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## Top 10 Mistakes

1. Lack of a Thorough Cash Flow Analysis
2. Having Too Much Liquidity
3. Having Too Low of WAM/Duration
4. Thinking One Can Time The Market
5. Not Amortizing (Accreting)

6. Lack of Diversification
7. Having Too Many Investment Positions
8. Not Having the Right Number/Mix of Brokers
9. Not Providing Transparent Reporting
10. Benchmarking Incorrectly (or Not At All)

## Public Fund Stewardship: You Have 3 Jobs!

- Preserving principal (Safety)
- Ensuring cash is available to pay bills on a timely basis (Liquidity)

- Generating a market rate of income/return for the taxpayer (Income/Yield)

The investment portfolio is the only area of state and local government where revenue can be generated without charging taxes and fees to the taxpayers

## Good Stewardship?

Is having 100\% of the portfolio in cash (LAIF/MMF), good stewardship?

Is having 100\% of the portfolio invested in 5 year UST Notes all with gains, good stewardship?

Your Risk is Asymmetrical!
Safety and Liquidity Outweigh Income
But What is the First Question Asked?


Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#1

## Lack of a Thorough Cash Flow Analysis

## Cash Flow Analysis: Fiscal Years

Month End Portfolio Balance


## Cash Flow Analysis: Historical Balances



## Cash Flow Analysis: Monthly (80/20 Rule)

| REVENUES | JUL | AUG | SEPT | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Tas | 0.0 | 11.6 | 155.6 | 39.0 | 90.6 | 7.3 | 35.5 | 88.1 | 16.3 | 102.7 | 45.0 | 3.0 | 594.7 |
| State Revenues | 101.9 | 90.4 | 84.8 | 70.0 | 84.4 | 105.3 | 71.9 | 89.2 | 84.2 | 77.4 | 71.0 | 72.0 | 1,002.5 |
| Debt Service Proceeds | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.1 | 87.2 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 20.0 | 238.3 |
| Miso. Revenues | 304.8 | 215.7 | 280.9 | 310.9 | 302.4 | 294.1 | 301.4 | 300.7 | 273.0 | 218.0 | 252.0 | 210.0 | 3,263.9 |
| TOTAL REVENUES | 425.7 | 317.7 | 521.3 | 442.0 | 564.6 | 458.2 | 408.8 | 490.5 | 388.5 | 398.1 | 379.0 | 305.0 | 5,099.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXPENSES | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | TOTAL |
| Payroll | 72.2 | 67.2 | 67.4 | 112.3 | 71.6 | 70.2 | 71.6 | 69.3 | 68.7 | 92.3 | 72.0 | 65.0 | 899.8 |
| Acoounts Payable | 99.2 | 98.4 | 97.8 | 102.4 | 80.6 | 92.4 | 77.3 | 91.2 | 97.6 | 110.0 | 110.0 | 110.0 | 1,166.9 |
| WiresiPERS | 224.2 | 158.8 | 148.4 | 215.5 | 205.1 | 200.9 | 234.7 | 179.3 | 176.0 | 222.1 | 179.0 | 241.0 | 2,385.0 |
| Debt Servioe | 122.3 | 24.5 | 21.6 | 20.6 | 68.9 | 56.2 | 64.3 | 23.9 | 27.7 | 20.6 | 43.6 | 76.6 | 570.8 |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 517.9 | 348.9 | 335.2 | 450.8 | 426.2 | 419.7 | 447.9 | 363.7 | 370.0 | 445.0 | 404.6 | 492.6 | 5,022.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VARIANCE | (92.2) | (31.2) | 186. 1 | (8.8) | 138.4 | 38.5 | (39.1) | 126.8 | 18.5 | [46.9) | [25.6) | (187.6) | 77.0 |



## Cash Flow Analysis: Daily

| REVENUES | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BeqinninaCash(MMF) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 1.0 | $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ | 1.8 | 6.8 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 1.8 |
| Investment-Mature |  |  | 24.0 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.0 |
| Investment-Call |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment-Sell |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property Tax |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120.0 |
| StateRevenues |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt Service Proceeds |  | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Misc. Revenues-6293 |  | 20.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 6.0 | 49.0 | 35.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 16.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 11.8 | 16.8 | 11.8 | 16.8 | 170.8 |


| EXPENSES | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCPauroll-2111 |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.0 |
| AIP-6223.2133 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Debt Service |  | 23.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WiresIPers-2122 |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Misc. Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment-Purchase |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |  | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 135.0 |
| TOTAL | 0.0 | 48.0 | 30.0 | 5.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 167.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET POSITION | 6.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 1.8 | 3.8 |

Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#2

## Having Too Much Liquidity

## Portfolio Structure: Rule of Thumb

> Primary Liquidity: 0-3 Months 10\%-15\%

Secondary Liquidity: 3-12 Months
10\%-15\%

Core Investments: 1-5 Years
70\%-80\%

Total Portfolio
100\%
Bond Proceeds? -- Municipal Advisor Rule

## Before and After...(still in progress)

## January 2016 WAM: . 8 Yrs



MONTH-END PORTFOLIO BOOK YIELD


January 2017 WAM: 1.6 Yrs

## Having Too Low of WAM/Duration

(Having Too Many Callables... And/Or the "Wrong Kind" of Callables)

## Two Main Portfolio Risks/Decisions



## Interest Rate Risk



## Credit Risk



## Optimal WAM/Duration for Operating Funds?



## Will Volatility Wake Up?



Source: Bloomberg

## WAM: Sweet Spot Analysis

Benchmark Treasury Modified Sharp Ratio Analysis

|  | 1/31/1990 to 12/31/2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Maturity <br> 3 Mon T-Bill | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avg Yield } \\ 2.90 \end{gathered}$ | Avg Duration0.24 | Modified Sharp Ratio | \% Return of 30Yr / \% 30Yr Risk |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 55\% | 1 | 2\% |
|  | 6 Mon T-Bill | 3.03 | 0.48 | 0.284 | 58\% | 1 | 3\% |
|  | 1 Yr T-Bill | 3.17 | 0.97 | 0.280 | 60\% | 1 | 6\% |
| Sweet Spot | 2 Yr T-Note | 3.50 | 1.90 | 0.315 | 67\% | 1 | 12\% |
|  | 3 Yr T-Note | 3.73 | 2.85 | 0.292 | 71\% | 1 | 19\% |
|  | 5 Yr T-Note | 4.16 | 4.45 | 0.283 | 79\% | 1 | 29\% |
|  | 10 Yr T-Note | 4.74 | 7.96 | 0.231 | 90\% | 1 | 52\% |
|  | 30 Yr T-Bond | 5.25 | 15.35 | 0.154 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% |

