects of Declining Revenues and Higher Interest Rates

Given the uncertainty regarding the economy and the markets, it is difficult to make forecasts with a high degree of certainty. Accordingly, Sensitivity 1 for General Fund unrestricted revenues was developed, assuming more significant revenue declines in fiscal years 2020 through 2022 of $4.0 \%, 3.0 \%$ and $2.0 \%$, respectively. There is no revenue growth assumed in fiscal year 2023 and 2024, and $1 \%$ revenue growth in fiscal year 2025. Under these assumptions, New Hampshire's debt ratios would change as summarized in the chart below:

Debt Ratios Assuming More Significant Revenue Declines in FY 2020-2022

| Summary of Debt Ratios for Net General Fund Debt |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moody's Median | New Hampshire |  |  |  |
|  | 2018 | Base Case |  | Declining Revenue Assumption |  |
|  |  | FY 2018 | FY 2025 Est. | FY 2018 | FY 2025 Est. |
| Debt to Personal Income | 2.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.6\% |
| Debt Per Capita | \$987 | \$460 | \$408 | \$460 | \$408 |
| Debt Service to Revenues | 4.2\%* | 6.4\% | 6.1\% | 6.4\% | 6.4\% |

[^0]With the more significant revenue declines, the ratio of debt service to revenues would remain at $6.4 \%$ for both fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2025, compared to $6.1 \%$ in fiscal year 2025 in the Base Case. At the $6.4 \%$ level, this ratio would be still well below the $10 \%$ rule of thumb. Other ratios would not change since the amount of bonds issued would remain the same. (The details of this analysis are shown on pages 10 and 11 of the Appendix).

A second sensitivity analysis was developed with regard to different market rates. It assumes that tax-exempt interest rates increase by 100 basis points ( $1 \%$ ). The results are as follows:
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Debt Ratios Assuming Increased Tax-Exempt Rates


* Ten percent is a rule of thumb used by rating agency analysts as a warning level that should not be exceeded, as a greater relative amount would place too heavy a fixed cost burden on the budget, thereby limiting fiscal flexibility.

The ratio of debt service to revenues would decrease from $6.4 \%$ in fiscal year 2018 to $6.3 \%$ for fiscal year 2025, well below the $10 \%$ rule of thumb. Other ratios would not change from the Base Case because the amount of bonds issued would not change. (The details of this analysis are shown on pages 12 and 13 of the Appendix).

## Effect of State Guarantees on Debt Ratios

Page 4 of the Appendix shows the effect of State guarantees on New Hampshire's debt ratios in the Base Case. For this analysis there was $\$ 69.5$ million of outstanding guaranteed debt at June 30, 2018, which, when added to the State's net General Fund debt, brings the total to $\$ 688.5$ million, as shown in the table below:

Net General Fund and Guaranteed Debt at June 30, 2018

|  | (\$ in millions |
| :--- | :---: |
| Net General Fund Debt | $\$ 619.0$ |
| Guaranteed Debt |  |
| Business Finance Authority | 49.8 |
| Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs) | 19.7 |
| Total Guaranteed Debt | $\underline{\$ 69.5}$ |
| Total Net General Fund and Guaranteed Debt | $\underline{\$ 688.5}$ |

There is approximately $\$ 134.2$ million of authorized but unissued State guaranteed debt at June 30, 2018, as shown in the table below:

Authorized But Unissued State Guaranteed Debt at June 30, 2018

| Purpose | Amount |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Local Superfund Sites |  | $(\$$ in millions $)$ |
| Business Finance Authority |  | $\$ 20.0$ |
| Pease Development Authority | $\underline{65.3}$ |  |
| Total | $\underline{\$ 134.9}$ |  |

For this scenario, we assumed that the Business Finance Authority would issue $\$ 13.06$ million in each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024; Pease Development Authority would issue $\$ 16.3$ million in each of fiscal years 2020 through 2022; and the Local Superfund would issue $\$ 6.7$ million in each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 and $\$ 6.6$ million in fiscal year 2022, as shown in aggregate on page 9 of the Appendix.
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The table below compares the ratios in three cases. The first case is the Base Case, excluding guaranteed debt. The second case (Case 2 in the table below), which is a more pessimistic scenario shown on page 4 of the Appendix, includes all the outstanding and additional debt issuances for State guaranteed debt described above. In this second case, the State's exposure would reach approximately $\$ 720.2$ million at June 30, 2025, which is $\$ 163.1$ million more than the net General Fund debt expected to remain outstanding at that time (Base Case). The last "worst case" (Case 3 in the table below) scenario combines outstanding and additional issuances of State guaranteed debt with additional annual declining revenue assumption (Sensitivity 1), shown in the Appendix on page 14. The resulting debt ratios are summarized in the chart below:

|  | Summary of Debt Ratios Including State Guaranteed Debt New Hampshire |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Including Guaranteed Debt |  |  |  |
|  | Moody's Median | Case 1 (Base Case) Net General Fund Debt |  | Case 2 <br> All Guaranteed Debt |  | Case 3 <br> All Guaranteed Debt and Declining Revenues |  |
|  | 2018 | FY 2018 | FY 2025 Est. | FY 2018 | FY 2025 Est. | FY 2018 | FY 2025 Est. |
| Total Debt Outstanding (000,000) | --- | \$619 | \$557 | \$688 | \$720 | \$688 | \$720 |
| Debt to Personal Income | 2.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% |
| Debt Per Capita | \$987 | \$460 | \$408 | \$512 | \$528 | \$512 | \$528 |
| Debt Service to Revenues | 4.2\%* | 6.4\% | 6.1\% | 6.8\% | 7.2\% | 6.8\% | 7.6\% |

