Measure R Short-Term Borrowing

Finance, Budget and Audit Committee May 20, 2015



Issue

- State and Federal grants require that Metro pay project expenses and request reimbursement of the payments.
- A short-term borrowing program will help bridge the gap between when expenditures are required and when programmed funding is received.
- Without short-term liquidity, we may be faced with delaying or stopping projects until funds can be accumulated to construct projects on a "pay go" basis.



Estimated Benefits of Short-Term Borrowing to Avoid Project Delays

Example	Estimated Amounts
Estimated expenditures for FY16 for Regional Connector Project	\$228.4 million
Estimated cost of one year delay (FY16) for Regional Connector Project (based on estimated project cost escalation and one year of extended overhead)	\$94.4 million
Estimated cost of one year short-term borrowing to fund \$228.4 million of FY16 Regional Connector Project expenditures	\$2.1 million
Estimated savings from short-term borrowing to avoid one year delay in Regional Connector Project, after issuance and interest costs	\$92.3 million



Comparison of Short and Long Term Borrowing Costs

		Estimated Annual Interest Cost At \$300M		
I. Short-Term Borrowing Program ¹				
(Based on bank proposals received)				
Current short-term rates (borrowing rate of 0.83%)	\$	2,488,000		
5-year historic average of short-term rates (borrowing rate of 0.85%)	\$	2,548,400		
10-year historic average of short-term rates (borrowing rate of 1.92%)	\$	5,745,100		
II. Long-Term Borrowing				
TIFIA Loans (Crenshaw rate of 2.43%) ²	\$	7,290,000		
Measure R Bonds (estimated rate of 3.29%)	\$	9,870,000		
Savings for one year from short-term borrowing at current rates versus TIFIA	\$	4,802,000		
Savings for one year from short-term borrowing at current rates versus Measure R Bonds (at estimated rate of 3.29%)		7,382,000		
 This analysis assumes the terms of the costliest bank proposal. TIFIA loan terms differ – this analysis assumes most advantageous TIFIA loan. 				



Summary of Proposals and Recommendations Credit Agreements Supporting \$300 Million Measure R Short-Term Borrowing Program

	Rank	Bank	Maximum Commitment Amount	Estimated Annual Cost based on Commitment Amount	Estimated Annual Interest Cost Normalized for Comparison Purposes At \$300M*		
5-Year Revolver Program (Estimated borrowing rate of .49% to .83%)							
	1	Bank of the West	\$50 million	\$252,200	\$1,513,000		
	2	State Street	\$100 million	\$488,600	\$1,465,700		
	3	RBC	\$150 million	\$1,018,500	\$2,036,900		
	4	JP Morgan	\$300 million	\$2,488,000	\$2,488,000		
	3-Year Revo	olver Program (Estimated borro					
	1	Bank of the West	\$50 million	\$214,700	\$1,288,000		
	2	State Street	\$100 million	\$438,600	\$1,315,700		
	3	RBC	\$150 million	\$703,500	\$1,406,900		
	4	Wells Fargo	\$75 million	\$397,000	\$1,588,000		
	5	Bank of America	\$300 million	\$1,813,000	\$1,813,000		
	6	JP Morgan	\$300 million	\$1,858,000	\$1,858,000		
	7	Barclays	\$150 million	\$944,000	\$1,888,000		
3-Year CP Program (Estimated borrowing rate of .64%)			ng rate of .64%)				
		Bank of Tokyo - Mitsubishi	\$ 300 million	\$1,916,900	\$1,916,900		
Currently recommended proposers are indicated in bold. Terms are locked for time specified in each proposal.							
	*Costs are calculated on per \$300 million basis, although most proposals are for smaller commitment amounts.						



Metro

Benefits of Short-Term Borrowing Program

Short-Term Financing:

- Short-term interest rates are very attractive now, including bank fees and marketing costs.
- Relatively fast to issue additional debt when needed.
- No need to borrow more than current project requirements so no extra interest costs or negative arbitrage.
- Can be repaid without any penalty.