(Avg Yield - Risk Free Yield) / Avg Duration = MSR

$$
(3.502 \mathrm{y}-2.903 \mathrm{~m}) \quad / 1.902 \mathrm{y}=.315
$$

## WAM: Sweet Spot Analysis

| WAM | 0.5Y | $1.0 Y$ | 1.5Y | $2.0 Y$ | 2.5Y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treasury | 1Y | $2 Y$ | 3Y | 4Y | 5 Y |
| 1990 | 7.88 | 8.37 | 8.36 | 8.25 | 8.12 |
| 1991 | 5.86 | 7.32 | 7.87 | 8.07 | 8.13 |
| 1992 | 3.89 | 5.63 | 6.79 | 7.42 | 7.78 |
| 1993 | 3.43 | 4.41 | 5.52 | 6.49 | 7.12 |
| 1994 | 5.31 | 4.99 | 5.34 | 6.03 | 6.75 |
| 1995 | 5.95 | 6.05 | 5.66 | 5.84 | 6.36 |
| 1996 | 5.51 | 6.00 | 6.17 | 5.92 | 6.12 |
| 1997 | 5.63 | 5.91 | 6.12 | 6.26 | 6.12 |
| 1998 | 5.05 | 5.56 | 5.74 | 5.93 | 6.12 |
| 1999 | 5.08 | 5.28 | 5.57 | 5.73 | 5.90 |
| 2000 | 6.11 | 5.83 | 5.61 | 5.75 | 5.85 |
| 2001 | 3.48 | 5.03 | 5.26 | 5.29 | 5.52 |
| 2002 | 2.00 | 3.23 | 4.46 | 4.87 | 5.04 |
| 2003 | 1.24 | 2.15 | 3.10 | 4.12 | 4.60 |
| 2004 | 1.89 | 2.02 | 2.66 | 3.35 | 4.18 |
| 2005 | 3.62 | 3.12 | 2.94 | 3.27 | 3.76 |
| 2006 | 4.93 | 4.33 | 3.82 | 3.60 | 3.80 |
| 2007 | 4.52 | 4.59 | 4.34 | 4.06 | 3.92 |
| 2008 | 1.82 | 3.18 | 3.78 | 3.91 | 3.89 |
| 2009 | 0.47 | 1.48 | 2.67 | 3.37 | 3.64 |
| 2010 | 0.32 | 0.83 | 1.59 | 2.56 | 3.22 |
| 2011 | 0.18 | 0.58 | 1.09 | 1.74 | 2.57 |
| 2012 | 0.17 | 0.36 | 0.75 | 1.26 | 1.84 |
| 2013 | 0.13 | 0.29 | 0.56 | 1.02 | 1.51 |
| 2014 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 0.61 | 0.96 | 1.40 |
| 2015 | 0.32 | 0.57 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 1.33 |
| 2016 | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.98 |  | 1.29 |
| Avg Yield | 3.18 | 3.64 | 4.01 | 4.34 | 4.66 |
| 3M Tsy Avg | 2.90 | 2.90 | 2.90 | 2.90 | 2.90 |
| Excess Return | 0.28 | 0.74 | 1.11 | 1.44 | 1.76 |
| WAM | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.50 |
| Mod Sharp | 0.555 | 0.739 | 0.738 | 0.720 | 0.705 |



## WAM/Duration Impact

| WAM | Portfolio Size | $\%$ | Annual Interest | Total Interest |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2Yr WAM | $\$ 100,000,000 \times 4.34 \%=$ | $\$ 4,340,000 \times 27$ Years $=$ | $\$ 117,180,000$ |  |
| 1Yr WAM | $\$ 100,000,000 \times 3.64 \%=$ | $\$ 3,640,000 \times 27$ Years $=$ | $\$ 98,280,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 18,900,000$ |


| 2Yr WAM | \$1,000,000,000 X 4.34\% = | \$43,400,000 X | 27 Years | \$1,171,800,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1Yr WAM | \$1,000,000,000 X 3.64\% = | \$36,400,000 X | 27 Years | \$982,800,000 |
|  |  |  | Difference | \$189,000,000 |

$2 Y r$ WAM $\$ 4,000,000,000 \times 4.34 \%=\$ 173,600,000 \times 27$ Years $=\$ 4,687,200,000$
1 Yr WAM $\$ 4,000,000,000 \times 3.64 \%=\$ 145,600,000 \times 27$ Years $=$

Difference

## Callable Bonds: Friend and Foe

Bond Convexity is a measure of the non-linear relationship of bond prices to changes in interest rates, the second derivative of the price of the bond with respect to interest rates (duration is the first derivative).



If you buy a par or discounted callable, do you want it to be called?

## Effective Duration: Bullets 1-5Yrs vs. Callables 1-5Yrs



What's the maximum \% of callables you should have? What types of callables?

## Do You See a Problem?

MATURITY DISTRIBUTION


Years

## Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#4

## Thinking One Can Time the Market

## Best Way to Know Where Rates are Heading



## Awesome Advice

## THE ONLY FUNCTION OF ECONOMIC FORECASTING IS TO MAKE ASTROLOGY LOOK RESPECTABLE.

John Kenneth Galbraith
Canadian-American Economist

"'It's tough to make predictions, especially about the future'" Yogi Berra

## Econ Funnies

## Two economists walk into a bar... they have no idea what happens next!

## Edgar Fiedler Quotes

Economist-Asst. Treasury Secretary (Nixon \& Ford)

"If you have to forecast, forecast often."
"Ask five economists and you'll get five different answers six if one of them went to Harvard."
"The herd instinct among economic forecasters makes sheep look like independent thinkers."


## How Did the Market Do at Predicting Fed Funds?



## The Fed Was Worse




## $100+$ PhDs
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## How Did Non-Fed Forecasters Do Out the Curve?



## Hotels.com Captain Obvious Alert!



## Risk and Return are Related

## Risk/Return Tradeoff



## Risk and Return Are Related

| County | Amount <br> Billions |  | WAM in <br> Days | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sac: Sacramento | $\$$ | 3.54 | 289 | $1.01 \%$ |
| LAlF | $\$$ | 22.63 | 180 | $0.75 \%$ |
| CC: Contra Costa | $\$$ | 2.68 | 176 | $1.03 \%$ |
| Fresno | $\$$ | 2.96 | 900 | $1.48 \%$ |
| LA: Los Angeles | $\$$ | 28.90 | 642 | $1.10 \%$ |
| Mer: Merced | $\$$ | 0.84 | 539 | $1.17 \%$ |
| OC: Orange | $\$$ | 4.27 | 364 | $0.85 \%$ |
| RS: Riverside | $\$$ | 7.10 | 452 | $0.85 \%$ |
| SD: San Diego | $\$$ | 8.91 | 419 | $1.12 \%$ |
| SF: San Francisco | $\$$ | 8.16 | 412 | $0.90 \%$ |
| SLO: San Luis Obispo | $\$$ | 0.84 | 179 | $0.83 \%$ |
| Sol: Solano | $\$$ | 1.05 | 300 | $0.86 \%$ |
| Son: Sonoma | $\$$ | 2.05 | 625 | $1.14 \%$ |