* Ten percent is a rule of thumb used by rating agency analysts as a warning level that should not be exceeded, as a greater relative amount would place too heavy a fixed cost burden on the budget, thereby limiting fiscal flexibility.

As would be expected, all debt ratios rise as a result of additional State guaranteed debt issuances. At June 30, 2025, the State's debt to personal income would be $0.7 \%$ in Case 2 as opposed to $0.6 \%$ in the Base Case. Debt per capita would be $\$ 528$ in Case 2 versus $\$ 408$ in the Base Case; and debt service to revenues would be $7.2 \%$ compared to $6.1 \%$ in the Base Case, reaching a high of $7.6 \%$ in fiscal year 2020. With an assumption of additional declining revenues added to Case 2, the "worst case" scenario, debt service to revenue ratio increases to $7.6 \%$ in fiscal year 2025. Debt per capita and debt to personal income ratio would remain below the 2018 Moody's medians in all cases.
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## Conclusion

The State's debt ratios are considered "manageable" to "low" by the rating agencies. If the State issues a total of $\$ 360$ million of new, net tax-supported general obligation debt in fiscal years 2020 through 2025, as outlined above, the amount of debt outstanding would fall over the period, as existing debt is retired faster than new debt is issued, and the effect on the debt ratios would be as follows: debt to personal income would decrease from the current level of $0.8 \%$ to $0.6 \%$ at the end of fiscal year 2025; debt service to revenues would decrease from $6.4 \%$ to $6.1 \%$ by June 30,2025 ; and debt per capita would decline from $\$ 460$ to $\$ 408$. At these levels, the debt ratios would not only remain "manageable", but would, in fact, improve.

Sensitivity analyses show that with more significant revenue declines in fiscal years 2020 through 2022, the debt service to revenue ratio would be $6.4 \%$ by fiscal year 2025, above the $6.1 \%$ level in the Base Case, and it would be $6.3 \%$ in the scenario with increased interest rates. At these levels, the debt service to revenue ratios in the two sensitivity scenarios would still be well below the warning level for excessive debt service burden of $10 \%$.

When existing and additional State guaranteed debt are added to the Base Case scenario, debt to personal income is projected to decline from the fiscal year 2018 level of $0.8 \%$ to $0.7 \%$ by fiscal year 2025, debt per capita is projected to increase from $\$ 512$ in fiscal year 2018 to $\$ 528$ by fiscal year 2025, and the debt service to revenues ratio is forecast to increase from $6.8 \%$ in fiscal year 2018 to $7.2 \%$ by fiscal year 2025. Under the "worst case" scenario with the increase of General Fund unrestricted revenues declines and the addition of State guaranteed debt, the projected ratio of debt service to revenues would rise from the projected Base Case level of $6.1 \%$ to $7.6 \%$ for fiscal year 2025.

The State's ratio of debt service to revenues remains above the Moody's median level and should be monitored so corrective actions can be taken if revenue growth falls below projections. This becomes particularly important if the $10 \%$ "warning level" is approached. At this time, however, there are no concerns, as this ratio is projected to decline over the projected period through fiscal year 2025 and to remain well below $10 \%$.
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## Appendix -- Analytic Summary

| List of Exhibits | Page 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Assumptions to Base Case | Page 2 |
| Base Case Results | Page 3 |
| Effect of State Guaranteed Bonds on Debt Ratios | Page 4 |
| Debt Service on Outstanding General Obligation Debt | Page 5 |
| Debt Service on Projected General Obligation Debt (5\%) | Page 6 |
| Debt Service on Projected General Obligation Debt (6\%) | Page 7 |
| Estimated Debt Service on Outstanding State Guaranteed Debt | Page 8 |
| Estimated Debt Service on State Guaranteed Debt to Be Issued | Page 9 |
| Assumptions to Sensitivity Case 1 (Revenues Decline More Significantly in FY 2020-2022) | Page 10 |
| Sensitivity Case 1 Results | Page 11 |
| Assumptions to Sensitivity Case 2 (Interest Rates Increased) | Page 12 |
| Sensitivity Case 2 Results | Page 13 |
| "Worst Case" Scenario (General Fund, State Guaranteed Bonds and Declining Revenues) | Page 14 |
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## Assumptions to Base Case - Issuance of \$60 Million Annually in FY 2020-25

