

Debt Affordability Analysis



**January 2026 State of Alaska
State Bond Committee
Debt Management Policies
And State Debt Capacity**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

• Executive Summary	Page 3
• Introduction	Page 5
• Debt Policy Considerations	Page 12
• Current Debt Position	Page 13
• Discussion of Credit Ratings and Applicable Ratios	Page 14
• Affordable Level of Additional Debt or Obligation	Page 17
• School Debt Reimbursement Program	Page 20
• Level and Impact of Moral Obligations	Page 20
• Consideration of Debt Structuring Elements	Page 21
• Evaluation of Refunding Opportunities	Page 24

Appendix A – Alaska Public Debt Report Tables

Appendix B – State’s Post Issuance Policy

Executive Summary

A carefully considered debt management plan is a useful tool for policy leaders and government professionals when determining appropriate levels of debt. It is critical to balance the State's long-term financial outlook, economic considerations, an ongoing capital program and maintenance of a strong credit rating. Negative pressure on the quality of the State's credit rating from late 2014 through 2021 was based on the State's diminished Unrestricted General Fund (UGF) revenue generation caused by lower oil prices and the difficulty in determining how the State generates and categorizes revenue or how the State prioritizes spending to resolve any resulting UGF structural deficit. Options considered for change have included diminishing state UGF spending, implementing a broad-based tax, implementing, or increasing other taxes, and using some portion of the Permanent Fund investment earnings. As of fiscal year 2026, the options that have been exercised are reducing and constraining state UGF spending, implementing a statutory percent of market value draw on the Permanent Fund combined with diminishing the Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) distribution amount in certain years from the original statutory formula, reclassifying a portion of Permanent Fund earnings as UGF revenue, and the historical utilization of certain applicable federal aid during the COVID-19 pandemic. The changes implemented at this time have reduced and may temporarily balance recurring operating and capital budget outlays but may not fully resolve the recurring structural fiscal imbalance of the State's UGF portion of the budget for upcoming state budget years.

The current debt capacity of the State of Alaska is estimated to be approximately \$1,900 million, an increase of \$275 million from the prior analysis. The increase in capacity is mainly due to debt paydown, as well as higher UGF revenue projections in the Fall 2025 Revenue Sources Book (RSB), especially out-year UGF projections as a result of estimates for POMV transfers and the production forecast compared to the prior debt capacity analysis that included projections contained within the Fall 2024 RSB. This estimate was determined using the standard historical methodology (discussed below) and includes revisions to revenue projections, utilizing an average of UGF revenue for the five most recently closed fiscal years and continues the averaging methodology during the forecast period based on revenue estimates in the Fall 2025 RSB. The update to this methodology stems from two main points, 1) the uncertainty related to the use of unrestricted general fund revenue generated from the percent of market value transfers from the Alaska Permanent Fund for either PFDs or state UGF budget needs, and the State's difficulty in agreeing upon and implementing a comprehensive plan that results in the projected balancing of a UGF budget for future budget years, and 2) the inherent volatility in oil prices and production levels.

The State of Alaska's budget shortfall and correlated credit rating concerns have moderated since fiscal year 2015 when oil prices and UGF revenue diminished significantly, and since the volatility associated with the COVID-19 Pandemic waned. During fiscal year 2025, Moody's and Kroll both upgraded the rating of State of Alaska General Obligation bonds to "Aa2" and "AA+," respectively. Based on the rating criteria, including communications from the rating agencies, the factors that can negatively impact and or result in a rating downgrade is the accelerating depletion of the State's budget reserves including significant growth in pension obligations or other long-term liabilities. In addition, lacking a long-term fiscal plan that provides for balanced budgets places downward pressure on the State's debt capacity over a long-term time horizon.

Debt capacity is generally determined based on annual debt service not exceeding a percentage of UGF revenues. The State has historically used revenue classified as UGF in the State's RSBs as the basis of determining revenue available for debt service. This has recently been augmented through this report's use of a five-year average methodology. The uncertainty credit rating agencies and investors have in our bonds relates to the uncertainty of revenue such as the POMV transfer to UGF and subsequent amount that will be appropriated for governmental services versus dividend payments to qualified residents of Alaska. Investors in the State's bonds and credit rating agencies need to be confident that there will be sufficient revenues to pay annual debt service payments in current and future years.

Following the 2018 Legislature passing Senate Bill 26 which, beginning in fiscal year 2019, provided a framework for appropriating investment income of the Permanent Fund for state government expenditure. SB 26 establishes that the amount available for appropriation shall be equal to "5.25% of the average market value of the Permanent Fund for the first five of the preceding six fiscal years, including the fiscal year just ended." Per SB 26, on July 1, 2021, the calculation then diminished to 5% of the average market value as further described. For fiscal year 2019, this change resulted in an additional \$2.7 billion of UGF revenue and became the largest revenue source for the UGF budget. Chapter 2, Table 5, of the State of Alaska, Department of Revenue, Tax Division's Fall 2025 RSB, lists the POMV transfer to UGF at approximately \$3,799 million for FY 2026 and estimates \$3,997 million for FY 2027.

The shift to include certain investment revenue of the Alaska Permanent Fund as UGF in the State's revenue sources beginning in fiscal year 2019 significantly boosted UGF revenue. For purposes of estimating debt capacity, the Department of Revenue has determined that using the UGF revenue projection which includes transfers of revenue from the Permanent Fund is appropriate, but the political and budgeting uncertainty over use of the transfer places downward pressure on historical debt capacity metrics for this category of UGF. For context, the ten-year capacity for general obligation bonds without including the Alaska Permanent Fund revenue would be approximately \$1.3 billion, which would be over \$1.8 billion less than the capacity if considering the entire amount of the Permanent Fund POMV transfer as UGF revenue.

The Department of Revenue has developed a multi-pronged debt capacity model which enables the State to calculate its available borrowing capacity based on the current fiscal structure. The model results are based on the following constraints:

- Debt service on general obligation bonds and state supported debt (obligations that are based solely on the state's commitment to annually seek appropriation for repayment, which could be supported by a lease) in any year shall be targeted not to exceed a level of 4% of the projected year's unrestricted revenues. In fiscal year 2021, this became the primary methodology for establishing debt capacity;
- Debt service on general obligation bonds, state supported debt, and the debt reimbursement programs shall be targeted not to exceed a level of 7% of the year's projected unrestricted revenues;

- An average of UGF revenue for the five most recently closed fiscal years, using the State revenue forecast for all projected fiscal years;
- All future debt issuances are amortized over 20 years, with level debt service payments;
- All bonds are issued at an assumed interest rate of 5%; and
- Annual unrestricted revenues available to pay debt service through 2035 are set at amounts stipulated in the Fall 2025 RSB of the Tax Division (adjusted using a five-year average of the five prior fiscal years as mentioned above).
- The impact of PERS and TRS state assistance payments is included for context, utilizing the most recent ARM Board adopted actuarial valuation reports (FY24).

Introduction and Background

The following section provides a description of recent events and background relating to debt management at the State of Alaska.

On August 5, 2020, the final \$110 million of general obligation bond authorization from the 2012 Transportation Act was issued. There is currently no authorized but unissued general obligation bonding authority.

In September 2020, the Alaska Supreme Court issued a decision that invalidated the proposed structure to issue up to one billion in bonds by the Alaska Tax Credit Certificate Bond Corporation for the repayment of oil and gas tax credits. This ruling also eliminated the ability of the Alaska Pension Obligation Bond Corporation to issue up to \$1.5 billion in bonds to fund actuarially determined unfunded pension liabilities in the Public Employees Retirement System and the Teachers Retirement System and the ability to issue up to \$300 million in subordinated toll revenue bonds for the Knik Arm Crossing. In all of these constructs, the only source of revenue expected for the repayment of securities for at least some portion of the amortization was a subject to appropriation pledge of the State of Alaska's general fund. These reductions in authorized but unissued bonding authority have a somewhat muted but beneficial impact on the State's available debt capacity, as it was uncertain if they would have been utilized.

From fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2021, the State's UGF budget expenditures exceeded UGF revenues and were balanced primarily using funds from the Constitutional Budget Reserve (CBR) and Statutory Budget Reserve (SBR) in combination with other funds along with sources of UGF revenue. In the fiscal year 2025 budget, UGF revenues modestly exceeded budget expenditures. The enacted fiscal year 2026 budget (projected as of the Fall 2025 RSB) includes a budget deficit of approximately \$350 million (State of Alaska – Office of Management and Budget, Fiscal Year 2026 Management Plan plus Proposed Supplements as of December 11, 2025).