Data as of: January 31،2017


Source: Entities' Websites
FTN FINANCIAL.
MAIN STREET ADVISORS

## Portfolio Structure/Strategy

There are three primary ways to structure an operating portfolio:

- Matching Cash Flows
- Matching an Index
- Optimizing Relative Value


## 0-5 Year Cash Flow Matched Portfolio



## 1-5 Year Index Matched Portfolio



FTN FINANCIAL.
Main STreet Advisors

## Optimizing Relative Value

- 



## Auto ABS: Relative Value

Our Preferred 'AAA' Rated ABS Offer Exceptional Value Compared to Alternatives


## Strategy Comparison

## Proactive Management



WAM: 2.42 Yrs
Book YTM: 1.41\%


WAM: 2.38 Yrs
Book YTM: 1.34\%

## Active Management



WAM: 2.62 Yrs
Book YTM: 1.48\%

## The Relative Value "Dilemma"



Source: Bloomberg
FTN FINANCIAL.
MAIN STREET ADVISORS

Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#5

## Not Amortizing

## Amortization vs. Holding at Cost: Discount Note

| Buy/Sell | Buy | Cusip | 313385HRO | Status | Accepted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issue | FHDN 0 07/03/17 | Broker | FTNF | Benchmark |  |
| Audit Trail |  |  |  | Broker Name |  |
| Quantity | 10,000,000 | Disc Rate | 0.9917 | Principal | \$ 9,900,000.00 |
| Price | 99,0000 | Yield | 1.0131 | Acc Int | 0.00 |
| Settle Date | 07/05/2016 | Spread |  | Net | 9,900,000,00 |
| B/Price | 0.000000 (0-00) | B/Yield |  | B/Discount |  |

If you are not amortizing, when will you recognize the $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ gain (income)?

## Amortization vs. Holding at Cost: Coupon

|  |  |  | Interest Payments |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maturity | Price | Coupon | Yr1 | Yr2 | Yr3 | Yr4 | Yr5 | Total |
| 5 Yr | $\$ 100$ | $3 \%$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 15$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 Yr (Old 7yr) | $\$ 110$ | $5 \%$ | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ |
| (Amortization) |  |  | $-\$ 2$ | $-\$ 2$ | $-\$ 2$ | $-\$ 2$ | $-\$ 2$ | $-\$ 10$ |
| (Net Earnings) |  |  | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 15$ |


|  | End of Year Amortized Value |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yr0 | Yr1 | Yr2 | Yr3 | Yr4 | Yr5 |
| 5 Yr (Old 7yr) | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 108$ | $\$ 106$ | $\$ 104$ | $\$ 102$ | $\$ 100$ |
| 5 Yr | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 100$ |
| 5 Yr (Old 7yr-Unamortized) | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 100$ |

## Amortization vs. Holding at Cost

## End of Year Amortized Value



## Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#6

## Lack of Diversification

## How Do We Diversify Portfolios?

- Maturities
- Major Sectors: Treasury, Agency, Corporate, ABS, Muni
- Minor Sectors: Industrial, Finance, Utilities
- Issuers
- Structures: Bullet, Callable, Floating, TIPS, Paydowns


## Legal vs. Suitable

For example: State Code allows 5\% in a corporate, 5\% in a CP, and 5\% in a CD

## Check "Foreign" Issuers

| Issuer Information | Privileging |
| :---: | :---: |
| Program Name TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | Firm (FTN FINANCIAL) |
| Industry Banks | Identifiers |
| Program Information | ID 89113WSG2 |
| Ticker (Issuer) TDNY | BB\# PPBT2ZN07 |
| Program Type (YCD) YANKEE CD | DTC Cusip |
| Reg Type | FIGI BBG00FJROPB8 |
| Day Type ACT/360 | Ratings : Program/Long/Short |
| Calc Type <br> (7) INTE Dealer | S\&P N.A. /AA- / A-1+ |
|  | MDY N.A. /Aa1 / P-1 |
|  | FITCH N.A. /AA- /F1+ |
| Issuer Information | Identifiers |
| Name TORONTO-DOMINION BANK Industry Banks | ID Number EK7960066 |
|  | CUSIP 89114QAZ1 |
| Security Information | ISIN US89114QAZ19 |
| Mkt Iss Global | Bond Ratings |
| Country CA Currency USD | Moody's Aa1 |
| Rank Sr Unsecured Series MTN | S\&P AA- |
| Coupon 1.625000 Type Fixed | Composite AA |
| Cpn FreqS/A |  |
| Day Cnt 30/360 Iss Price 99.99700 | Issuance \& Trading |
| Maturity 03/13/2018 | Amt Issued/Outstanding |
| BULLET | USD 1,000,000.00 (M) / |
| Iss Sprd 52.00bp vs T $102 / 15 / 18$ | USD 1,000,000.00 (M) |

Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#7

## Having Too Many Investment Positions

## Diversification is Great...But

What do you have to do for each investment:

- Analyze It
- Check Compliance for It
- Buylt
- Deliver It
- Price It
- Reconcile It
- Post Interest for It
- Mature, Call, Sell It
- Report It



## Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#8

## Not Having the Right Number/Mix of Brokers

## Developing a Win-Win Relationship with Brokers



## Dealers

## Cantor Fitzgerald \& Co.

Citigroup Global Markets
Goldman, Sachs \& Co.
Jefferies LLC
J.P. Morgan Securities LLC


Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner \& Smith
Morgan Stanley \& Co. LLC
Wells Fargo
Bank of Nova Scotia
BMO Capital Markets Corp.
RBC Capital Markets, LLC
TD Securities (USA), LLC


BNP Paribas Securities Corp.
Barclays Capital Inc.
Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. HSBC Securities (USA) Inc.
RBS Securities Inc.