School Building Aid Bonds Included
(1) Includes issuance of $\$ 63.41$ million of New Money 2018 Series A Bonds in December 2018.
(2) $\$ 60$ million issued annually in FY 2020 through 2025 at an interest rate of $5 \%$,
with $60 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the first ten years and $40 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the remaining ten years
(3) Ending Outstanding Debt represents total net General Fund Debt to be paid from General Fund Unrestricted Revenues and includes school building aid debt paid for with the Education Trust Fund ("ETF") M\&R tax revenue allocation.
(4) General Fund Unrestricted Revenues reflect actual revenues for FY 2018 and budgeted revenues for FY 2019, with the ETF portion of meals and room tax revenues designated for the debt service on school building aid bonds added. Assumes annual decrease in FY 2020-22 by $2 \%, 1.5 \%$ and $1 \%$, respectively, no revenue growth in FY 2023 and 1\% revenue growth in FY 2024-25.
(5) Total Personal Income - source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis for 2017 figure of $\$ 80,122$ million. Assumes $2.7 \%$ growth annually thereafter
(6) Population source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017 figure of $1,343,000$. Assumes $0.2 \%$ growth annually thereafter.
(7) For certain sensitivities, state guaranteed debt that is added to Net General Fund Debt includes the outstanding $\mathbf{\$ 1 9 . 7}$ million of Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs) and BFA debt totaling $\$ 49.784$ million at June 30, 2018.
(8) Debt Service includes State guaranteed debt outstanding or to be issued for the following: local Superfund sites, BFA, and PDA .

Excludes water pollution control, local landfills and local school guaranteed debt (with exception of QSCBs). Assumes level debt service over 20 years at $6.00 \%$ for new State guaranteed debt.
$\$ 36.06$ million is issued in each of FY 2020 and 2021, $\$ 35.96$ million in 2022 and $\$ 13.06$ million in each of FY 2023 and 2024
Estimated authorized but unissued State guaranteed debt of $\$ 134.2$ million includes:
$\$ 20$ million for local Superfund sites; $\$ 65.3$ million for BFA and $\$ 48.9$ million for Pease.

Footnotes on the attached charts refer to the assumptions above.

|  | THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE <br> Debt Affordability Study Update <br> Base Case: Issuance of $\$ 60$ Million Annually in FY 2020-25 <br> School Building Aid Bonds Included |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Actual | Projected |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
|  | $\underline{2018}$ | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | 2021 | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ | 2019-2025 |
| Net General Fund Debt (000's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Outstanding |  | \$618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 |  |
| Issuances (1)(2) |  | \$63,410 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$423,410 |
| Retirements: Existing Debt (1) |  | 76,555 | 77,917 | 66,961 | 60,887 | 52,661 | 49,743 | 46,592 | 431,316 |
| New Debt (2) |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 3,600 | 7,200 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 18,000 | 54,000 |
| Total Retirements |  | \$76,555 | \$77,917 | \$70,561 | \$68,087 | \$63,461 | \$64,143 | \$64,592 | \$485,316 |
| Net New Debt |  | $(\$ 13,145)$ | $(\$ 17,917)$ | $(\$ 10,561)$ | $(\$ 8,087)$ | $(\$ 3,461)$ | $(\$ 4,143)$ | $(\$ 4,592)$ | $(\$ 61,906)$ |
| Ending Outstanding (3) | 618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 | \$557,090 | $(\$ 61,906)$ |
| Existing Debt Service (000's) (1) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$103,967 | \$89,404 | \$80,543 | \$69,446 | \$64,057 | \$58,693 |  |
| New Debt Service (000's) (2) | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 1,500 | \$8,010 | 14,340 | 20,490 | 26,460 | 32,250 |  |
| Total Debt Service (000's) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$105,467 | \$97,414 | \$94,883 | \$89,936 | \$90,517 | \$90,943 |  |
| General Fund Unrestricted Revenues (000's)(4) | \$1,607,984 | \$1,542,803 | \$1,511,772 | \$1,486,090 | \$1,471,070 | \$1,470,029 | \$1,484,446 | \$1,499,005 |  |
| Debt Service as a Percent of Revenues | 6.4\% | 6.8\% | 7.0\% | 6.6\% | 6.4\% | 6.1\% | 6.1\% | 6.1\% |  |
| Total Personal Income (000,000's) (5) | 82,285 | 84,507 | 86,789 | 89,132 | 91,539 | 94,010 | 96,548 | 99,155 |  |
| Debt to Personal Income | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |  |
| Population (000's) (6) | 1,346 | 1,348 | 1,351 | 1,354 | 1,356 | 1,359 | 1,362 | 1,365 |  |
| Debt Per Capita | \$460 | \$449 | \$435 | \$426 | \$420 | \$416 | \$412 | \$408 |  |

Footnotes explained on page 2.
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Effect of State Guaranteed Bonds on Debt Ratios - Base Case
Net General Fund Debt (000's)
Beginning Outstanding (7) (8)
G.O. Issuances
State Guaranteed Issuances (7) (8) Retirements G.O. Debt