To date, the State of Alaska's credit rating peaked in 2013 with the highest ratings from the three legacy credit rating agencies. The significant reduction in UGF in fiscal year 2015, the State's practice of segregating revenues and portraying certain current year revenue as restricted by custom combined with a pattern of budgets that relied on past year revenue held primarily in the CBR placed significant strain on the State's credit rating. While the State continues to maintain

high credit ratings, multiple downgrades did occur over the years since 2015. A general outline and 10-year history of activity, including bold text for current ratings, is detailed below:

2015: AAA, AAA, Aaa ratings since 2013 or earlier, Stable Outlook
January 5, 2016: downgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA+ Negative Outlook
February 29, 2016: downgrade by Moody's Investors Service to Aa1 Negative Outlook
June 14, 2016: downgrade by Fitch Ratings to AA+ Negative Outlook
July 25, 2016: downgrade by Moody's Investor Service to Aa2 Negative Outlook
July 13, 2017: downgrade by Moody's Investor Service to Aa3 Negative Outlook
July 18, 2017: downgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA Negative Outlook
November 2, 2017: downgrade by Fitch Ratings to AA Negative Outlook
Fiscal year 2018 ratings outlooks revised to Stable by all three rating agencies
September 5, 2019: downgrade by Fitch Ratings to AA- Negative Outlook
April 17, 2020: downgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA- Negative Outlook
May 6, 2020: downgrade by Fitch Ratings to A+ Negative Outlook
April 22, 2021: outlook revised from Negative to Stable by Moody's Investors Service
May 4, 2021: outlook revised from Negative to Stable by Standard & Poor's
March 21, 2022: outlook revised from Stable to Positive by Standard & Poor's
April 12, 2022: outlook revised from Negative to Stable by Fitch Ratings
July 20, 2023: initiation of AA rating by Kroll Bond Rating Agency
April 30, 2024: upgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA Stable Outlook
May 6, 2024: outlook revised to Positive from Stable by Moody's Investors Service
September 27, 2024: outlook revised to Positive from Stable by Fitch Ratings
February 25, 2025: upgrade by Kroll Bond Rating Agency to AA+ Stable Outlook
June 17, 2025: upgrade by Moody's Investor Service to Aa2 Stable Outlook
September 12, 2025: upgrade by Fitch Ratings to AA- Stable Outlook

The State's credit rating had stabilized in fiscal year 2018 with the adjustment of the outlook of the State from negative to stable by all three legacy rating agencies. These adjustments reflected recognition of the financial options that the State has available to it in addressing challenges of reported recurring UGF budget deficits, incremental change that had occurred over the prior three years to address the State's fiscal situation, and most significantly the State's initial use of Permanent Fund earnings as UGF in the fiscal year 2019 budget as a result of the passage of SB 26. This stability diminished late in fiscal year 2019 through the beginning of fiscal year 2021 as the State experienced political gridlock during the process of creating the fiscal year 2020 budget, with multiple special sessions of the Legislature and high-level policy disagreement between the Executive and Legislative branches of government. Continued reliance on the CBR and the forecast depletion of the CBR resulted in additional rating action in the Spring of 2020. In fiscal year 2020, Moody's placed the State's credit on negative outlook, Standard and Poor's placed the credit on negative outlook and downgraded one notch, and Fitch Ratings placed the credit on negative outlook and downgraded two notches.

In fiscal year 2021, Moody's and Standard & Poor's revised the State's credit rating outlook from negative to stable. In the Spring of 2022, Standard and Poor's revised the outlook on the State to positive from stable, and Fitch Ratings revised the outlook on the State from negative to stable. The credit ratings stability resulted from improved revenue generation from both petroleum, which

was in-part related to geopolitical concerns over energy sustainability, and investment performance, combined with the implemented budgets' austerity for fiscal year 2022.

The erosion of the quality of the State's credit rating since 2015 has been the result of the State's diminished UGF generation caused by low oil price, volatility, and the difficulty in determining how and when to change how the State generates and categorizes revenue or how the State prioritizes spending to resolve the UGF structural deficit. Options for change involve spending less, spending differently or generating more revenue and reaching consensus on the appropriate options has proven extremely challenging. As of fiscal year 2026, the options that have been exercised are reducing state UGF spending, diminishing the PFD distribution from the statutory formula in certain years, reclassifying a portion of Permanent Fund earnings as UGF revenue, and use of applicable COVID-19 pandemic federal relief funds during their availability.

The State of Alaska experienced a steep decline in unrestricted revenue due to the sharp drop in the price of oil from over \$100 per barrel in August 2014 to below \$30 per barrel in December 2014. From 2015 through 2017 the Alaska North Slope (ANS) oil price stabilized in the \$40-\$50 per barrel range, increased gradually through fiscal year 2019 to an average price of \$69.46. Then in fiscal year 2020, the price dropped to an average of \$52.15 per barrel, in fiscal year 2021 the average price was \$54.14 per barrel. The State's historical UGF classification of revenue declined from \$5,390 million in fiscal year 2014 to a low of \$1,355 million in fiscal year 2017. Fiscal year 2019 UGF increased to approximately \$5,350 million with the inclusion of \$2,723 million of Alaska Permanent earnings, fiscal year 2020 UGF was \$4,529 million, fiscal year 2021 UGF was \$4,783 million, fiscal year 2022 UGF was \$6,939 million, fiscal year 2023 UGF was \$7,044 million, fiscal year 2024 UGF was \$6,631 million, and fiscal year 2025 UGF was \$6,342 million. In the Fall 2025 Revenue Forecast, total UGF revenue is projected to fluctuate over the forecast period between a low of \$5,947 million in fiscal year 2026 to a high of \$8,157 million in fiscal year 2036. Despite the increase in the overall baseline projection of UGF revenue since fiscal years 2015-2021, the State must still determine which options, or combination of options to utilize to achieve long-term budget balance and stability, which may include additional reductions in UGF expenditures, additional UGF revenue generation, and the appropriate size of the annual Permanent Fund Dividend distribution to qualified residents of Alaska.

General Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements related to accounting for pension liabilities and other post-employment benefits (OPEB) have been implemented since 2016 and updated the reporting and disclosure requirements related to pension liabilities. Requirements of GASB include that if a government is committed to making payments on an unfunded pension liability on behalf of another entity, the amount of liability supported must be reported as a debt of the government making the payments and that the assumed rate of return for retirement trusts must be adjusted up and down by 1% to provide a range of potential outcomes. Senate Bill 125 was passed in 2008 and committed to funding any actuarially determined contribution rate that exceeds employer contributions of 22% for the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and 12.56% for the Teachers Retirement System (TRS). While TRS funding is arguably a state responsibility, this debt would be found primarily on local school districts' balance sheets if SB 125 was not in place. Under GASB, the State's payment commitment under SB 125 increased the State of Alaska's long-term debt by \$5,801 million to \$8,473 million as of June 30, 2015, compared to \$2,672 million as of June 30, 2014. Recognition of this long-term obligation was incorporated

into the State's debt affordability analysis in 2017. Updated demographic and economic assumptions were adopted by the ARM Board in June 2022 and were used in recent actuarial valuation reports. One significant item that changed was the actuarial assumption for investment rate of return. This rate was revised down from 7.38 percent, currently assuming 7.25 percent.

Based on pension system ACFRs, from June 30, 2024, to June 30, 2025, the net position of the PERS increased by approximately \$1.94 billion, or 7.8%. This increase in net position was primarily due to increased net investment income and funding levels of both the PERS Pension, and to a lesser extent, the Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) trusts. As of June 30, 2025, the PERS employers' net pension liability was \$4,962,316,000 and the plan fiduciary net position as a percentage of the total pension liability was 71.23%. The PERS Total other OPEB liabilities were less than the Plan fiduciary net position resulting in an employers' net OPEB assets of negative \$2,661,351,000 which reflects an excess of \$2,661,351,000 in assets of the OPEB trust.

From June 30, 2024, to June 30, 2025, the net position of the TRS increased by \$728,404,000 or 6.4%. This increase in net position was primarily due to increased net investment income and funding levels of both the TRS Pension, and to a lesser extent, the Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) trusts. As of June 30, 2025, the TRS employers' net pension liability was \$1,554,467,000 and the plan fiduciary net position as a percentage of the total pension liability was 80.65%. The TRS Total other OPEB liabilities were less than the Plan fiduciary net position resulting in an employers' net OPEB assets of negative \$1,195,576,000 which reflects an excess of \$1,195,576,000 in assets of the OPEB trust.