SG Americas Securities, LLC UBS Securities LLC

Daiwa Capital Markets America Mizuho Securities USA Inc. Nomura Securities International


FTN Financial
Arbor Trading
D.A. Davidson

Government Perspectives
Hilltop Securities
InCapital
Intl FC Stone
Key Bank
Multi-Bank Securities
Oppenheimer
Piper Jaffray
R.W. Baird

Raymond James
Southwest Securities
Sterne Agee
Stifel Nicolaus
Stone \& Youngberg
Vining Sparks
Zions Capital

## Competitive Shopping

Sell: FHLB 1.375\% 2/18/21 Par: \$50,000,000

| Dealer | Yield | Price | Principal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2.010\% | 97.4701 | 48,735,037 |  |
| 2 | 2.015\% | 97.4504 | 48,725,224 |  |
| 3 | 2.018\% | 97.4387 | 48,719,338 |  |
| 4 | 2.021\% | 97.4269 | 48,713,452 |  |
| 5 | 2.025\% | 97.4112 | 48,705,606 |  |
| 6 | 2.027\% | 97.4034 | 48,701,683 |  |
| 7 | 2.034\% | 97.3759 | 48,687,957 | Maximum Bid VS. Minimum Bid \$248,546 |
| 8 | 2.039\% | 97.3563 | 48,678,155 |  |
| 9 | 2.043\% | 97.3406 | 48,670,315 |  |
| 10 | 2.050\% | 97.3132 | 48,656,599 |  |
| 11 | 2.059\% | 97.2779 | 48,638,970 |  |
| 12 | 2.059\% | 97.2779 | 48,638,970 |  |
| 13 | 2.067\% | 97.2466 | 48,623,306 |  |
| 14 | 2.074\% | 97.2192 | 48,609,605 |  |
| 15 | 2.089\% | 97.1605 | 48,580,260 |  |
| 16 | 2.094\% | 97.1410 | 48,570,482 |  |
| 17 | 2.102\% | 97.1097 | 48,554,844 |  |
| 18 | 2.105\% | 97.0980 | 48,548,981 |  |
| 19 | 2.108\% | 97.0862 | 48,543,118 |  |
| 20 | 2.110\% | 97.0784 | 48,539,211 |  |
| 21 | 2.137\% | 96.9730 | 48,486,491 |  |

Trading


## Bloomberg

MarketAxess ${ }^{\circ}$

## Tradeweb

## Dealer Plafforms

## Electronic Trading

|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/1 | civity Pane |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x |  |  |  |  | 1:05 | Detail | Pass |
|  | Sell | Dealer | Quantity | Yield | Price |  | Status |
| Cusip | 912828849 | BAML | 2,000,000 | 0.864 | 100-0018 | Hit | Firm 0:01 |
| Settle | 03/29/17 | JPM | 2,000,000 | 0.854 | 100-0014 | Hit | Firm 0:01 |
| CBBT Px | 100-00/100-00+ | TD | 2,000,000 | 0.864 | $100-00{ }^{1}$ | Hit | Firm 0:01 |
| CBBT Y\d | 0.874/0.833 | JEFF | 2,000,000 | 0.844 | 100-00 ${ }_{8}^{3}$ | Hit | Firm 0:01 |
|  |  | RBC | 2,000,000 | 0.874 | 100-00 | Hit | Subject |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/1 Ac | tivity Panel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X |  |  |  |  |  | Detail | Ressbmit |
|  | Sell | Dealer | Quantity | Yield | Price |  | Status |
| Cusip | 912828049 | BAML | 2,000,000 | 0.864 | 100-0018 |  | Traded Away |
| Settle | 03/29/17 | JPM | 2,000,000 | 0.854 | $100-00^{\frac{1}{4}}$ |  | Covered |
| CBBT Px | 100-00/100-00+ | TD | 2,000,000 | 0.864 | $100-00{ }_{8}^{1}$ |  | Traded Away |
| CBBT Yld | 0.874/0.833 | JEFF | 2,000,000 | 0.844 | 100-003 ${ }_{8}^{3}$ |  | Acceppted |
|  |  | RBC | 2,000,000 | 0.874 | 100-00 |  | Traded Away |

## Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#9

## Not Providing Transparent Reporting

## Clearly Communicating Information to Your Audiences

- Know Your Audiences:
- Governing Body
- Management
- Auditors
- Rating Agencies
- GFOA (CAFR)
- Peers
- Taxpayers
- Provide Details to the Appropriate Audiences
- Be Completely Transparent
- Keep it Simple - Charts/Graphs/Tables
- Demonstrate How the Investment Portfolio is Meeting Objectives


## Reporting Fundamentals

"When performance is measured, performance improves. When performance is measured and reported, the rate of improvement accelerates." Thomas S. Monson


## Summary -- "Dashboard"



## Compliance

| Item / Sector | Parameters | In Compliance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weighted Average Maturity | Weighted Average Maturity (WAM) must be less than 2.5 years | Yes: | 1.61 Yrs |
| U.S. Treasuries | No limit, maximum maturity 5 years | Yes: | 21.1\% |
| U.S. Federal Agencies | 60\% limit, 30\% issuer limit (such as FHLB, FFCB, FHLMC, FNMA, TVA, GNMA), maximum maturity 5 years | Yes: | 19.3\% |
| Supranational Debt | $10 \%$ limit, $5 \%$ issuer limit (IFC, IADB, and IBRD), maximum maturity 5 years, Aaa or AAA by at least two rating agencies | Yes: | 0.0\% |
| Local Agency Investment Fund | $50 \%$ limit (including funds invested in a Joint Powers Authority) , California State's deposit limit is $\$ 65$ million | Yes: | 18.8\% |
| Commercial Paper | $20 \%$ limit, $5 \%$ per issuer, maximum maturity 270 days, rated P-1, A-1, or F1 by Moody's, S\&P, or Fitch (longterm rating of A3, or A- by Moody's, S\&P or Fitch), issued by a domestic corporation with at least $\$ 500$ million total assets | Yes: | 3.1\% |
| Corporate Bonds | $30 \%$ limit, $5 \%$ per issuer, maximum maturity 5 years; rated at least A3, or A- by at least two rating agencies, maturities past threes years must be rated at least Aa3 or AA- by at least two rating agencies | Yes: | 26.8\% |
| Money Market Funds | 20\% limit, $10 \%$ issuer limit, rated AAA-m or Aaa-mf, treasury and agency funds | Yes: | 0.0\% |
| FDIC Insured CDs | $30 \%$ limit, FDIC limit per issuer (currently $\$ 250,000$ ), maximum maturity 5 years | Yes: | 14.0\% |
| Joint Powers Authority | 20\% limit (maximum limit of 50\% of Successor Agency/Authorities' portfolios) | Yes: | 0.0\% |
| Bankers' Acceptances | $20 \%$ limit, $5 \%$ per issuer, 180 days maximum maturity, rated P-1, A-1, or F1 by Moody's, S\&P, or Fitch | Yes: | 0.0\% |

Investment transactions were executed in accordance with the California State Government Code and the City's Investment Policy. The City believes the Investment Pool contains sufficient cash flow liquidity to meet the next six months of expected expenditures.