State Guaranteed Debt (8)
Total Retirements
Net New Debt
Ending Outstanding
G.O. Debt Service (000's)
State Guaranteed Debt Service (000's) (8)
Total Debt Service (000's)
General Fund Unrestricted Revenues (000's) (4)
Debt Service as a Percent of Revenues

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Actual } \\ \underline{2018} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Projected |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ |  |
|  | \$688,456 | \$672,310 | \$686,423 | \$706,802 | \$728,413 | \$731,150 | \$732,569 |  |
|  | \$63,410 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$423,410 |
|  | 0 | 36,060 | 36,060 | 35,960 | 13,060 | 13,060 | 0 | 134,200 |
|  | 76,555 | 77,917 | 70,561 | 68,087 | 63,461 | 64,143 | 64,592 | 485,316 |
|  | 3,001 | 4,030 | 5,120 | 6,262 | 6,862 | 7,498 | 7,817 | 40,590 |
|  | \$79,556 | \$81,947 | \$75,681 | \$74,349 | \$70,323 | \$71,641 | \$72,409 | \$525,906 |
|  | $(\$ 16,146)$ | \$14,113 | \$20,379 | \$21,611 | \$2,737 | \$1,419 | $(\$ 12,409)$ | \$31,704 |
| \$688,456 | \$672,310 | \$686,423 | \$706,802 | \$728,413 | \$731,150 | \$732,569 | \$720,160 | \$31,704 |
| \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$105,467 | \$97,414 | \$94,883 | \$89,936 | \$90,517 | \$90,943 |  |
| 6,493 | 6,480 | 9,505 | 12,531 | 15,537 | 16,558 | 17,579 | 17,461 |  |
| 109,069 | 111,242 | 114,972 | 109,944 | 110,419 | 106,494 | 108,095 | 108,404 |  |
| \$1,607,984 | \$1,542,803 | \$1,511,772 | \$1,486,090 | \$1,471,070 | \$1,470,029 | \$1,484,446 | \$1,499,005 |  |
| 6.8\% | 7.2\% | 7.6\% | 7.4\% | 7.5\% | 7.2\% | 7.3\% | 7.2\% |  |
| \$82,285 | \$84,507 | \$86,789 | \$89,132 | \$91,539 | \$94,010 | \$96,548 | \$99,155 |  |
| 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% |  |
| 1,346 | 1,348 | 1,351 | 1,354 | 1,356 | 1,359 | 1,362 | 1,365 |  |
| \$512 | \$499 | \$508 | \$522 | \$537 | \$538 | \$538 | \$528 |  |

Footnotes explained on page 2.

| THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE Debt Affordability Study Update |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | 2024 | 2025 |
| Principal Repayments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Fund | 51,286,329 | 53,115,382 | 47,455,598 | 42,862,152 | 37,858,986 | 34,538,957 | 32,477,715 |
| University System Appropriated | 16,482,328 | 16,002,648 | 13,457,357 | 11,976,366 | 9,554,268 | 9,956,115 | 8,866,385 |
| School Building Aid | 8,786,668 | 8,798,826 | 6,048,000 | 6,048,000 | 5,248,000 | 5,248,000 | 5,248,000 |
| Total Repayments | 76,555,325 | 77,916,855 | 66,960,956 | 60,886,518 | 52,661,254 | 49,743,072 | 46,592,100 |
| Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Fund | 20,072,777 | 19,119,431 | 16,660,730 | 14,654,611 | 12,588,114 | 10,785,598 | 9,218,481 |
| University System Appropriated | 5,018,770 | 4,238,796 | 3,517,991 | 2,979,299 | 2,416,164 | 1,959,639 | 1,530,688 |
| School Building Aid | 3,115,892 | 2,691,625 | 2,263,872 | 2,022,192 | 1,780,512 | 1,568,272 | 1,351,472 |
| Total Payments | 28,207,439 | 26,049,852 | 22,442,593 | 19,656,102 | 16,784,790 | 14,313,508 | 12,100,642 |
| Total Debt Service Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Fund | 71,359,106 | 72,234,812 | 64,116,329 | 57,516,763 | 50,447,100 | 45,324,554 | 41,696,196 |
| University System Appropriated | 21,501,098 | 20,241,444 | 16,975,348 | 14,955,665 | 11,970,432 | 11,915,754 | 10,397,073 |
| School Building Aid | 11,902,560 | 11,490,451 | 8,311,872 | 8,070,192 | 7,028,512 | 6,816,272 | 6,599,472 |
| Total Debt Service | 104,762,764 | 103,966,707 | 89,403,549 | 80,542,620 | 69,446,044 | 64,056,580 | 58,692,742 |

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## Debt Affordability Study Update