A 1% reduction in the rate of return on investments from the actuarially assumed rate of 7.25% down to 6.25% increases the PERS liability to \$6,784,035,000 and TRS liability to \$2,374,044,000. The remaining current balance of liabilities as well as the magnitude in change in liability from potential negative future outcomes continue to highlight the impact that PERS and TRS funding needs have on the State.

The State has finite capacity to borrow money in a cost-effective manner. Any borrowing which jeopardizes the State's credit rating or perceived credit by investors will increase the cost of borrowing money by the State as well as certain other issuers in Alaska. As such, these guidelines are established to ensure that any borrowings by the State are reflective of the best practices and represent conservative, well balanced approaches to debt management. These guidelines also envision that in certain circumstances, deviations from these guidelines may be in the best interest of the State, however any such deviations should be well studied by the State and its financial advisor(s).

As of June 30, 2025, the State had reportable general fund obligations, all in fixed rate mode of approximately:

	Debt Outstanding	2026 Debt Service	Final Maturity
General Obligation	468,800,000	64,100,000	2041
Subject to Appropriation			
COPS	10,300,000	2,900,000	2029
Lease Revenue	119,200,000	18,600,000	2033
School Debt Reimbursement*	319,000,000	46,700,000	2044
TIDSRA Reimbursements*	8,600,000	2,800,000	2031
Total Pension Liability**	3,892,000,000	218,800,000	~2039
TOTAL	4,817,900,000	353,900,000	

*Debt service listed in this table reflects full authority for statutory reimbursements, and subject to further review and adjustments through DEED and DOTPF, who are administrators of those specific programs.

**This total includes other municipal employer's liabilities. From most recent State of Alaska PERS and TRS actuarial valuation reports, as of June 30, 2024, final maturity extends beyond 2039 for certain state assistance payments.

As of June 30, 2025, the State had no authorized but unissued general fund obligations:

	Authority	Estimated Debt Service	Term
General Obligation	\$0	\$0	N/A
Subject to Appropriation	\$0	\$0	N/A
School Debt Reimbursement	None*	Currently limited to revisions through DEED for already authorized projects (prior to the original moratorium in 2015)	N/A
TOTAL	\$0	\$0	

*The most recent moratorium extension in 2021 expired on July 1, 2025.

As of June 30, 2025, the State had debt obligations secured and paid by the general fund of approximately \$598.3 million, comprised of \$468.8 million of general obligation bonds, \$10.3 million of Certificates of Participation, and \$119.2 million of lease-revenue bond conduit issues of political subdivisions all issued in fixed rate mode. The State's general obligation debt was conservatively structured with generally level debt service and is currently amortizing principal at a rate of between approximately \$40 and \$50 million per year through the medium-term. No additional State general fund secured bond issuance authority exists at this time.

As of June 30, 2025, the State had approximately \$156.7 million outstanding in the Veteran's Mortgage Loan Program which the general fund guarantees but has never had to pay the debt service. This guarantee was obtained in 1982 as it was required by the 1980 Mortgage Subsidy Bond Tax Act to obtain tax exempt financing of mortgages for US military veterans in Alaska. This is the only debt issued by a political subdivision that is guaranteed by the State. The program

maintains the highest credit rating of AAA prior to including the state guarantee and therefore has no impact on the State's debt capacity.

Per Alaska Statute 14.11.100, "State aid for costs of school construction debt" the state shall allocate payment to municipalities for the reimbursement of qualified debt service issued to fund authorized school district capital projects. This program is administered by the State of Alaska's Department of Education and Early Development and is commonly referred to as the School Debt Reimbursement Program (SDRP).

Per Alaska Statute 29.60.700, "Reimbursement for costs of municipal capital projects" the state shall allocate payments to municipalities for the reimbursement of qualified debt service issued to fund authorized municipal capital projects. This program is administered by the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities and is commonly referred to as the Transportation and Infrastructure Debt Service Reimbursement Authorization (TIDSRA).

The SDRP was funded at 50% of the statutory funding allowance in fiscal year 2020, at 0% in fiscal year 2021, approximately 42% in fiscal year 2022, and the enacted fiscal year 2026 budget funds the program at approximately 70%. Other than certain University of Alaska reimbursements, the TIDSRA was not funded in fiscal year 2020, 2021, or 2022. Based on the statutory framework of the programs, the analysis in this publication continues to assume that the authorized amounts will be paid over the entire forecast period. The SDRP funding is subject to annual appropriation and partial funding has been appropriated in fiscal years 1983, 1986 through 1991, 2017, 2020 through 2022, and enacted 2026, with no appropriation in fiscal year 2021. During years of partial, or no funding, municipal revenues must be used to pay this debt service. In a 2022 supplemental appropriation, there was a backfill for prior year offsets occurring during fiscal years 2017 and 2020 through 2022. As of June 30, 2025, approximately \$319.0 million of municipal general obligation bonds with annual debt service of approximately \$46.7 million in FY 2026 gradually diminishing to the final year's payment of \$200 thousand in 2044 are eligible for reimbursement under the SDRP and approximately \$9.8 million of University and other municipal general obligation bonds with approximately \$2.8 million in annual payment in fiscal year 2026 gradually diminishing through final maturity in 2031 are eligible for reimbursement under the TIDSRA. The SDRP has existed since 1970 and provides varying levels of municipal reimbursement for qualified school construction projects' debt service from the general fund. The program was recently in a moratorium on additional participation until July 1, 2025.

On June 30, 2025, there was \$1,112.9 million of moral obligation debt of the State, \$440.5 million of State revenue (Alaska International Airports System) and University of Alaska debt, and \$2,941.3 million of State agency debt.

The State funds its two main retirement systems, PERS and TRS, as both an employer and by providing assistance payments to limit the percentage of payroll that participating employers would otherwise be required to pay. The limits for employer payments were established as percentages of payroll by Senate Bill 125 in 2008 at 22% for PERS and 12.56% for TRS. Additionally, Senate Bill 55 (SB 55), an Act relating to employer contributions to the System, made changes to Alaska Statute (AS) 39.35.255 that indicated the State of Alaska, as a participating employer, shall contribute to the System every payroll period an amount sufficient to

pay the full actuarially determined employer normal cost, all contributions required under AS 39.30.370 (HRA) and AS 39.35.750 (all DCR costs – employer match, ODD, RMP), and past service costs for members at the contribution rate adopted by the Board under AS 37.10.220 for the fiscal year for that payroll period.

The State of Alaska, as an employer, will pay the full actuarial determined employer contribution rate adopted by the Board for each fiscal year effective July 1, 2021. If the retirement plans earn 7.25% on pre-funded benefit payments in the trusts those estimated payments are in the \$219 million to \$345 million range over the projection period. The annual debt payment increases if the State's earnings rate in the trusts is below the actuarially assumed rate.

After reviewing the State's debt, revenue volatility and fiscal position and comparing the State's experience and practices with the best practices of other states:

- The state recognizes that using “Debt Service as a percent of general government spending (or revenues)” is a better measure of an entity’s debt burden. The ratio illustrates the relative portion that debt service represents of total State annual expenses or State resources. Recognizing the volatile nature of State revenue, the State Bond Committee adopted a formal policy to target no more than 5 percent of annual UGF revenue for debt service on general obligation bonds and other public debt directly secured by a subject to appropriation pledge of the State of Alaska. A higher target of no more than 8 percent of annual UGF for debt service on general obligation bonds and other public debt directly secured by a subject to appropriation pledge of the State of Alaska as well as debt reimbursement programs was also established. This policy was updated in 2019 due to the inclusion of certain Permanent Fund earnings as UGF through SB 26, for both Permanent Fund Dividends (PFD) as well as other State expenses, combined with downward pressure on debt capacity due to uncertainty about how future years’ Permanent Fund earnings may be allocated between the PFD and other State expenses, which made an adjustment of these ratios from 5% to 4% and from 8% to 7% prudent. As augmented from 2022 forward, the revenue component of the calculation will use 5-year averages of revenue of the five most recently closed fiscal years, including forecasted amounts for all future fiscal years projected within the State’s Fall RSB.

The State has historically used revenue classified as UGF in the State’s semi-annual Revenue Sources Book (RSB) as the basis of determining revenue available for debt service. Until fiscal year 2019, this revenue number didn’t include large amounts of current year investment revenue and still partially excludes a portion of current year investment revenue of the Permanent Fund that is available for appropriation. Prior to 2019, all of these amounts were saved or distributed to state residents as a PFD and therefore customarily classified as restricted. Beginning in the Fall 2015 RSB, a table titled “Current-Year Revenue Subject to Appropriation” was included to highlight the magnitude of the omission of the revenue availability. In the Fall 2025 RSB, fiscal year 2026 UGF revenue projections are \$5,947 million in Chapter 2 Table 1, while revenue subject to appropriation is estimated to be approximately \$6,732 million in Chapter 3 Table 1. Additionally, fiscal year 2026 earnings for the Permanent Fund above the FY 2026 POMV payout from the Permanent Fund Earnings Reserve are included in Chapter 4, Table 1 as \$3,700 million. This value is not included in the revenue subject to appropriation table which is limited to the FY 2026 POMV amount of \$3,799 million. The retention of investment earnings above the POMV

calculation is important to manage for market volatility and inflation proofing of the Permanent Fund balance but can understate the financial strength of the State over the forecast period.