Securities' market values are derived from the Entity's custodian.
FTN FINANCIAL.
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## Comparison (Monthly/Quarterly/Annually)

| Portfolio Metrics | $\mathbf{1 2 / 3 1 / 2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 / 3 0 / 2 0 1 6}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value | $\$ 87,086,531$ | $\$ 91,710,223$ |  |
| Book Value | $\$ 87,359,544$ | $\$ 91,576,188$ |  |
| Par Value | $\$ 87,224,000$ | $\$ 91,417,468$ | $\$ 1.001$ |
| Net Asset Value | $\$ 0.997$ | $1.280 \%$ | $0.130 \%$ |
| Yield to Maturity | $1.410 \%$ | $0.764 \%$ | $0.426 \%$ |
| 2Yr Treasury Note Yield | $1.190 \%$ | $0.630 \%$ | $0.080 \%$ |
| LAIF Yield (monthly avg) |  |  |  |
| Average Years to Maturity | $0.710 \%$ | 2.10 | 0.02 |
| Effective Duration | 2.12 | 2.09 | 2.06 |

*LAIF rate is estimated for current month/quarter end

| Sectors (Book Value) | $\mathbf{1 2 / 3 1 / 2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 / 3 0 / 2 0 1 6}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal Agency | $\$ 43,115,977$ | $\$ 49,133,855$ | $-\$ 6,017,878$ |
| LAIF | $\$ 15,000,000$ | $\$ 7,500,000$ | $\$ 7,500,000$ |
| Corporate | $\$ 15,013,261$ | $\$ 15,019,110$ | $-\$ 5,849$ |
| Certificates of Deposit | $\$ 4,224,000$ | $\$ 4,471,908$ | $-\$ 247,908$ |
| U.S. Treasury | $\$ 10,006,306$ | $\$ 10,005,847$ | $\$ 459$ |
| Total | $\$ 87,359,544$ | $\$ 86,130,720$ | $\$ 1,228,824$ |

FTN FINANCIAL.
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## Cash Flow

Next Twelve Month Maturities


## History

## Book Value



|  | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | \$66.1 | \$63.0 | \$60.7 | \$56.6 | \$54.2 | \$52.9 | \$57.2 | \$59.5 | \$57.0 | \$56.2 | \$59.8 | \$61.9 |
| Fiscal Year 2011 | \$57.5 | \$54.6 | \$55.4 | \$53.3 | \$48.5 | \$53.1 | \$57.1 | \$60.9 | \$58.6 | \$59.8 | \$63.2 | \$64.3 |
| Fiscal Year 2012 | \$69.3 | \$67.3 | \$68.5 | \$65.5 | \$63.8 | \$63.6 | \$69.2 | \$73.0 | \$71.9 | \$62.1 | \$66.8 | \$69.2 |
| Fiscal Year 2013 | \$65.5 | \$60.9 | \$60.1 | \$58.0 | \$54.8 | \$58.1 | \$64.6 | \$67.8 | \$65.1 | \$72.1 | \$73.6 | \$76.9 |
| Fiscal Year 2014 | \$73.5 | \$68.8 | \$66.3 | \$63.8 | \$62.1 | \$69.2 | \$74.2 | \$75.5 | \$76.3 | \$80.9 | \$86.3 | \$84.6 |
| Fiscal Year 2015 | \$84.3 | \$80.8 | \$79.1 | \$77.4 | \$74.8 | \$77.6 | \$81.5 | \$81.0 | \$83.3 | \$83.3 | \$87.1 | \$92.9 |
| Fiscal Year 2016 | \$92.4 | \$85.6 | \$87.1 | \$83.8 | \$78.3 | \$81.2 | \$84.2 | \$88.7 | \$89.2 | \$90.2 | \$94.0 | \$99.7 |
| Fiscal Year 2017 | \$95.7 | \$93.4 | \$95.5 | \$89.2 | \$87.9 | \$87.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figures in M illions, A verage Daily Balance

## History

## Book Value by Fiscal Year



|  | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year 2012 | \$69.3 | \$67.3 | \$68.5 | $\$ 65.5$ | \$63.8 | \$63.6 | \$69.2 | $\$ 73.0$ | \$71.9 | \$62.1 | \$66.8 | \$69.2 |
| Fiscal Year 2013 | \$65.5 | \$60.9 | \$60.1 | \$58.0 | \$54.8 | \$58.1 | \$64.6 | \$67.8 | \$65.1 | \$72.1 | \$73.6 | $\$ 76.9$ |
| Fiscal Year 2014 | \$73.5 | \$68.8 | \$66.3 | \$63.8 | \$62.1 | \$69.2 | \$74.2 | \$75.5 | \$76.3 | \$80.9 | \$86.3 | \$84.6 |
| Fiscal Year 2015 | \$84.3 | \$80.8 | \$79.1 | \$77.4 | \$74.8 | \$77.6 | \$81.5 | \$81.0 | \$83.3 | \$83.3 | \$87.1 | $\$ 92.9$ |
| Fiscal Year 2016 | \$92.4 | \$85.6 | \$87.1 | \$83.8 | $\$ 78.3$ | \$81.2 | \$84.2 | \$88.7 | \$89.2 | \$90.2 | \$94.0 | \$99.7 |
| Fiscal Year 2017 | $\$ 95.7$ | \$93.4 | \$95.5 | \$89.2 | \$87.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figures in Millions, Average Daily Balance

## History




## Analysis



## Analysis

## Purchase YTM Per 6-Month Maturity Intervals

| Years | Book Yield | \% of <br> Portfolio* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to .5 | $0.68 \%$ | $9.80 \%$ |
| .5 to 1.0 | $0.98 \%$ | $17.05 \%$ |
| 1.0 to 1.5 | $1.56 \%$ | $6.06 \%$ |
| 1.5 to 2.0 | $1.67 \%$ | $12.79 \%$ |
| 2.0 to 2.5 | $1.69 \%$ | $10.70 \%$ |
| 2.5 to 3.0 | $1.73 \%$ | $12.16 \%$ |
| 3.0 to 3.5 | $1.71 \%$ | $8.87 \%$ |
| 3.5 to 4.0 | $1.72 \%$ | $8.91 \%$ |
| 4.0 to 4.5 | $1.55 \%$ | $3.61 \%$ |
| 4.5 to $5.0+$ | $1.37 \%$ | $10.06 \%$ |

*Based on Book Value


## Analysis

## Interest Rate Shock Analysis

Instantaneous Interest Rate Changes and Approximate Change in Portfolio's Market Value


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ? } \\
& \text { What's the approximate duration of } \\
& \text { this portfolio }
\end{aligned}
$$