Debt Service on New General Obligation Debt (5\%)

|  |  | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Issued in FY2019 | Outstanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Interest Payments | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Debt Issued in FY2020 | Outstanding |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 | 45,600 | 42,000 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  | 1,500 | 2,910 | 2,730 | 2,550 | 2,370 | 2,190 |
|  | Total Debt Service |  | 1,500 | 6,510 | 6,330 | 6,150 | 5,970 | 5,790 |
| Debt Issued in FY2021 | Outstanding |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 | 45,600 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  | 1,500 | 2,910 | 2,730 | 2,550 | 2,370 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 6,510 | 6,330 | 6,150 | 5,970 |
| Debt Issued in FY2022 | Outstanding |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  | 1,500 | 2,910 | 2,730 | 2,550 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 6,510 | 6,330 | 6,150 |
| Debt Issued in FY2023 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  | 1,500 | 2,910 | 2,730 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 6,510 | 6,330 |
| Debt Issued in FY2024 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  | 1,500 | 2,910 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 6,510 |
| Debt Issued in FY2025 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,500 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 |
| Totals Debt Service on New G.O. Debt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Principal Payments | 0 | 0 | 3,600 | 7,200 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 18,000 |
|  | Interest Payments | $\underline{0}$ | 1,500 | 4,410 | 7,140 | 9,690 | 12,060 | 14,250 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 1,500 | 8,010 | 14,340 | 20,490 | 26,460 | 32,250 |
| Rate on Current Interest Bonds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate on Commercial Paper: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## Debt Affordability Study Update

Debt Service on New General Obligation Debt (6\%)

|  |  | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Issued in FY2019 | Outstanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Interest Payments | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Debt Issued in FY2020 | Outstanding |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 | 45,600 | 42,000 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  | 1,800 | 3,492 | 3,276 | 3,060 | 2,844 | 2,628 |
|  | Total Debt Service |  | 1,800 | 7,092 | 6,876 | 6,660 | 6,444 | 6,228 |
| Debt Issued in FY2021 | Outstanding |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 | 45,600 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  | 1,800 | 3,492 | 3,276 | 3,060 | 2,844 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 7,092 | 6,876 | 6,660 | 6,444 |
| Debt Issued in FY2022 | Outstanding |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 | 49,200 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  | 1,800 | 3,492 | 3,276 | 3,060 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 7,092 | 6,876 | 6,660 |
| Debt Issued in FY2023 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 | 52,800 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  | 1,800 | 3,492 | 3,276 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 7,092 | 6,876 |
| Debt Issued in FY2024 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 | 56,400 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3,600 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  | 1,800 | 3,492 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 7,092 |
| Debt Issued in FY2025 | Outstanding |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |
| Current Interest Bonds | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,800 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 |
| Totals Debt Service on New G.O. Debt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Principal Payments | 0 | 0 | 3,600 | 7,200 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 18,000 |
|  | Interest Payments | $\underline{0}$ | 1,800 | 5,292 | 8,568 | 11,628 | 14,472 | 17,100 |
|  | Total Debt Service | 0 | 1,800 | 8,892 | 15,768 | 22,428 | 28,872 | 35,100 |
| Rate on Current Interest Bonds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate on Commercial Paper: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIR

## Debt Affordability Study Update

Debt Service on State Guaranteed Debt to be Issued

|  | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ | $\underline{2026}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issuances in FY2018 (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance |  | 36,060,000 | 35,079,725 | 34,040,633 | 32,939,196 | 31,771,673 | 30,534,098 | 29,222,269 |
| Principal |  | 980,275 | 1,039,092 | 1,101,437 | 1,167,523 | 1,237,575 | 1,311,829 | 1,390,539 |
| Interest |  | $\underline{2,163,600}$ | 2,104,783 | 2,042,438 | 1,976,352 | 1,906,300 | 1,832,046 | 1,753,336 |
| Total Debt Service |  | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 |
| Issuances in FY2019 (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance |  |  | 36,060,000 | 35,079,725 | 34,040,633 | 32,939,196 | 31,771,673 | 30,534,098 |
| Principal |  |  | 980,275 | 1,039,092 | 1,101,437 | 1,167,523 | 1,237,575 | 1,311,829 |
| Interest |  |  | 2,163,600 | 2,104,783 | 2,042,438 | 1,976,352 | 1,906,300 | 1,832,046 |
| Total Debt Service |  |  | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 | 3,143,875 |
| Issuances in FY2020 (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance |  |  |  | 35,960,000 | 34,982,443 | 33,946,233 | 32,847,851 | 31,683,565 |
| Principal |  |  |  | 977,557 | 1,036,210 | 1,098,383 | 1,164,286 | 1,234,143 |
| Interest |  |  |  | 2,157,600 | 2,098,947 | 2,036,774 | 1,970,871 | 1,901,014 |
| Total Debt Service |  |  |  | 3,135,157 | 3,135,157 | 3,135,157 | 3,135,157 | 3,135,157 |
| Issuances in FY2021 (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance |  |  |  |  | 13,060,000 | 12,704,970 | 12,328,638 | 11,929,725 |
| Principal |  |  |  |  | 355,030 | 376,332 | 398,912 | 422,847 |
| Interest |  |  |  |  | 783,600 | 762,298 | 739,718 | 715,784 |
| Total Debt Service |  |  |  |  | 1,138,630 | 1,138,630 | 1,138,630 | 1,138,630 |
| Issuances in FY2022 (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance |  |  |  |  |  | 13,060,000 | 12,704,970 | 12,328,638 |
| Principal |  |  |  |  |  | 355,030 | 376,332 | 398,912 |
| Interest |  |  |  |  |  | 783,600 | 762,298 | 739,718 |
| Total Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1,138,630 | 1,138,630 | 1,138,630 |
| Total State Guaranteed Debt to be Issued |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Principal | 0 | 980,275 | 2,019,367 | 3,118,085 | 3,660,201 | 4,234,843 | 4,488,934 | 4,758,270 |
| Interest | $\underline{0}$ | 2,163,600 | 4,268,383 | 6,304,821 | 6,901,336 | 7,465,324 | 7,211,234 | 6,941,898 |
| Total Debt Service | 0 | 3,143,875 | 6,287,750 | 9,422,907 | 10,561,537 | 11,700,168 | 11,700,168 | 11,700,168 |
| Total Outstanding and Future Issuances of State Guaranteed Debt (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Principal | 3,001,131 | 4,029,849 | 5,120,290 | 6,262,190 | 6,862,001 | 7,497,802 | 7,816,720 | 8,154,773 |
| Interest | 3,478,428 | 5,475,342 | 7,410,533 | 9,274,601 | 9,695,783 | 10,080,976 | 9,644,421 | 9,188,731 |
| Total Debt Service | 6,479,560 | 9,505,192 | 12,530,824 | 15,536,790 | 16,557,784 | 17,578,778 | 17,461,141 | 17,343,504 |