- The State Bond Committee shall continue to monitor other ongoing commitments of the general fund including the School Debt Reimbursement Program, the Veteran's Mortgage Program, PERS and TRS system funding requirements, and any other quantifiable multi-year obligations of the state to pay or reimburse on outstanding liabilities.
- While state law doesn't require that municipalities pursue refinancing opportunities on bonds subject to reimbursement from the State, the State Bond Committee will continue to monitor opportunities and encourage municipalities to refinance and reduce the State's appropriation requirements.
- The State's reported broad fiscal position as reflected in the Revenue Sources Book, Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, and official budgetary analysis largely determines debt capacity. Despite the persistent environment of recurring UGF fiscal imbalance between available UGF revenues and unrestricted expenditures the shift of certain Permanent Fund earnings to UGF combined with recent positive trends in legacy oil revenue generation and production estimates may increase the State's capacity for new debt without further credit degradation.

Debt Policy Considerations

The following policies are established to standardize the practices of the issuance and management of debt by the State Bond Committee of the State of Alaska. The primary objectives of the policies are to establish conditions for the use of debt and to create procedures and policies that minimize the State's debt service and issuance costs, maintain credit ratings, reflect best practices for State government finance, and maintain full and complete financial disclosure and reporting. The policies apply to any debt authorized by law and issued directly by the State or issued by another entity but authorized by law and only paid for by the State, including general obligation bonds, lease-revenue bonds, certificates of participation, subject to appropriation obligations, revenue bonds, municipal or other debt reimbursement programs, PERS and TRS unfunded liabilities, any other forms of indebtedness, as well as any debt which is implicitly or explicitly guaranteed by the State.

Debt policies promote the best and most efficient use of the State's finite capacity to borrow to meet the State's commitments to provide services to its citizens without jeopardizing the future financial health of the State. These policies should be considered guidelines for general use and seek to provide the State with adequate flexibility to be able to respond to constantly changing economic conditions and changes in financial markets. Nevertheless, nothing contained herein should be construed as prohibiting the State from undertaking actions not specifically contemplated in these policies should it be determined to be necessary and appropriate. Regular

updates to debt policies are encouraged as necessary to ensure that the State maintains sound financial management practices reflecting current market and economic conditions.

Beginning in 1983 the State has measured debt capacity by comparing debt service to UGF revenues. The State's policy was that state general fund supported debt service should not exceed 5% of UGF revenues. Beginning in 1985, the State included general obligation, lease revenue, University, certificates of participation, and the school debt reimbursement program in the ratio. University debt was subsequently removed from the calculation. In 1999, recognizing past practice of the State, the policy was amended to still target 5%, but allow for the ratio to reach up to 8% due to revenue volatility. This policy was further refined in 2013 to target no more than 5% of UGF for general fund supported debt service and no more than 8% for debt service of general obligation bonds, lease revenue bonds, certificates of participation, and the debt reimbursement programs. In fiscal year 2019, with the addition of certain earnings of the Permanent Fund to UGF, including the PFD distribution, the policy was amended again. A 1% reduction to each ratio was incorporated to target no more than 4% of UGF for general obligation debt service, lease revenue bonds, and certificates of participation and no more than 7% for debt service of general obligation bonds, lease revenue bonds, certificates of participation, and the debt reimbursement programs. Based on the recent partially funded or unfunded local debt that had some state level subject to appropriation commitment to reimburse debt service, and the additional constraints established by the Alaska Supreme Court on subject to appropriation debt structures in fiscal year 2021, the focus of future capacity is on general obligation bonds.

Current and anticipated reserve balances including the Constitutional Budget Reserve and the Permanent Fund Earnings Reserve should be, in combination, maintained at, at least, minimum fund levels to ensure the highest probability of credit rating security. The State's most significant long-term reserve, the Alaska Permanent Fund Corpus is protected by the State's Constitution and shall remain intact. On June 30, 2025, the State had short term reserves of approximately \$15.5 billion comprised of \$12.6 billion in the Permanent Fund Earnings Reserve Account (a balance of \$8.8 billion with the committed POMV transfer amount of approximately \$3.8 billion) and an asset balance of approximately \$2.9 billion in the CBR. The final fiscal year 2025 total budget was \$15,891 million and the UGF budget was \$5,527 million. Thus, short term reserves were sufficient to fund approximately 2.8 times the amount of unrestricted general fund spending, or over 30 times the amount of outstanding general obligation bonds.

Current Debt Position

As of June 30, 2025, the State of Alaska ("State") had approximately \$468.8 million in General Obligation debt outstanding all in fixed rate mode. The State's general obligation bonds are being repaid at the rate of approximately \$40 to \$50 million in principal per year over the medium-term. The State has issued all of its authority to sell general obligation bonds as of July 2020. Between 1981 and 2003 the State didn't authorize any general obligation bonds. This lack of use of bonds was in part due to significant issuance in the 10-year period from 1975 to 1984 when the amount of general obligation debt outstanding increased from \$392 million to \$946 million combined with the volatile nature of the State's unrestricted general fund revenue which declined precipitously in 1987. This led to a preference for pay-go funding as a primary source of capital during years of higher revenue generation and almost no capital spending in years of lower revenue generation.

In the 23 years since 2002 the state and voters have authorized just five general obligation bond propositions. It is likely that if State revenues become less volatile and are approximately equal to expenses as the State begins relying on revenue sources other than those tied to Alaska North Slope oil price and production that additional use of general obligation bonds may materialize.

As of June 30, 2025, the State had additional net tax supported debt of approximately \$10.3 million in Certificates of Participation (COP) and \$119.2 million of capital lease obligations securitized through political subdivisions that were authorized by Alaska Law. The State's COPs and capital lease obligations are being repaid at the aggregate level of between approximately \$16.8 to \$23.0 million per year over the next eight years.

Rating agencies have historically highlighted the State's conservative financial management, citing a low debt burden and sizable reserve amounts necessary to offset shifts in the price or production of oil. While the State has relied on North Slope oil production for revenues for over 45 years, there are potential long-term alternatives in the development of natural gas resources, mineral production, implementation of a State broad based tax, and a defined methodology for use of earnings of the Permanent Fund to offset costs of government services. In fiscal year 2019, the transfer from the Earnings Reserve of the Permanent Fund was classified as UGF for the first time, but without a clear direction for how the revenue should be split between paying for government services or the PFD. This lack of clarity has resulted in extended budget development debate beginning in 2019 that has persisted through the recent fiscal year's budget processes.

An evident factor in assessing the historically conservative nature of the State's debt practices is witnessed by the relatively low level of debt service as a percentage of UGF revenue. While the current State policy is designed to limit the ratio of state and state supported debt obligations to 7% of UGF, during the ten years preceding fiscal year 2025 the State remained below 5% in six of those years. In fiscal year 2015, with the reduction of UGF due to the falling price of oil, the ratio increased to 10.1% then to 13.9% in fiscal year 2016, to 15.0% in fiscal year 2017 and 9.4% in 2018. In fiscal year 2019 the ratio was 4.1%, in fiscal year 2020 4.5%, in fiscal year 2021 4.1%, in fiscal year 2022 2.6%, in fiscal year 2023 2.6%, in fiscal year 2024 2.5%, in fiscal year 2025 2.3%, and the ratio is projected to be 2.3% in fiscal year 2026.

Based on the Fall 2025 RSB's projections for UGF the State's ratios are projected to remain well below allowed percentages throughout the forecast period. A metric that demonstrates the conservative debt practice of the State is the trajectory of general obligation debt retirement. Approximately 87% of the current general obligation debt outstanding will be repaid over the next ten years, allowing for the potential of the State to participate and support future capital projects.

The State has traditionally structured its general obligation bond issues as long-term fixed rate debt and currently has no exposure to floating or variable rate debt or derivative products.