FTN FINANCIAL
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## History

Sector History


| Sector | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency | 46.1\% | 48.5\% | 55.2\% | 50.9\% | 49.7\% | 53.0\% | 56.1\% | 58.7\% | 57.0\% | 58.6\% | 58.1\% | 49.4\% |
| Corporate | 20.7\% | 20.7\% | 19.7\% | 18.1\% | 17.3\% | 16.2\% | 16.0\% | 16.1\% | 17.4\% | 18.7\% | 18.9\% | 17.2\% |
| Treasury | 4.9\% | 7.3\% | 7.3\% | 6.8\% | 10.8\% | 10.8\% | 11.4\% | 11.5\% | 11.6\% | 12.4\% | 12.6\% | 11.5\% |
| Certificates of Deposit | 5.8\% | 5.4\% | 5.5\% | 5.1\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 5.1\% | 5.1\% | 5.2\% | 5.3\% | 5.3\% | 4.8\% |
| LAIF | 22.5\% | 18.2\% | 12.3\% | 19.2\% | 17.3\% | 15.1\% | 11.4\% | 8.6\% | 8.7\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | 17.2\% |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

## Issuers



## Activity



*Redemptionsinclude maturities, calls, and sells(excludingpaydowns)

|  | Mar-15 | Apr-15 | May-15 | Jun-15 | Jul-15 | Aug-15 | Sep-15 | Oct-15 | Nov-15 | Dec-15 | Jan-16 | Feb-16 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Purchases | 109 | 139 | 70 | 93 | 53 | 45 | 44 | 58 | 61 | 87 | 41 | 55 |
| Number of Redempti | 92 | 93 | 78 | 119 | 65 | 50 | 54 | 60 | 49 | 44 | 59 | 51 |
| Total Transactions | $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ |

## FTN FINANCIAL.

MAIN STREET ADVISORS

## Activity

Transactions by Dealer

| Dealer | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deutsche Bank | 22 | 23 | 20 | 23 | 23 | 28 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 180 |
| US Bank* | 22 | 18 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 18 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 158 |
| UBS | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| Key Bank | 1 |  | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Wells Fargo | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 5 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| Incapital | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 5 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| B of A ML |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Mizuho |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Brean | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| JP Morgan |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Barclays | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Jefferies | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| LOOP Capital Mkts |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| RBC | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| BMO |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Citigroup |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Daiwa |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Toyota Motor Credit |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Credit Suisse |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| FTN Financial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| BNP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cantor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| GE Capital* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Goldman Sachs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Morgan Stanley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Nomura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Piper Jaffray |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Raymond James |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Scotia Bank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Suntrust |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Vining Sparks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Total | 55 | 45 | 44 | 57 | 61 | 86 | 41 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 444 |

FiscalYe ar-to-Date Transactions


## FTN FINANCIAL.
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## Ratings


Non Aaa/P-1


| Sector | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aaa/P-1 | 80.4\% | 80.6\% | 79.8\% | 78.9\% | 79.8\% | 80.0\% | 79.6\% | 79.7\% | 79.9\% | 80.0\% | 81.6\% | 80.8\% |
| Aa1 | 2.2\% | 2.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% |
| Aa2 | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 2.4\% | 2.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.1\% |
| Aa3 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| A1 | 6.6\% | 6.6\% | 6.9\% | 8.6\% | 8.7\% | 8.6\% | 8.9\% | 8.9\% | 8.9\% | 8.9\% | 8.8\% | 9.4\% |
| A2 | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 6.2\% | 5.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 4.8\% |
| A3 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| NR-Not Rated | 3.7\% | 3.5\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 3.9\% | 3.7\% | 3.7\% | 3.5\% | 3.4\% | 3.3\% | 1.7\% | 1.6\% |
| Baa1 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
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## Credit Analysis



Sources: FTN Financial
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## Quarterly GASB 31 Calculation

> INVESTMENT POOL
> MARK-TO-MARKET
> FISCAL YEAR 2016 Y-T-D

| DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| :--- | ---: |
| Invested Value at December 31, 2015 | $333,092,674$ |
| Add: Proceeds of Investments Matured/Sold in FY16 | $172,338,733$ |
| Less: Cost of Investments Purchased in FY16 | $(159,417,821)$ |
| Add: Amortization Adjustment | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Less: Invested Value at June 30, 2015 | $(346,590,397)$ |
| Change in Market Value of Investments | $\mathbf{( 5 7 6 , 8 1 0 )}$ |

FTN FINANCIAL.
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## wo. 37 | Fegruarvans Governmental Accounting Standards Series

Statement No. 72 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board

Fair Value Measurement and Application

Level 1 of the fair value hierarchy are valued using prices quoted in active markets for those securities or offer same day liquidity at a price of par.

Level 2 of the fair value hierarchy are generally valued using a matrix pricing technique. Matrix pricing is the process of estimating the market price of a bond based on the quoted prices of more frequently traded comparable bonds.

Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy are generally used for assets where there are unobservable inputs.

## GASB

## ${ }^{\text {no. } 35 \text { | Dеceweer } 2015}$ Governmental Accounting Standards Series



## LAIF Performance Report

Quarter Ending 12/31/15
Apportionment Rate: $0.37 \%$
Earnings Ratio: 0.00001006140492611
Fair Value Factor: 0.999186963

Daily: $0.43 \%$
Quarter to Date: $0.38 \%$
Average Life: 179

## GASB 100

мо. 35 | оесенев 2015 Governmental Accounting Standards Series

Statement No. 100 of the
Governmental Accounting
Standards Board

Lost Opportunity Costs


## Economic/Market - GDP



## Economic/Market - Employment






## Economic/Market -- Inflation






## Economic/Market -- Rates






## Economic/Market -- Global Rates



## Performance




[^0]Top Ten Common Mistakes: \#10

## Benchmarking Incorrectly <br> (or Not At All)

## What Does Your BOS Want You to Show Them



## Why Do We Benchmark Performance?

## Model Investment Policy -- Primary Objectives

Safety: Safety of principal is the primary objective of the (Local Agency's) investment program. Investments shall be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure the preservation of principal in the overall portfolio by mitigating credit risk and interest rate risk. To attain this objective, the (Local Agency) will diversify the portfolio by investing funds among a variety of securities with independent returns.

Liquidity: The investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable the (Local Agency) to meet all operating requirements which might be reasonably anticipated. This objective shall be achieved by matching investment maturities with forecasted cash outflows and inflows, and maintaining an additional liquidity buffer for unexpected cash needs.

Income: The investment portfolio shall be designed with the objective of attaining a market rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles, taking into account the investment risk constraints of safety and liquidity needs.