(1) Assumes level debt service with the following parameters:

Number of Years Interest Rate

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Debt Affordability Study Update
Assumptions to Sensitivity Case 1 - Issuance of $\mathbf{\$ 6 0}$ Million Annually in FY 2020-25; Revenues Decline More Significantly in FY 2020-2022 School Building Aid Bonds Included
(1) Includes issuance of $\$ 63.41$ million of New Money 2018 Series A Bonds in December 2018.
(2) $\$ 60$ million issued annually in FY 2020 through 2025 at an interest rate of 5\%,
with $60 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the first ten years and $40 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the remaining ten years.
(3) Ending Outstanding Debt represents total net General Fund Debt to be paid from General Fund Unrestricted Revenues and includes school building aid debt paid for with the Education Trust Fund ("ETF") M\&R tax revenue allocation.
(4) General Fund Unrestricted Revenues reflect actual revenues for FY 2018 and budgeted revenues for FY 2019, with the ETF portion of meals and room tax revenues designated for the debt service on school building aid bonds added. Assumes annual decrease in FY 2020-22 by $4 \%, 3 \%$ and $2 \%$, respectively, no revenue growth in FY 2023-24 and 1\% revenue growth in FY 2025.
(5) Total Personal Income - source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis for 2017 figure of $\$ 80,122$ million. Assumes $2.7 \%$ growth annually thereafter.
(6) Population source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017 figure of $1,343,000$. Assumes $0.2 \%$ growth annually thereafter.
(7) For certain sensitivities, state guaranteed debt that is added to Net General Fund Debt includes the outstanding $\$ 19.7$ million of Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs) and BFA debt totaling \$49.784 million at June 30, 2018.
(8) Debt Service includes State guaranteed debt outstanding or to be issued for the following: local Superfund sites, BFA, and PDA

Excludes water pollution control, local landfills and local school guaranteed debt (with exception of QSCBs). Assumes level debt service over 20 years at $6.00 \%$ for new State guaranteed debt.
$\$ 36.06$ million is issued in each of FY 2020 and 2021, $\$ 35.96$ million in 2022 and $\$ 13.06$ million in each of FY 2023 and 2024.
Estimated authorized but unissued State guaranteed debt of $\$ 134.2$ million includes:
$\$ 20$ million for local Superfund sites; $\$ 65.3$ million for BFA and $\$ 48.9$ million for Pease.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Debt Affordability Study Update

## Sensitivity Case 1 - Issuance of $\$ 60$ Million Annually in FY 2020-25 Revenues Decline More Significantly in FY 2020-2022

