
Public Finance & Investments Division Finance Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Prudently and efficiently manage the debt and investment portfolios of the MOA while providing liquidity to meet daily cash requirements.

Direct Services

Provide the most cost-effective source of financing for all departments of the MOA.

Manage investment portfolios of the MOA with the objectives of:

- Safety of Principal,
- Liquidity to meet all operating requirements and
- Achieve the highest return on investment while complying with investment guidelines.

Provide investment performance reporting for the portfolios within the Municipal Cash Pool (MCP).

Provide investment accounting and investment earnings allocation services to all MOA departments.

Accomplishment Goals

- Maintain a rating of at least “AA” for the MOA’s general obligation bonds.
- Refund any outstanding debt that provides a minimum net present value savings and provide the most cost-effective source of financing for all departments of the MOA.
- Invest only in securities that comply with AMC at the time of investment.
- Provide an investment return, gross of fees, that outperforms the respective benchmark for each portfolio manager within the MCP.

Performance Measures

- The rating of the MOA’s general obligation by Standard & Poor’s and Fitch.
- Dollar amount of the net present value savings achieved by refunding outstanding debt with cost effective, innovative, and creative sources of funding.
- Monthly compliance report for investments that measure if the investments in the portfolio are compliant with AMC and P&P 24-11.
- Quarterly portfolio performance reports that measure the actual returns, gross of fees, of the portfolios within the MCP compared to the respective benchmark returns for the MCP.

Information as of September 30, 2022

Measure #1: The rating of the MOA’s general obligation by Standard & Poor’s and Fitch.

Year	Standard & Poor’s	Fitch
2008	AA Stable	AA Stable
2009	AA Stable	AA Stable
2010	AA Stable	AA+ Stable
2011	AA Stable	AA+ Stable
2012	AA+ Stable	AA+ Stable
2013	AA+ Stable	AA+ Stable
2014	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable
2015	AAA Negative	AA+ Stable
2016	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable
2017	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable

2018	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable
2019	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable
2020	AAA Stable	AA+ Stable
2021	AA+ Negative	AA+ Stable
2022	AA Negative	AA Stable

Measure #2: Dollar amount of the net present value savings achieved by refunding outstanding debt with cost effective, innovative, and creative sources of funding.

Year	Description of Refunding	Refunding Par Amount	Nominal Savings	NPV Savings
2009	AWWU-Water	\$ 49,680,000	\$ 149,533,362	\$ 5,848,119
2010	GO-GP (refunding) C-1	11,840,000	1,036,948	1,137,757
	GO-GP (restructuring) C-2	11,910,000	-2,225,384	-583,328
2011	GO-Schools (refunding) C	28,310,000	1,947,120	1,832,934
2012	GO-GP (refunding) B	30,215,000	1,934,725	2,526,664
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	24,080,000	1,504,758	1,502,047
2013	No Refunding Activity			
2014	GO-GP (refunding) B	78,430,000	11,375,985	10,446,307
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	37,150,000	4,247,874	3,633,494
	ML&P Refunding	180,575,000	1,720,900	1,444,736
2015	GO-GP (refunding) B	115,250,000	13,142,354	12,667,732
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	81,040,000	10,155,939	9,198,977
	CIVICVentures (refunding)	93,970,000	17,203,908	9,099,922
2016	GO-Schools (refunding) C	41,960,000	4,444,132	4,297,132
2017	AWWU-Water	88,660,000	21,549,897	16,521,828
	AWWU-Wastewater	64,895,000	14,799,257	11,324,814
	AWWU-Water Refunding (T)	13,915,000	7,215,937	278,533
2018	GO-GP (refunding) B	20,265,000	617,965	1,199,551
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	57,020,000	6,827,125	6,301,871
2019	GO-GP (refunding) B	27,750,000	3,729,199	3,385,347
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	10,295,000	1,359,022	1,242,941
2020	GO-GP (refunding) B	1,765,000	255,829	254,632