## Primary Benchmarking Factors to Consider

A benchmark is a collection of securities or risk factors and associated weights that represents the persistent and prominent investment characteristics of a manager's investment process. A benchmark should be:

- Unambiguous: The identities and weights of securities constituting the benchmark are clearly defined.
- Investable: It is possible to forgo active management and simply hold the benchmark.
- Measurable: The benchmark's return is readily calculable on a reasonably frequent basis.
- Appropriate: The benchmark is consistent with the manager's investment style and sectors.
- Specified in Advance: The benchmark is specified prior to the start of an evaluation period and known to all interested parties.
> "The failure of a benchmark to possess these properties compromises its utility as an effective investment management tool. The properties listed merely formalize intuitive notions of what constitutes a fair and relevant performance comparison. It is interesting to observe that a number of commonly used benchmarks fail to satisfy these properties." CFA Institute


## Relevant General Characteristics

To Be Relevant, Benchmarks Should Reflect the General Characteristics of a Portfolio's:

- Sector Allocations
- Duration/Maturity
- Turnover



## Keeping Score of Your Portfolio

| HOME <br> BONUS |  | GUEST $\qquad$ <br> BONUS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FOULS | PLAYER | FOULS |
| $\%$ |  | : |
| SCORE | MATCH | SCORE |

- Weighted Yield
- Book Rate of Return
- Total Rate of Return


## Calculation Methodology of Each Benchmark

Weighted Yield= Portfolio's Weighted Average Purchase Yield

+ Accrued/Received Interest
Book Return= +/- Amortization/Accretion of Premiums/Discounts
+/- Realized Gains/Losses
Average Daily Book Balance for the Period
+ Accrued/Received Interest
Total Return= +/- Realized Gains/Losses
+/- Unrealized Gains/Losses
Time Weighted Invested Market Value for the Period


## Yield Return-Custom Benchmark

Yields

| Index | Jan-2015 | Feb-2015 | Mar-2015 | Apr-2015 | May-2015 | Jun-2015 | Jul-2015 | Aug-2015 | Sep-2015 | Oct-2015 | Nov-2015 | Dec-2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MMF | 0.03\% | 0.04\% | 0.05\% | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 0.07\% | 0.08\% | 0.08\% | 0.10\% | 0.10\% | 0.11\% | 0.24\% |
| BAML 1-5Yr Agy | 0.75\% | 0.92\% | 0.84\% | 0.88\% | 0.89\% | 0.96\% | 0.96\% | 0.99\% | 0.86\% | 0.98\% | 1.13\% | 1.30\% |
| BAML 1-5Yr Tsy | 0.69\% | 0.91\% | 0.81\% | 0.84\% | 0.87\% | 0.93\% | 0.93\% | 1.01\% | 0.87\% | 0.99\% | 1.18\% | 1.29\% |

Weights

| Index | Jan-2015 | Feb-2015 | Mar-2015 | Apr-2015 | May-2015 | Jun-2015 | Jul-2015 | Aug-2015 | Sep-2015 | Oct-2015 | Nov-2015 | Dec-2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MMF | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| BAML 1-5Yr Agy | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% |
| BAML 1-5Yr Tsy | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

Weighted Yield

| Index | Jan-2015 | Feb-2015 | Mar-2015 | Apr-2015 | May-2015 | Jun-2015 | Jul-2015 | Aug-2015 | Sep-2015 | Oct-2015 | Nov-2015 | Dec-2015 | 12 Mon. Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weighted Yield | 0.51\% | 0.65\% | 0.59\% | 0.62\% | 0.64\% | 0.68\% | 0.69\% | 0.72\% | 0.63\% | 0.72\% | 0.84\% | 0.98\% | 0.69\% |



## Yield Return-Pros and Cons

## Pros:

- Ease of Calculation
- Ease of Understanding (presenting to governing body)
-Helpful for Budgeting Interest Income


## Cons:

-Does Not Account for Realized Gains or Losses

- Does Not Accurately Account for Accrued Interest
-Subject to Yield To Maturity Assumptions


## Book Rate of Return-Calculation Complexities

+ Accrued/Received Interest
Book Return= +/- Amortization/Accretion of Premiums/Discounts
+/- Realized Gains/Losses
Average Daily Book Balance for the Period

Amortization: The accumulation of value until maturity (premiums)

Accretion: The accumulation of value until maturity (discounts)

Realized Gains/Losses: Liquidation Principal minus Book Value Principal

## Book Rate of Return-Pros and Cons

## Pros:

- Matches Budgeting Process
- Closely Matches Actual Cash Flows


## Cons:

- Subject to Manipulation of Realized Gains/Losses
- Won't Reflect Portfolio's Market Volatility Changes and Risks
- Calculation is More Complex
- Does Not Have a Standardized Calculation

Note: Benchmark Development is Similar to Weighted Yield Methodology

> When Should You Change Your Benchmark?

## Total Rate of Return -- GIPS Methodology

> + Accrued/Received Interest

Total Return= +/- Realized Gains/Losses

> +/- Unrealized Gains/Losses

Time Weighted Invested Market Value for the Period

## Total Rate of Return Complexities

## Bond Index AImanac

## Calculation methodologies

Bond Indices

```
Bond Indices | Glokal
```

28 January 2013

## Bank of America

 Merrill Lynch
## Total return calculations

## Calculating index values

The daily closing Index value is a function of the prior month-end index value and the current month-to-date return:

$$
I V_{n}=I V_{0} \times\left(1+T R R_{n}\right)
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I V_{n}=\text { closing index value on day } n \\
& I V_{0}=\text { closing index value on prior month-end } \\
& T R R_{n}=\text { month-to-date index total return on day } n
\end{aligned}
$$

The month-to-date return of an index $\left(T R R_{n}\right)$ is equal to the sum of the individual constituent returns times their respective beginning of month weights:

$$
T R R_{n}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} B_{i} T R R_{n} \times B_{i} W g t_{0}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{TRR_{n}=\text {Indexmonth-to-datetotalreturnonday}n} \\
& \operatorname{BiTRR}_{n}=\text { month-to-date total return on day } n \text { of bond } i \\
& \operatorname{BiWgt}_{0}=\text { beginning of month weight of bond } i
\end{aligned}
$$

Periodic returns between any two dates can be derived from the beginning and end of period index values. Since index values represent closing levels, period returns will include market movement on the end of period date but exclude market movement on the beginning of period date. Therefore, to capture returns for the month of June, divide the June 30 Index value by the May 31 Index value:

$$
T R R=\frac{I V_{n}}{I V_{0}}-1
$$

where:
$T R R=$ periodic total return
$V_{n}=$ closing index value on the end of period date
$V_{0}=$ closing index value on the beginning of period date

Annualized returns are derived from period total returns:

$$
A n n T R R_{n}=\left(1+T R R_{n}\right)^{365 / d}-1
$$

where:
$A_{n n} T R R_{n}=$ annualized total return for period $n$
$T R R_{n}=$ periodic total return for period $n$
$d=$ number of actual days in period $n$

## Total Return Index Parameters/Rules

## Bank of America/Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year Treasury and Agency Index

 (Ticker: G1A0 -- Fixed Coupon)-Issue Size: \$250 Million and Up (Agency), \$1 Billion and Up (Treasury)