Discussion of Credit Ratings and Applicable Ratios

The State of Alaska's credit ratings as of December 31, 2025, were:

Moody's Investor Service – 'Aa2' with a stable outlook

Standard & Poor's – 'AA' with a stable outlook
Fitch Ratings – 'AA-' with a stable outlook
Kroll Bond Rating Agency – 'AA+' with a stable outlook

The current Standard and Poor's Public Finance Criteria focusing specifically on how they assess the strength of a governmental entity's financial management practices was released in October 2016 (criteria has been reviewed and republished approximately annually, with nonmaterial changes). State general obligation bond ratings are driven by five primary credit factors:

- Government Framework
- Financial Management
- Economy
- Budgetary Performance
- Debt and liability profile

In the update, S&P stated they are "publishing this article to help market participants better understand our approach to assigning state ratings." S&P seeks to determine if the entity has established policies relative to, among other things, the issuance of debt, maturity and debt structure, and debt refunding guidelines. Issuers deemed "Strong" in this regard would be entities that have well-defined debt policies, with strong reporting and monitoring mechanisms in place.

In its May 4, 2021, publication "*U.S. State Tax-Supported Rating Criteria*," Fitch references four key factors that play a significant role in driving the rating outcome for a given issuer. The main factors used by Fitch are revenue framework, expenditure framework, long-term liability burden, and operating performance.

In its March 22, 2022, publication "*US States and Territories Methodology*," Moody's Investors Service explained the rating methodology for states. Primary rating factors identified are economy, financial performance, governance, and leverage. The document provides general guidance to help readers understand how qualitative and quantitative risk characteristics are likely to affect rating outcomes for US states and territories. Moody's uses a state's gross domestic product as a proxy for its capacity to carry liabilities, because in most states the economy drives current and future tax revenue.

In its November 1, 2017, publication "*U.S. State General Obligation Rating Methodology*," Kroll Bond Rating Agency ("KBRA") explained the rating methodology for states. The drivers focus on four rating determinants that encompass the critical aspects of a state's credit profile. These rating determinants include the State's management structure and policies, debt burden and additional continuing obligations, financial performance and liquidity position and state resource base. When appropriate, KBRA's rating assessment may emphasize the strength of management as a critical element of a state's credit profile. The analytical process employed in determining a State's general obligation rating may take into consideration the significant differences that exist between individual states in terms of the nature of their respective economic frameworks, the level of services they provide and the resources available to the State.

As part of the credit review process to determine a state's debt burden, rating agencies review each entity's outstanding debt and future capital plans through the following:

- **Debt Ratios**
 - Debt to personal income
 - Debt service as a percentage of general government spending (or, conversely, unrestricted revenues)
- **Debt Structure**
 - A review of the composition of the debt (GO, appropriation-backed or special tax)
 - The rate at which the debt is repaid
 - The purpose for which the bond proceeds are used
 - The percentage of fixed vs. variable rate debt
- **Future Borrowing Plans**
- **Pension and OPEB Funding Levels**

Debt Ratios

The rating agencies are generally consistent in the manner in which they review an issuer's debt profile, thereby facilitating comparative analysis within peer groups. Such comparative analysis has taken on greater importance over the last several years as investors in the capital markets have pushed for greater transparency within the ratings process.

Fitch believes the calculation of net tax-supported debt as a percentage of personal income to be the best indicator of a state's debt burden and has opined that "...a low debt burden is a positive credit factor." Fitch considers a ratio less than 10% to be "LOW", and a ratio in the 40% range to be "MODERATE".

Debt Service as a % of general government spending (or revenues) is a much more meaningful measure of an entity's debt burden. The ratio illustrates the relative portion debt service represents of total state annual expenses or state resources. As an example, Table 2 provides a historic list of states, and a snapshot of debt policy guidelines linked to annual operating revenues:

State	Debt Service as a % of Unrestricted Revenues	Legal Authority
Florida	8.0%*	Policy
Georgia	8.0%	Policy
Maryland	8.0%	Policy
Minnesota	3.0%	Policy
North Carolina	4.8%	Policy
Texas	5%**	Constitutional
Vermont	6.0%	Policy
Virginia	5.0%	Policy

* 8% cap; 6% target
** Calculated using the average revenues of the prior 3 years

S&P, in past reports released in conjunction with the State's general obligation bond issuance, has noted what the general obligation and appropriation-backed debt service represented as a percentage of general fund and non-major special fund expenditures. In formalizing and linking the State debt policy to revenues at a level comparable to its peers, the State has maintained sufficient borrowing capacity to meet its historical capital needs.

The State of Alaska's ratio for fiscal year 2026 using the Fall 2025 RSB revenue forecast including state general obligation and state supported debt service (certificates of participation and lease revenue bonds supported by the general fund), is 1.5% using the forecasted unrestricted revenue of approximately \$5,947 million. The School Debt Reimbursement Program represents an additional 0.8% for a total of 2.3%.

Affordable Level of Additional Debt or Obligations

Debt Capacity in the short-term is estimated to be approximately \$1,900 million. Over the 10-year projection the capacity is expected to grow an additional \$1,600 million and reach approximately \$3,500 million based on the current revenue forecast and the assumption that the State is able to implement a method of establishing fiscal balance in future fiscal years.

The Department of Revenue has developed a multi-pronged debt capacity model which enables the State to calculate its available borrowing capacity based on current fiscal structure. The model results are based on the following constraints:

- Debt service on general obligation bonds and state supported debt (obligations that are based solely on the state's commitment to annually seek appropriation for repayment, which could be supported by a lease) in any year shall be targeted not to exceed a level of

4% of the year's projected unrestricted revenues. In fiscal year 2021 this became the primary methodology for establishing debt capacity;

- Debt service on general obligation bonds, state supported debt, and the debt reimbursement programs shall be targeted not to exceed a level of 7% of the year's projected unrestricted revenues;
- An average of UGF revenue for the five most recently closed fiscal years and utilizing this average for future forecasted years within the Fall RSB;
- All future debt issuances are amortized over 20 years, with level debt service payments;
- All bonds are issued at an assumed interest rate of 5%;
- Annual unrestricted revenues available to pay debt service through 2035 are set at amounts stipulated in the Fall 2025 RSB; and
- The impact of PERS and TRS state assistance payments is included for additional context.

Improved revenue forecasts combined with the legal invalidation of several authorized but unissued subject to appropriation debt instruments have improved the State's capacity to issue new debt. As financial resources evolve through time, debt capacity should be expected to either shrink or grow, and caution should be used in deciding to commit to any level of debt prior to revenue recovery or re-identification. Given the state's current fiscal structure and projected annual unrestricted revenue, the amount that the state could issue without negative credit action is more limited than the analysis would otherwise imply. Projects that are funded with debt should be carefully considered and fall into the infrastructure category. The State's credit rating won't be entirely secure until some form of binding fiscal plan that achieves an expectation of a recurring balanced budget is implemented. As previously noted, the term "debt" includes all the State's outstanding general obligation and state-supported debt.

Projected state payments on debt obligations are summarized below, as well as the average balance methodology for projected UGF revenue. State obligations paid directly from the general fund or reimbursed by the general fund for municipal obligations both gradually decrease from current levels. The PERS and TRS special funding situation has also been adjusted to account for certain state assistance payments covered by the State as an employer through SB 55 and utilizes reporting within the actuarial valuation reports of the pension system for fiscal year 2024 (the most recently adopted by the ARM Board).

FY	Fall 2025						Total State Payments for Debt Obligations
	Unrestricted General Fund Revenue Forecast (using a 5-year ave. lookback)	Total State or Direct State pay debt	School Debt Reimbursement Program	DOT Reimbursement Program	Expected Payment on Behalf of PERS/TRS		
2026	6,353,920,000	85,600,000	46,700,000	2,800,000	218,800,000	353,900,000	
2027	6,584,380,000	86,100,000	41,400,000	2,600,000	257,700,000	387,800,000	
2028	6,437,200,000	85,200,000	39,400,000	2,200,000	260,700,000	387,500,000	
2029	6,294,600,000	81,000,000	34,600,000	900,000	264,300,000	380,800,000	
2030	6,266,100,000	77,600,000	32,100,000	900,000	270,800,000	381,400,000	
2031	6,334,480,000	65,600,000	29,900,000	400,000	277,300,000	373,200,000	
2032	6,532,360,000	65,500,000	26,700,000	-	284,600,000	376,800,000	
2033	6,728,140,000	65,400,000	20,500,000	-	292,300,000	378,200,000	
2034	6,950,960,000	48,500,000	18,200,000	-	300,500,000	367,200,000	
2035	7,182,400,000	25,400,000	13,200,000	-	308,900,000	347,500,000	

The table on the following page depicts the State's existing debt service as a percentage of the Fall 2025 RSBs forecasted UGF. While there is significant additional issuance capacity under the 4% and 7% caps in the forecast period, the transitions occurring with use of permanent fund earnings and unrestricted revenue are still coalescing and these percentages do not include the projected state statutory payments for PERS and TRS employers. Those estimated payments are included for context within the table.

