

New Issue: MOODY'S ASSIGNS Aa2 RATING AND STABLE OUTLOOK TO STATE OF HAWAII'S GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF 2011, SERIES DZ AND REFUNDING SERIES EA, EB, EC, AND ED

Global Credit Research - 03 Nov 2011

APPROXIMATELY \$4.85 BILLION OUTSTANDING G.O. DEBT

State
HI

Moody's Rating

ISSUE	RATING
General Obligation Bonds of 2011, Series DZ	Aa2
Sale Amount	\$800,000,000
Expected Sale Date	11/15/11
Rating Description	General Obligation
General Obligation Refunding Bonds of 2011, Series EA	Aa2
Sale Amount	\$382,410,000
Expected Sale Date	11/15/11
Rating Description	General Obligation
General Obligation Refunding Bonds of 2011, Series EB	Aa2
Sale Amount	\$2,850,000
Expected Sale Date	11/15/11
Rating Description	General Obligation
General Obligation Refunding Bonds of 2011, Series EC	Aa2
Sale Amount	\$56,000,000
Expected Sale Date	11/15/11
Rating Description	General Obligation
General Obligation Refunding Bonds of 2011, Series ED	Aa2
Sale Amount	\$23,000,000
Expected Sale Date	11/15/11
Rating Description	General Obligation

Opinion

NEW YORK, Nov 3, 2011 -- Moody's Investors Service has assigned a Aa2 rating to the State of Hawaii's \$800 million General Obligation Bonds of 2011, Series DZ; and General Obligation Refunding Bonds of 2011: \$382.41 million Series EA; \$2.8 million Series EB; \$56 million Series EC; and \$23 million Series ED. Proceeds of the new money bonds will be used to finance or reimburse the state for expenditures on various capital improvement projects. The refunding bond proceeds will be used to refund outstanding debt for gross and net present value savings.

SUMMARY RATINGS RATIONALE

The Aa2 ratings incorporates Hawaii's strained financial operations following the recession-driven revenue fall-off over the last several years; depletion of reserves; low pension funded ratios and growing expenses for other post employment benefits (OPEB); and high debt ratios, in part reflecting debt issues for K-12 school capital projects. The state's vital tourism industry is showing signs of improvement. Revenue growth projections were increased in September 2011 to reflect economic growth as well as the new temporary tax laws that went into effect. The forecast also considered the effect of the tax refund delay from fiscal 2010 to fiscal 2011. Hawaii's audited financial results have been late since fiscal 2007, a weak trend that detracts from the state's otherwise relatively strong governance practices such as multi-year financial planning and quarterly binding consensus revenue forecasting. The fiscal 2010 audit was recently released.

STRENGTHS:

- Well-established multi-year and quarterly consensus forecasting by the state's council on revenues
- Strong executive power to reduce spending
- Historical fiscal conservatism; prompt action to address revenue shortfalls
- Continued military housing construction helps offset slow residential and commercial markets

- Liquidity is sufficient for the state to avoid short-term cash flow borrowing
- Rapid amortization of debt; no exposure to variable rate debt or derivative products

CHALLENGES:

- Vulnerability to shifts and/or extended downturns in its tourism-based economy, resulting in revenue falloff and budget shortfalls
- Depleted reserves reduce state's ability to address further revenue erosion
- Large state and local government employment sector contributes to spending pressure for salary and benefit settlements
- Debt ratios likely to remain high given state-level capital funding, especially for education
- Pension funding levels likely to decline over near term and remain low relative to other states despite recent reforms; high OPEB liability

DETAILED CREDIT DISCUSSION

2012-2013 BIENNIAL BUDGET CLOSES LARGE SHORTFALL

As in recent years, Hawaii faced another large operating deficit for the current biennium (2012-2013) amounting to \$539 million (10% of operating revenues) in fiscal 2012 and \$498 million (8.6%) in fiscal 2013. A 4% gap also emerged for fiscal year 2011 and given the limited time to resolve the shortfall, solutions were largely one-time. The Emergency Budget Reserve (EBR) was drawn down from \$46 million to about \$10 million and the state also used a portion of the balance in its Hurricane Relief Fund (HRF), which had \$21 million fund balance as of October 2011. The state plans to recapitalize the EBR and HRF over the near term, and maintain an EBR balance between 5% and 10% of revenues. However, with such modest reserves, any immediate need for funds would likely necessitate borrowing.