School Building Aid Bonds Included

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Actual } \\ & \underline{2018} \end{aligned}$ | School Building Aid Bonds Included |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Projected | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline 2019-2025 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net General Fund Debt (000's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Outstanding |  | \$618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 |  |
| Issuances (1)(2) |  | \$63,410 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$423,410 |
| Retirements: Existing Debt (1) |  | 76,555 | 77,917 | 66,961 | 60,887 | 52,661 | 49,743 | 46,592 | 431,316 |
| New Debt (2) |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 3,600 | 7,200 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 18,000 | 54,000 |
| Total Retirements |  | \$76,555 | \$77,917 | \$70,561 | \$68,087 | \$63,461 | \$64,143 | \$64,592 | \$485,316 |
| Net New Debt |  | $(\$ 13,145)$ | $(\$ 17,917)$ | $(\$ 10,561)$ | $(\$ 8,087)$ | $(\$ 3,461)$ | $(\$ 4,143)$ | $(\$ 4,592)$ | $(\$ 61,906)$ |
| Ending Outstanding (3) | \$618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 | \$557,090 | $(\$ 61,906)$ |
| Existing Debt Service (000's) (1) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$103,967 | \$89,404 | \$80,543 | \$69,446 | \$64,057 | \$58,693 |  |
| New Debt Service (000's) (2) | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 1,500 | \$8,010 | 14,340 | 20,490 | 26,460 | 32,250 |  |
| Total Debt Service (000's) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$105,467 | \$97,414 | \$94,883 | \$89,936 | \$90,517 | \$90,943 |  |
| General Fund Unrestricted Revenues (000's)(4) | \$1,607,984 | \$1,542,803 | \$1,481,154 | \$1,433,886 | \$1,405,133 | \$1,404,091 | \$1,403,879 | \$1,417,632 |  |
| Debt Service as a Percent of Revenues | 6.4\% | 6.8\% | 7.1\% | 6.8\% | 6.8\% | 6.4\% | 6.4\% | 6.4\% |  |
| Total Personal Income (000,000's) (5) | 82,285 | 84,507 | 86,789 | 89,132 | 91,539 | 94,010 | 96,548 | 99,155 |  |
| Debt to Personal Income | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |  |
| Population (000's) (6) | 1,346 | 1,348 | 1,351 | 1,354 | 1,356 | 1,359 | 1,362 | 1,365 |  |
| Debt Per Capita | \$460 | \$449 | \$435 | \$426 | \$420 | \$416 | \$412 | \$408 |  |

Footnotes explained on page 2.

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## Debt Affordability Study Update

## Assumptions to Sensitivity Case 2 - Issuance of \$60 Million Annually in FY 2020-25; Interest Rates Increase in FY 2020 School Building Aid Bonds Included

(1) Includes issuance of $\$ 63.41$ million of New Money 2018 Series A Bonds in December 2018
(2) $\$ 60$ million issued annually in FY 2020 through 2025 at an interest rate of 6\%,
with $60 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the first ten years and $40 \%$ of the principal amortized in equal payments over the remaining ten years.
(3) Ending Outstanding Debt represents total net General Fund Debt to be paid from General Fund Unrestricted Revenues and includes school building aid debt paid for with the Education Trust Fund ("ETF") M\&R tax revenue allocation.
(4) General Fund Unrestricted Revenues reflect actual revenues for FY 2018 and budgeted revenues for FY 2019, with the ETF portion of meals and room tax revenues designated for the debt service on school building aid bonds added. Assumes annual decrease in FY 2020-22 by 2\%, 1.5\% and 1\%, respectively, no revenue growth in FY 2023 and 1\% revenue growth in FY 2024-25.
(5) Total Personal Income - source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis for 2017 figure of $\$ 80,122$ million. Assumes $2.7 \%$ growth annually thereafter.
(6) Population source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017 figure of $1,343,000$. Assumes $0.2 \%$ growth annually thereafter.
(7) For certain sensitivities, state guaranteed debt that is added to Net General Fund Debt includes the outstanding $\$ 19.7$ million of Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs) and BFA debt totaling $\$ 49.784$ million at June 30, 2018.
(8) Debt Service includes State guaranteed debt outstanding or to be issued for the following: local Superfund sites, BFA, and PDA .

Excludes water pollution control, local landfills and local school guaranteed debt (with exception of QSCBs). Assumes level debt service over 20 years at $6.00 \%$ for new State guaranteed debt.
$\$ 36.06$ million is issued in each of FY 2020 and 2021, $\$ 35.96$ million in 2022 and $\$ 13.06$ million in each of $F Y 2023$ and 2024.
Estimated authorized but unissued State guaranteed debt of $\$ 134.2$ million includes:
$\$ 20$ million for local Superfund sites; $\$ 65.3$ million for BFA and $\$ 48.9$ million for Pease.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Debt Affordability Study Update
Sensitivity Case 2 - Issuance of $\$ 60$ Million Annually in FY 2020-25; Interest Rates Increase in FY 2020