	GO-GP (refunding) C	43,820,000	6,212,814	5,658,803
	GO-GP (refunding) D	13,900,000	2,917,962	2,804,721
	GO-Schools (refunding) F	77,830,000	8,941,887	8,124,692
2021	GO-GP (refunding) B	25,595,000	1,991,520	1,776,259
	GO-Schools (refunding) D	35,740,000	2,836,228	2,528,815
2022	No Refunding Activity			
	Grand Total		\$ 295,277,263	\$ 124,455,300

Financing Program	Savings
Master Lease Program 2008 – 2019	\$1,000,000
Port Commercial Paper Program 2008 – 2015	9,600,000
Port Direct Loan Agreement 2016 – 2020	3,000,000
ML&P Commercial Paper Program 2012 – 2015	27,400,000
ML&P Direct Loan Agreement 2016 – 2019	12,776,000
ASU Direct Loan Agreement 2013 – 2019	9,380,000
ASU Intermediate Term Borrowing Program (ITBP) 2017 – 2019	750,000
AWU Direct Loan Agreement 2013 – 2019	11,900,000
AWU Intermediate Term Borrowing Program (ITBP) 2017 – 2019	1,500,000
Tax Anticipation Notes Issues 2006 – 2021*	16,969,157
2006 – 2021 Savings Achieved	\$94,275,157

* Net profit achieved by keeping long term funds invested in The Municipal Cash Pool

Measure #3: Monthly compliance report for investments that measure if the investments in the portfolio are compliant with AMC and P&P 24-11.		
Year	In Full Compliance?	Notes
2020	Yes, with exceptions	
	August and September	On August 31 and September 30, CARES Act funds of approximately \$96 million and \$116 million (respectively) were invested in money markets in-order to maintain the liquidity required for rapid deployment of this money into the community.
2021	Yes, with exceptions	
	January, February, and March	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in January, February, and March; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).

	April, May, and June	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	July, August, and September	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	October, November, and December	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
2022	Yes, with exceptions	
	January, February, and March	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	April, May, and June	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	July, August, and September	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	October and November	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	December	As of December 31, 2022, we are in full compliance.

2023	Yes, with exceptions	
	February and March	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	April	Large cash positions were held in the RMF account for short term spending expected in the near term; the returns on the type of short term, quality investments that would normally be invested in did not increase return, so these funds were left in money markets (which comprise Treasuries) rather than being invested individually in Treasuries (which would have reduced liquidity but not improved return).
	August	On August 31, MOA sent \$44.1 million and the School District sent \$43.7 million to USBank Debt Service accounts, and a debt service investment of \$5 million matured. All of these cash inflows were invested overnight in Money Market accounts, leaving the portfolio out of compliance with concentration limits for one day. On September 1, \$92.6 million was paid out for debt service and the portfolio was back in compliance.
	November and December	MOA staff have not been reinvesting matured RMF Fund investments, instead utilizing Money Market Funds (which comprise Treasuries) because the yield curve is inverted and liquidity may be needed soon.

Measure #4: Quarterly portfolio performance reports that measure the actual returns, gross of fees, of the portfolios within the MCP compared to the respective benchmark returns for the MCP.

	YTD 12/31/2023*	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
BlackRock Portfolio	7.28	-8.16	0.24	6.89	9.18	-0.04
Benchmark	7.24	-8.76	0.14	6.47	8.56	0.23
Excess Return	0.04	0.60	0.10	0.42	0.62	-0.27
PNC Portfolio	4.97	-3.50	-0.44	3.78	4.35	1.70
Benchmark	4.61	-3.69	-0.47	3.33	4.03	1.60
Excess Return	0.36	0.19	0.03	0.45	0.32	0.10
APCM Portfolio	5.34	1.76	0.16	0.65	2.58	1.85
Benchmark	5.02	1.46	0.05	0.67	2.28	1.87
Excess Return	0.32	0.30	0.11	-0.02	0.30	-0.02
Total MCP	5.87	-3.13	0.12	3.55	5.44	0.67

Values are expressed as percentages - * Quarter 1, 2024 returns were not available at the time of this report