FY	Fall 2025 Unrestricted General Fund Revenue Forecast (\$thousands)	Percentage of UGF to direct pay State Debt (4% cap)	Percentage of UGF to pay State debt and reimbursement	Percentage of UGF to pay projected special Payments on Behalf of PERS/TRS	Percentage of UGF to pay State Debt, reimbursements & PERS/TRS
			Debt (7% cap)		
2026	5,947,100	1.5%	2.3%	3.7%	6.0%
2027	6,215,500	1.4%	2.1%	4.1%	6.2%
2028	6,337,000	1.4%	2.1%	4.1%	6.2%
2029	6,488,700	1.2%	1.7%	4.1%	5.8%
2030	6,684,100	1.2%	1.7%	4.1%	5.8%
2031	6,936,500	0.9%	1.3%	4.0%	5.3%
2032	7,194,400	0.9%	1.3%	4.0%	5.3%
2033	7,451,100	0.9%	1.2%	3.9%	5.1%
2034	7,645,900	0.6%	0.8%	3.9%	4.7%
2035	7,831,500	0.3%	0.5%	3.9%	4.4%

The table above highlights the impact of the State's statutorily committed payments to PERS and TRS with the payments representing percentages surpassing direct pay state debt. When combined with state debt obligations and state reimbursement obligations the annual payments represent between 4.4 and 6.2 percent of estimated total UGF over the forecast horizon.

School Debt Reimbursement Program

Municipal school districts may apply for school debt reimbursement for construction or major maintenance projects by October 15 of the year preceding the fiscal year in which reimbursement would occur when the program has statutory authority to accept new participants. The program's authority may be restricted or terminated at the Legislature's discretion, and in 2015 the Legislature placed a moratorium on the program for any bonds approved by voters after January 1, 2015, for a period of five years. This moratorium was subsequently extended in 2020. In fiscal year 2016, then Governor Walker vetoed approximately 21% of program funding, in 2020 Governor Dunleavy vetoed approximately 50% of program funding, and then in 2021 vetoed 100% of program funding. In fiscal year 2022 the program was funded at approximately 42% of the formula. Through a 2022 supplemental appropriation, the budget included offsets to prior fiscal year reductions in fiscal year 2017 and 2020 through 2022. In fiscal years 2023 through 2025, the program's reimbursements were fully funded. The enacted fiscal year 2026 budget included approximately 70% of total entitlements under the program. This inconsistent funding practice highlights the budget flexibility the State has for funding this program. The Department of Education & Early Development ("DEED") staff reviews requests to determine the level of reimbursement for each project. Prior to recent moratoriums there were tiered levels of reimbursement available. Projects qualified for up to 70 percent debt service reimbursement when the project met all of DEED's eligibility guidelines. When a project exceeds the scale and scope of the Department's eligibility guidelines, they were reimbursed at a lower percentage based on the educational value as determined by the DEED.

The existing statutory and regulatory structure of the program mandates that municipalities issue general obligation bonds to participate in the program, which requires local voter approval of the project. After the municipality has both DEED and voter approval, it may issue bonds for the project and to the extent funds are appropriated, the State reimburses the approved percentage of the bond payments.

The State Bond Committee is not part of the School Debt Reimbursement Program. No records are kept by the Department of Revenue on the amount of debt outstanding that is subject to reimbursement other than the annual reporting requirements found in the Alaska Public Debt Book. The Department of Revenue recommends that if the program is re-authorized that it be provided a role to coordinate municipal issues' structures, terms, and refinancing criteria to ensure the needs of the State are fully met.

Level and Impact of Moral Obligations

Specific debt issued by several State agencies, such as Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation, Alaska Housing Finance Corporation, Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority, Alaska Student Loan Corporation, Alaska Municipal Bond Bank, and the Alaska

Energy Authority have been provided a statutory framework that allows some level of Moral Obligations of the State of Alaska. There is no direct obligation of the State to pay any debt service associated with these bonds, however there is an implied commitment of the State to appropriate funds (at the Legislature's discretion) to cover any shortfall in the event of a default on the bonds by these issuers. This implied commitment is based on a specific statutory framework that the State provided the agencies that requires debt service reserve funds and reporting the sufficiency of those reserve funds to the Legislature and Governor. As there is no obligation of the State to appropriate such funds, and there has not been an instance previously in which the State has had to honor the moral obligation pledge, rating agencies generally do not include these Moral Obligation bonds when calculating the State's financial ratios. However, in the event that the State did appropriate funds to one of these agencies to cover a shortfall, the rating agencies would likely consider all of that agency's debt as part of the State's general obligation debt in its future ratio calculations. In the case of the Alaska Municipal Bond Bank Authority (AMBBA) the State has provided an annual appropriation funding any reserve deficiency due to a borrower default in advance. This appropriation has significantly helped reduce borrowing costs for many municipal borrowers, but as a result of the appropriation there is a higher level of scrutiny for these bonds from all rating agencies.

On September 4, 2020, the Alaska Supreme Court issued a decision related to the Alaska Tax Credit Certificate Bond Corporation (ATCCBC) that created additional limitations on when the State can issue State Supported Debt. While the decision reaffirmed prior Supreme Court decisions allowing the use of State Supported Debt for lease-purchase of real property arrangements, it specifically disallowed the structure contemplated for the Alaska Tax Credit Certificate Bond Corporation. Due to similarity of structure, the decision also rendered the Pension Obligation Bond Corporation, and the Toll Bridge Revenue Bonds for the Knik Arm Bridge illegal. On September 28, 2020, the State of Alaska Department of Law filed a Petition for Rehearing with the Supreme Court in an attempt to obtain clarity on the scope of the Court's intent in their decision. The Court declined to respond to the Petition for Rehearing.

Consideration of Debt Structuring Elements

Structuring

As a matter of practice, in the late 1970's, 1980's, and the early 1990's the State issued bonds with 10-year amortizations to match the "Prudhoe Curve." In the late 1990's and early 2000's the State began issuing more 15 and 20-year amortizations, and in issues since 2009 the State has almost uniformly issued bonds with level 20-year amortizations with principal paid annually and interest paid semiannually. This practice is consistent with other highly rated states and local governments. Debt will be structured to obtain the lowest possible net cost to the State or State Issuer including the use of reserves, pre-paid debt service funds, over collateralizations, rate covenants, additional bonds tests and the use of serial or term bonds with consideration of market conditions, the nature of the project, and the nature and type of security provided.

Working within these guidelines, the State will take into account a number of factors in structuring any individual debt issue, including project feasibility, the source of funds to be used for debt

service, the impact on the State's overall debt amortization profile and the fair allocation of costs to current and future beneficiaries or users.

In general, and consistent with the useful life of the asset to be financed, the State will utilize a 15 to 25-year final maturity structure with annual principal payments. Except in the case of a refunding transaction, the maximum principal payment shall be no greater than 4 times the minimum principal payment for the financing, to maintain a preference for equal and uniform annual payments. Principal repayments should not be delayed unless debt repayment is dependent upon revenues derived from the project being financed, the transaction is a refund deferring the refunding principal schedule consistent with the refunded bonds, or there are other benefits to be achieved. Similarly, structures utilizing term bonds (without sinking fund requirements/redemptions) or other structures that result in significant "back loading" of debt are discouraged. Issues with a debt service reserve fund should use the fund to make the final payment.

Fixed and Variable Rate Debt

The optimal combination of fixed-rate and variable-rate is considered in order to manage the risk of the State's debt portfolio. The State will consider variable-rate debt to provide for asset-liability matching and lower cost of funding while maintaining a conservative portfolio of fixed-rate and variable-rate debt. As such, the State will not have outstanding variable rate debt in excess of its unrestricted cash balances. Additionally, the State's variable rate debt shall comprise no more than 25 percent of the State's overall direct debt obligations. This will allow the State to benefit from what has (on a historical basis) been the least expensive cost of financing without becoming overexposed to interest rate risk. The State currently has no variable rate debt outstanding.

Call Provisions

A call provision gives the issuer the right to redeem or "call" all or a portion of an outstanding issue of bonds prior to their stated dates of maturity and provides an opportunity to potentially reduce debt service costs in the future. The cost of any such feature is dependent on market conditions, overall transaction structure, and such cost shall be taken into consideration when evaluating the flexibility this feature affords. Various call options may be evaluated in terms of their provisions and market acceptance.