|  | Actual$\underline{2018}$ | School Building Aid Bonds Included |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Projected |  | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ | TOTAL |
|  |  | 2019 | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | 2019-2025 |
| Net General Fund Debt (000's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Outstanding |  | \$618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 | \$618,996 |
| Issuances (1)(2) |  | \$63,410 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$423,410 |
| Retirements: Existing Debt (1) |  | 76,555 | 77,917 | 66,961 | 60,887 | 52,661 | 49,743 | 46,592 | 431,316 |
| New Debt (2) |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 3,600 | 7,200 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 18,000 | 54,000 |
| Total Retirements |  | \$76,555 | \$77,917 | \$70,561 | \$68,087 | \$63,461 | $\$ 64,143$ | \$64,592 | \$485,316 |
| Net New Debt |  | $(\$ 13,145)$ | $(\$ 17,917)$ | $(\$ 10,561)$ | $(\$ 8,087)$ | $(\$ 3,461)$ | $(\$ 4,143)$ | $(\$ 4,592)$ | $(\$ 61,906)$ |
| Ending Outstanding (3) | \$618,996 | \$605,851 | \$587,934 | \$577,373 | \$569,286 | \$565,825 | \$561,682 | \$557,090 | \$557,090 |
| Existing Debt Service (000's) (1) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$103,967 | \$89,404 | \$80,543 | \$69,446 | \$64,057 | \$58,693 |  |
| New Debt Service (000's) (2) | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 1,800 | \$8,892 | 15,768 | 22,428 | 28,872 | 35,100 |  |
| Total Debt Service (000's) | \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$105,767 | \$98,296 | \$96,311 | \$91,874 | \$92,929 | \$93,793 |  |
| General Fund Unrestricted Revenues (000's)(4) | \$1,607,984 | \$1,542,803 | \$1,511,772 | \$1,486,090 | \$1,471,070 | \$1,470,029 | \$1,484,446 | \$1,499,005 |  |
| Debt Service as a Percent of Revenues | 6.4\% | 6.8\% | 7.0\% | 6.6\% | 6.5\% | 6.2\% | 6.3\% | 6.3\% |  |
| Total Personal Income (000,000's) (5) | 82,285 | 84,507 | 86,789 | 89,132 | 91,539 | 94,010 | 96,548 | 99,155 |  |
| Debt to Personal Income | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |  |
| Population (000's) (6) | 1,346 | 1,348 | 1,351 | 1,354 | 1,356 | 1,359 | 1,362 | 1,365 |  |
| Debt Per Capita | \$460 | \$449 | \$435 | \$426 | \$420 | \$416 | \$412 | \$408 |  |

Footnotes explained on page 2

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Debt Affordability Study Update
Effect of State Guaranteed Bonds and Declining Revenues on Debt Ratios

## Net General Fund Debt (000's)

Beginning Outstanding (7) (8)
G.O. Issuances
State Guaranteed Issuances (7) (8) Retirements G.O. Debt

State Guaranteed Debt (8)
Total Retirements
Net New Debt
Ending Outstanding
G.O. Debt Service (000's)

State Guaranteed Debt
Total Debt Service (000's)
General Fund Unrestricted Revenues (000's) (4) Debt Service as a Percent of Revenues

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Actual } \\ & \underline{2018} \end{aligned}$ | Projected |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline 2019-2025 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2023}$ | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2025}$ |  |
|  | \$688,456 | \$672,310 | \$686,423 | \$706,802 | \$728,413 | \$731,150 | \$732,569 |  |
|  | \$63,410 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 | \$423,410 |
|  | 0 | 36,060 | 36,060 | 35,960 | 13,060 | 13,060 | 0 | 134,200 |
|  | 76,555 | 77,917 | 70,561 | 68,087 | 63,461 | 64,143 | 64,592 | 485,316 |
|  | 3,001 | 4,030 | 5,120 | 6,262 | 6,862 | 7,498 | 7,817 | 40,590 |
|  | \$79,556 | \$81,947 | \$75,681 | \$74,349 | \$70,323 | \$71,641 | \$72,409 | \$525,906 |
|  | $(\$ 16,146)$ | \$14,113 | \$20,379 | \$21,611 | \$2,737 | \$1,419 | $(\$ 12,409)$ | \$31,704 |
| \$688,456 | \$672,310 | \$686,423 | \$706,802 | \$728,413 | \$731,150 | \$732,569 | \$720,160 | \$31,704 |
| \$102,576 | \$104,763 | \$105,467 | \$97,414 | \$94,883 | \$89,936 | \$90,517 | \$90,943 |  |
| 6,493 | 6,480 | 9,505 | 12,531 | 15,537 | 16,558 | 17,579 | 17,461 |  |
| 109,069 | 111,242 | 114,972 | 109,944 | 110,419 | 106,494 | 108,095 | 108,404 |  |
| \$1,607,984 | \$1,542,803 | \$1,481,154 | \$1,433,886 | \$1,405,133 | \$1,404,091 | \$1,403,879 | \$1,417,632 |  |
| 6.8\% | 7.2\% | 7.8\% | 7.7\% | 7.9\% | 7.6\% | 7.7\% | 7.6\% |  |
| \$82,285 | \$84,507 | \$86,789 | \$89,132 | \$91,539 | \$94,010 | \$96,548 | \$99,155 |  |
| 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% |  |
| 1,346 | 1,348 | 1,351 | 1,354 | 1,356 | 1,359 | 1,362 | 1,365 |  |
| \$512 | \$499 | \$508 | \$522 | \$537 | \$538 | \$538 | \$528 |  |

Footnotes explained on page 2.


[^0]:    * Ten percent is rule of thumb used by rating agency analysts as a warning level that should not be exceeded, as a greater relative amount would place too heavy a fixed cost burden on the budget, thereby limiting fiscal flexibility.