- Monthly Rebalanced
-Index "Buys" all Treasuries and Agency (non-subordinated) Fixed Rate Securities Between 1-3 Yrs
-Index "Sells" all Treasury and Agency Fixed Rate Securities Less Than 1 Yr
-"Buys" Newly Added Securities at the Bid


## BofA Merrill 1-3 Year Treasury \& Agency Index ${ }_{(12 / 31 / 66)}$

| Issuer | Percent |
| :--- | ---: |
| TSY | $88.98 \%$ |
| FNMA | $3.15 \%$ |
| FHLMC | $3.13 \%$ |
| FHLB | $2.39 \%$ |
| NCUA | $1.66 \%$ |
| FFCB | $0.39 \%$ |
| FICO | $0.14 \%$ |
| TVA | $0.11 \%$ |
| PEFCO | $0.06 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $100.00 \%$ |



## BofA Merrill 1-3 Year Treasury \& Agency Index ${ }_{(1 / 31 / 1 / 6)}$



## BofA Merrill 1-3 Year Treasury \& Agency Index

| G1A0 | 99) Download |  |  | BofAML Bond Indices: Index Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The BofA Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year US Treasury \& Agency Index |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inception | Date 09/30/1982 |  |
| 01/31/2016 | - Currenc | cy USD |  | Calculation | Conventional | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1/31 Rebalancing |  |  | Jan Market Change |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feb Index } \\ 1 / 31 / 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Jan Index } \\ 1 / 31 / 2016 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rebal Chg } \\ 1 / 31 / 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Jan Index } \\ 12 / 31 / 2015 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MTD Chg } \\ & 1 / 31 / 2016 \end{aligned}$ |
| Returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Return | Value |  | 652.172\| |  |  | 648.234 |  |
| Valuations (Scale MM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \# of Issues |  |  | 398 | 396 | 2 | 396 | 0 |
|  |  | Face Value |  |  | 3,103,588 | 3,146,688 | -43,100 | 3,146,688 | 0 |
|  |  | Accrued Int | erest |  | 13,174 | 13,230 | -56 | 11,725 | 1,505 |
|  |  | Cash |  |  | 0 | 3,029 | -3,029 | 0 | 3,029 |
|  |  | Full Market | Value |  | 3,168,148 | 3,214,287 | -46,140 | 3,194,879 | 19,408 |
|  |  | \% of | GOA |  | 32.59 | 33.01 | -0.43 | 33.52 | -0.51 |
| Yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Effective Yie |  |  | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.01 | 1.07 | -0.28 |
|  |  | Yield to Wor |  |  | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.01 | 1.07 | -0.28 |
|  |  | Yield to Mat | urity |  | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.01 | 1.07 | -0.27 |
| Spread (in Semi-Annual Terms) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | To Worst (vs | (vs Govt) |  | 1 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | OAS (vs Govt |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Libor OAS |  |  | -2 | -3 | 1 | -7 | 4 |
|  |  | Asset Swap |  |  | -2 | -2 | 0 | -6 | 4 |
| Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Effective Du | uration |  | 1.84 | 1.77 | 0.07 | 1.86 | -0.09 |
|  |  | Spread Dura | ation |  | 1.84 | 1.76 | 0.07 | 1.86 | -0.09 |

30 Bonds Left the Index and 32 Bonds Were Added to the Index

## BofA Merrill 1-3 Year Treasury \& Agency Index



## Book Return vs. Total Return



## Yield vs. Price

## 2 Year T-Note Yield



## Real World Example




Which would you rather have?

## 1-3Yr Tsy/Agy Index Components of Total Return



## 1-3Yr Tsy/Agy Index Components of Total Return

## Price Return vs Coupon Return 1991 to 2015

| Component | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Price | 3.2 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -5.4 | 4.1 | -1.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | -2.8 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 1.2 | -1.7 |
| Income | 8.5 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 3.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0}$ |


| Component | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Price | -2.2 | -1.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.6 | -1.6 | 0.2 | -0.2 | -1.1 | -1.2 | -1.0 | -1.1 |
| Income | 3.2 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ |


| Component | \% of Total | Avg Return |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Coupon Return | $102.3 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |
| Price Return | $-2.3 \%$ | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Total Return | $100.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |

Book Return and Total Return are basically the same over the long run for short-term fixed income indexes and portfolios

## How Did This Go Over in November 2016?



## How Did This Go Over in June 2016?



## GFOA

## 

## GFOA Best Practice...NOT!

## Using Benchmarks to Assess Portfolio Risk and Return

Background. Measuring portfolio risk and return results against appropriate market benchmarks ${ }^{1}$ is a technique to verify that all the investment objectives are being met and that portfolio investment returns are appropriate for the risk incurred. Comparing total return to a proper benchmark or index is the preferred means for assessing performance relative to risk and investment objectives.

Investment yield alone is not sufficient for assessing risk and performance. Investment yield measures the percentage increase or decrease that a portfolio generates during a given period and is useful for budgeting purposes but overall, is unreliable for decision making and assessing the risk and return characteristics of the portfolio.

## Total Return Implications

"Total rate of return measures the increase in the investor's wealth due to both investment income (for example, dividends and interest) and capital gains (both realized and unrealized). The total rate of return implies that a dollar of wealth is equally meaningful to the investor whether that wealth is generated by the secure income from a 90-day Treasury bill or by the unrealized appreciation in the price of a share of common stock."


Does your benchmarking methodology represent "the persistent and prominent investment characteristics" of your investment process and your investment objectives?

## Total Rate of Return-Pros and Cons

## Pros:

-Provides a GASB 31 Type of Risk Assessment
-Reflects Portfolio's Market Volatility Changes
-Provides a standardized approach of returns (GIPS)

## Cons:

-May not match objective in investment policy (principal preservation)

- May not match interest income budget objectives
-You don't generally "cash in" your total return
-More complex calculations


## Knowledge vs. Wisdom

## Knowledge is knowing that a tomato is a fruit.

Wisdom is not putting it in a fruit salad.

- Miles Kington


## Benchmark Reporting Conclusions

- To Adhere To the Third Object of Your Investment Policy-One Needs to Benchmark the Portfolio to See If It's Earning a "Market Rate of Return"
- Change the Benchmark Only When There Are Material Changes to the Portfolio
- It's Okay to Use All Three Measures
- Total Return Shows a Portfolios' Risk Similar to GASB 31 and is Helpful in Assessing Market Risks
- Book Return and Total Return Are More Sophisticated Measures
- Book Return Is Generally More Congruent With Most Municipalities' Budgeting Process and Investment Process
- It's Hard to "Spend" Total Return
- GIOA Best Practice for the Primary Benchmark is Book Return


[^0]:    *Benchmark: $40 \%$ Agy 13Y, 30\% Agy Discount Note 180D, 10\%Corp AA-AAA 13Y, 10\% CP 1D, 5\% Repo 1D, $5 \%$ M M F