Unless market conditions prove prohibitively expensive, the State's bonds shall be callable no later than 10 years from the date of sale and non-callable bonds shall only be considered for transactions with a final maturity less than or equal to 15 years from the date of sale.

Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) & Revenue Anticipation Notes (RANs)

Short-term State borrowing in anticipation of revenues is permitted under AS 43 Chapter 08. Although not utilized for the last 50 years, RANs may be issued and renewed from time to time but must be structured to mature and be paid off from revenues by the end of the fiscal year following the year in which the notes were issued. The full faith, credit, resources, and taxing power of the State are pledged to the payment of RANs. The use of RANs should be undertaken

only if the transaction costs plus interest on the debt are less than the cost of internal financing, or available cash is insufficient to meet working capital requirements.

Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) are authorized under AS 37.15 Article Three for both general obligation and revenue bonds. The State has issued BANs in advance of long-term financings for both general obligation and revenue bond issuances, most recently to fund portions of the 2012 General Obligation Bond Transportation Act.

Capital Appreciation Bonds

Capital Appreciation Bonds are structured as term bonds that do not pay interest until maturity. Interest is not paid to the investor until maturity, at an amount equal to the principal amount plus interest earned, compounded semiannually, at the stated yield. Their use is discouraged except for special circumstances as they are a higher cost of capital than other current interest structures. The State has no outstanding Capital Appreciation Bonds.

Certificates of Participation

Certificates of Participation (COPs) are issued based on a lease, authorized by stand-alone law that the State enters into with a trustee, being fractionalized and sold in bond size blocks to investors to raise funds for the acquisition and/or improvement of real property. COPs are the only way that a lease transaction can have the State of Alaska listed as the issuer. The State can also allow political subdivisions to securitize state lease payments and credit through lease revenue bonds by passing stand-alone law. Lease revenue bonds result in the loss of control of the State's credit, the reliance on a political subdivision's governing body to implement the terms and conditions of the financing, and the markets general reluctance to accept a disclosure document of potentially a small village as a proxy for the State of Alaska. The preference of the State is to use COPs for State of Alaska lease financing.

Credit Enhancements

Credit enhancement (letters of credit, bond insurance, sureties) should be used only when the net debt service on the bonds would be reduced by more than the costs of the enhancements or when dictated by the financial markets for the type of project financed. Special consideration should be given to any additional covenants or restrictions the credit enhancement provider may require.

Liquidity

To address remarketing risk inherent in a variable rate debt issuance, the State will evaluate alternative forms of liquidity such as direct pay letters of credit, standby letters of credit, and lines of credit. Such evaluation will necessarily weigh the value of mitigating remarketing risk vs. the economic costs associated with each available alternative.

Use of Derivatives

The State will consider the use of derivative products when such products meet the specific needs of a financing program or provide a demonstrated economic benefit to the State that outweighs the costs and risks of such transactions. The State will consider and monitor such derivative products strictly in accordance with its existing adopted State Swap Policy. Appropriate public finance professionals, including financial advisors and legal counsel, should be retained to ensure that any contemplated structure is appropriate for the State and its objectives and deliver opinions as to the fair pricing of any such transactions. Derivative products will not be used for speculation.

Competitive Sales

State Statute dictates that general obligation bonds are to be sold using a competitive method of sale. An exception to that requirement was provided for the 2010 authorization to allow for more complex bond structures authorized in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Given the State's credit profile and traditional financing structures, competitive sales will be utilized in issuing debt to provide the lowest cost of debt. Bids should be awarded on the lowest true interest cost basis (TIC) offered by bidders, provided other bidding requirements are satisfactory. The State reserves the right to negotiate certain terms and conditions with the lowest bidder.

Negotiated Sales

For State general obligation bonds negotiated sale can only be used if there is an exception to the statutory requirement for competitive sale or for refunding. When there is flexibility, negotiated sales of debt will be considered in the following circumstances: (1) when the complexity of the issue requires specialized sales expertise; (2) when the negotiated sale would result in substantial savings in time or money; (3) when market conditions are unusually volatile or uncertain; or (4) if the State feels that a negotiated financing would enhance the financing structuring or marketing process and outcome.

The negotiation of terms and conditions will include, but not be limited to, prices, interest rate, remarketing fees and commissions. Such terms will be based on prevailing terms and conditions for comparable issuers, including yields from secondary market trading of previously issued State debt.

Post Issuance Policy

The State Bond Committee has approved a Post Issuance Policy that is intended to guide the State in meeting its obligations with federal tax law requirements, transcripts, ongoing disclosure, and other notice requirements. A detailed copy of this policy can be found in Appendix B.

Evaluation of Refunding Opportunities

The refunding of debt obligations can take a number of forms, or combination of forms:

- Current Refunding

- Advance Refunding (no longer allowed on a tax-exempt basis after 2017)
- Forward Refunding
- Synthetic Refunding

The criteria used to evaluate the desirability of entering into a refunding transaction should be influenced by the form of the proposed transaction and should recognize the additional costs, risks, or uncertainties associated with the transaction. Refunding transactions should, if possible, be at least \$50 million in size unless issued in combination with a “new money” issue.

In general:

- Current refundings. Bonds which are currently callable. A refinancing should be pursued if total net present value savings of greater than 3% of the refunded debt service and each maturity being refunded has positive NPV savings. In general, current refundings should achieve at least \$1 million in net present value savings or \$200,000 in average annual saving. If a refinancing opportunity will otherwise be unused, savings thresholds and sizing goals may be diminished.
- Advance refundings. The Tax Reform Legislation of 2017 eliminated the ability to advance refund or refinance callable bonds in advance of the call date with tax-exempt bonds. Taxable bonds may be used to advance refund tax-exempt issues. When considering using taxable bonds in this scenario, savings should at least achieve the same savings levels as a current refunding and overwhelm the cost of shifting to a taxable mode versus waiting to the call date and maintaining the tax-exempt mode.
- Forward refundings refer to a refunding in which bonds are sold with a delayed closing that is likely to coincide with a date 90 days prior to the call date of the bonds to be refunded. This technique allows the transaction to be characterized as a current, as opposed to an advanced refunding. Forward refundings should achieve the same savings levels as current refundings. As part of the analysis, the cost of the forward premium and its impact on the savings to be achieved should be evaluated.
- Synthetic refundings create present value savings by synthetically refunding, but not retiring, outstanding bonds by utilizing derivative structures. Synthetic refundings are often used to produce refunding-type savings for bonds that may not be otherwise refunded (bonds that have already been advance refunded once, for example). Synthetic refundings are used in connection with current, advance and forward refundings and should generate an additional 2% NPV savings above the current refunding threshold unless a traditional financing is not possible because of tax or legal limitations. In that case, the advance refunding thresholds will apply.

APPENDIX A
Alaska Public Debt Reports

<https://treasury.dor.alaska.gov/home/debt-management/state-publications>

APPENDIX B **State's Post Issuance Policy**

Governmental Bonds

STATE OF ALASKA POST ISSUANCE COMPLIANCE POLICY

This policy is intended to guide the State of Alaska (the “State”) in meeting its obligations under applicable statutes, regulations and documentation associated with publicly offered and privately placed securities of the State. This policy addresses obligations of the State that arise and will continue following the issuance of securities. The State maintains a separate Debt Policy with respect to matters related to the issuance of security obligations, including compliance with the State’s disclosure obligations related to securities issuance. These obligations may arise as a result of federal tax law (with respect to tax-exempt securities) and securities laws (with respect to ongoing disclosure) or as a result of contractual commitments made by the State. This policy outlines obligations that may be applicable to each issue of securities and identifies the party to be responsible for monitoring compliance. In the State, the Debt Manager will be responsible for ensuring that the policy is followed, and checklists and records maintained. The Debt Manager may delegate responsibility to employees and outside agents for developing records, maintaining records and checklists. The State will provide educational opportunities (opportunities to attend educational programs/seminars on the topic) for the parties identified in this policy with responsibilities for post-issuance compliance in order to facilitate their performance of these obligations.

A. Transcripts.

1. The State’s bond counsel shall provide the State with three copies of a full transcript related to the issuance of securities (for each issue). The transcript shall be delivered in the following forms: one 3-ring binder, one soft cover and one CD-ROM and transcripts shall be delivered to the State within six months following the date of issuance of securities. It is expected that the transcript will include a full record of the proceedings related to the issuance of securities, including proof of filing an 8038-G or 8038-GC, if applicable.

2. Bond transcripts will be retained by the following parties and in the following locations within the State: Debt Manager’s office at State of Alaska Department of Revenue and State of Alaska Attorney General’s office.

B. Federal Tax Law Requirements (Applicable only if the securities are issued as “tax-exempt” securities).

1. *Use of Proceeds.*

a. If the project(s) to be financed with the proceeds of the securities will be funded with multiple sources of funds, the State will adopt an accounting methodology that:

_____ maintains each source of funding separately and monitors the actual expenditure of proceeds of the securities;

_____ commingles the proceeds and monitors the expenditures on a first in, first out basis; or

_____ provides for the expenditure of funds received from multiple sources on a proportionate basis.

b. Records of expenditures (timing of expenditure and object code) of the proceeds of securities will be maintained by the Debt Manager.

c. Records of investments and interest earnings on the proceeds of securities will be maintained by the Debt Manager. Such records should include the amount of each investment, the date each investment is made, the date each investment matures and if sold prior to maturity, its sale date, and its interest rate and/or yield. Interest earnings on proceeds will be deposited in the fund in which the proceeds of the securities were deposited (if not, then the plan for use of interest earnings will be discussed with the State's bond counsel).

d. Records of interest earnings on reserve funds maintained for the securities.

2. *Arbitrage Rebate.* The Debt Manager of the State ("Rebate Monitor") will monitor compliance with the arbitrage rebate obligations of the State for each issue ("issue") of securities which are described in further detail in the tax certificate if any, executed by the State for each issue and included in the transcript for the issue. If the State did not execute a tax certificate in connection with an issue, the Rebate Monitor should consult with the State's bond counsel regarding arbitrage rebate requirements. The State will provide educational opportunities (opportunities to attend educational programs/seminars on the topic) for the Debt Manager in order to facilitate his/her performance of these obligations.

a. If the Rebate Monitor determines that the total principal amount of tax-exempt governmental obligations (including all tax-exempt leases, etc.) of the State issued by or on behalf of the State and subordinate entities during the calendar year, including the issue, will not be greater than \$5,000,000, plus such additional amount not in excess of \$10,000,000 as is to be spent for the construction of public school facilities, the Rebate Monitor will not be required to monitor arbitrage rebate compliance for the issue, except to monitor expenditures and the use of proceeds after completion of the project (see #3 below). For purposes of this paragraph, tax-exempt governmental obligations issued to currently refund a prior tax-exempt governmental obligation will only be taken into account to the extent they exceed the outstanding amount of the refunded bonds.

b. If the Rebate Monitor determines that the total principal amount of tax-exempt governmental obligations (including all tax-exempt leases, etc.) of the State issued or incurred any calendar year is greater than \$5,000,000, plus such additional amount not in excess of \$10,000,000 as is to be spent for the construction of public facilities, the Rebate Monitor will monitor rebate compliance for each issue of tax-exempt governmental obligations issued during that calendar year.

i. *Rebate Exceptions.* The Rebate Monitor will review the tax certificate, if any, in the transcript in order to determine whether the State is expected to comply with a spending exception that would permit the State to avoid having to pay arbitrage rebate. If the tax certificate identifies this spending exception (referred to as the six-month exception, the 18 month exception or the 2-year exception), then the Rebate Monitor will monitor the records of expenditures (see B.1 above) to determine whether the State met the spending exception (and thereby avoid having to pay any arbitrage rebate to the federal government). If the State did not execute a tax certificate in connection with an issue, the Rebate Monitor should consult with bond counsel regarding the potential applicability of spending exceptions.

ii. *Rebate Compliance.* If the State does not meet or does not expect to meet any of the spending exceptions described in (i) above, the State will:

a. review the investment earnings records retained as described in B.1 above. If the investment earnings records clearly and definitively demonstrate that the rate of return on investments of all proceeds of the issue were lower than the yield on the issue (see the tax certificate in the transcript), then the State may opt not to follow the steps described in the following paragraph.

b. retain the services of an arbitrage rebate consultant in order to calculate any potential arbitrage rebate liability. The rebate consultant shall be selected no later than the completion of the project to be financed with the proceeds of the issue. A rebate consultant may be selected on an issue basis or for all securities issues of the State. The Rebate Monitor will obtain the names of at least three qualified consultants and request that the consultants submit proposals for consideration prior to being selected as the State's rebate consultant. The selected rebate consultant shall provide a written report to the State with respect to the issue and with respect to any arbitrage rebate owed if any.

c. based on the report of the rebate consultant, file reports with and make any required payments to the Internal Revenue Service, no later than the fifth anniversary of the date of each issue (plus 60 days), and every five years thereafter, with the final installment due no later than 60 days following the retirement of the last obligation of the issue.

c. *Yield Reduction Payments.* If the State fails to expend all amounts required to be spent as of the close of any temporary period specified in the Tax Certificate (generally 3 years for proceeds of a new money issue and 13 months for amounts held in a debt service fund), the State will follow the procedures described in B.2.b.ii above to determine and pay any required yield reduction payment.

3. *Unused Proceeds Following Completion of the Project.* Following completion of the project(s) financed with the issue proceeds, the Debt Manager will:

a. review the expenditure records to determine whether the proceeds have been allocated to the project(s) intended (and if any questions arise, consult with bond counsel in order to determine the method of re-allocation of proceeds); and

b. direct the use of remaining unspent proceeds (in accordance with the limitations set forth in the authorizing proceedings (i.e., bond ordinance) and if no provision is

otherwise made for the use of unspent proceeds, to the redemption or defeasance of outstanding securities of the issue.

4. *Use of the Facilities Financed with Proceeds.* In order to maintain tax-exemption of securities issued on a tax-exempt basis, the financed facilities (projects) are required to be used for governmental purposes during the life of the issue. The Debt Manager of the State will monitor and maintain records regarding any private use of the projects financed with tax-exempt proceeds. The IRS Treasury Regulations prohibit private business use (use by private parties (including nonprofit organizations and the federal government)) of tax-exempt financed facilities beyond permitted *de minimis* amounts unless cured by a prescribed remedial action. Private use may arise as a result of:

- a. Sale of the facilities;
- b. Lease of the facilities (including leases, easements or use arrangements for areas outside the four walls, e.g., hosting of cell phone towers);
- c. Management contracts (in which the State authorizes a third party to operate a facility (e.g., cafeteria);
- d. Preference arrangements (in which the State grants a third party preference of the facilities, e.g., preference parking in a public parking lot).

If the Debt Manager identifies private use of tax-exempt debt financed facilities, the Debt Manager will consult with the State's bond counsel to determine whether private use will adversely affect the tax-exempt status of the issue and if so, what remedial action is appropriate.

5. *Records Retention.*

a. Records with respect to matters described in this Subsection B will be retained by the State for the life of the securities issue (and any issue that refunds the securities issue) and for a period of three years thereafter.

- b. Records to be retained:
 - (i) The transcript;
 - (ii) Arbitrage rebate reports prepared by outside consultants;
 - (iii) Work papers that were provided to the rebate consultants;
 - (iv) Records of expenditures and investment receipts (showing timing of expenditure and the object code of the expenditure and in the case of investment, timing of receipt of interest earnings). (Maintenance of underlying invoices should not be required provided the records include the date of the expenditure, payee name, payment amount and object code; however, if those documents are maintained as a matter of policy in electronic form, then the State should continue to maintain those records in accordance with this policy);

(v) Copies of all certificates and returns filed with the IRS (e.g., for payment of arbitrage rebate); and

(vi) Copies of all leases, user agreements for use of the financed property (agreements that provide for use of the property for periods longer than 30 days), whether or not the use was within the four walls (e.g., use of the roof of the facility for a cell phone tower).

C. Ongoing Disclosure. Under the provisions of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Rule 15c2-12 (the "Rule"), underwriters are required to obtain an agreement for ongoing disclosure in connection with the public offering of securities. Unless the State is exempt from compliance with the Rule as a result of certain permitted exemptions, the transcript for each issue will include an undertaking by the State to comply with the Rule. The Debt Manager of the State will monitor compliance by the State with its undertakings, as well as any regulatory disclosure changes released by the SEC amending the Rule. These undertakings may include the requirement for an annual filing of operating and financial information and will include a requirement to file notices of listed "material events." For some types of material events (early bond calls), the State's fiscal agent has undertaken the responsibility of filing notice of the applicable material event.

D. Other Notice Requirements. In some instances, the proceedings authorizing the issuance of securities will require the State to file information periodically with other parties, e.g., bond insurers, banks, rating agencies. The types of information required to be filed may include (1) budgets, (2) annual financial reports, (3) issuance of additional debt obligations, and (4) amendments to financing documents. The Debt Manager of the State will maintain a listing of information filed and monitor compliance with other notice requirements.