The adopted 2012-2013 biennial budget was balanced mostly with recurring solutions. The shortfalls were resolved with \$216 million of revenue enhancements in fiscal 2012 and \$231 million in fiscal 2013, while expenditure reductions totaled \$319 million and \$458 million in the first and second years of the biennium, respectively. A number of revenue enhancements are temporary, such as the suspension of general excise tax exemptions. There are also temporary limitations on itemized deductions and delays in the increase of the standard deduction and personal exemption. For fiscal 2012 only, the rental motor vehicle surcharge will increase and a portion of that will be transferred to the general fund. The state will also cap the amount of transient accommodations taxes that flow to counties and the Hawaii Tourism Authority. The legislature could decide to keep the temporary measures in place in the future in the event of continued revenue under performance.

On the spending side, the budget includes reductions in TANF and Medicaid services as well as public welfare, some of which will likely take time to implement. The state settled with its largest union for a 5% pay cut, eliminating the furlough days that were imposed last year, and 50/50 sharing of healthcare costs which had previously been funded 60% by the state and 40% by employees. There are also lump sum program cuts that will affect most agencies and departments.

SEPTEMBER 2011 FORECAST INCREASES REVENUE PROJECTION

Hawaii's financial operations have been strained as the state struggles to regain balance following the revenue deterioration of the last several years. Fiscal 2011 revenues (unaudited) were 6.7% below the most recent peak in fiscal 2008. The September 2011 Council on Revenues forecast shows essentially flat (0.8%) year-over-year revenue growth for fiscal 2011, an improvement over the special forecast last March which projected a 1.6% decline. Out year projections are now higher with 14.5% growth expected in fiscal 2012, revised upward from the previous 11% estimate. However, 4.3% of the growth is caused by the effect of the income tax refund delay which skewed fiscal 2011 revenues downward. Economic growth accounts for 5.2% of the fiscal 2012 growth, and 5% is from the new tax laws. The revenue growth estimate for fiscal 2013 is slightly higher at 6.5% versus the prior 6%. Without the new temporary tax laws, the forecast for fiscal 2012 would have been lowered to 9.5%.

Hawaii's revenue performance has been weaker than expected for several reasons: 1) the overall slow pace of national and international economic recoveries which affect the state's vital tourism industry; 2) the distorting impact of tax refund delays (about \$187 million) from fiscal 2010 to fiscal 2011; and more recently 3) the natural disasters in Japan, a major source of tourism for the state, as well as global petroleum price movements attributable to political upheaval in the Middle East.

BALANCE SHEET DETERIORATION REFLECTS ONE-TIME BUDGET BALANCING ACTIONS AND DEPLETION OF RESERVES

Strong reserve levels are important for Hawaii given the state's heightened vulnerability to national and international shifts in its essential tourism-based economy. The currently low reserve levels leave Hawaii with reduced flexibility to address additional shortfalls that may emerge. Following the 2001 recession, Hawaii rebuilt its reserves to a very strong 20% of revenues which provided flexibility to address the 2008 recession. However, by the end of fiscal 2009 available reserves (unreserved undesignated general fund balance plus the EBR) were significantly reduced and the state recorded a negative GAAP available balance. This was in contrast to the prior recession when the state's reserves hit a low of about 7.5% at the end of fiscal 2003.

The state's audited financial statement have been late for four consecutive years. The recently released fiscal 2010 audit shows a continued negative GAAP unreserved undesignated General Fund balance. The state has employed one-time actions for budget relief in recent years including: the use of reserve balances from both the EBR and the HRF; debt restructurings; and tax refund delays. As a result, we expect available balances will also be GAAP negative at the end of fiscal 2011, representing three consecutive years of balance sheet deterioration. Fiscal 2012 revenues are projected to exceed the prior peak by almost 7% and the 2012-2013 biennial budget incorporates small year-end budget surpluses. However, Hawaii's available reserve levels are expected to remain modest as the state begins to restore structural budget balance after several years of relying on non-recurring solutions, including the federal stimulus funds that all states received.

SLOW ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN LINE WITH NATION; STABILITY OF FEDERAL DEFENSE SPENDING COULD BE CHALLENGED BY FEDERAL DEFICIT-CUTTING ACTIONS

Hawaii has typically exhibited countercyclical employment patterns. However, recent trends have followed the national and international economies, indicating a shift toward more cyclical performance. The recent recession has been particularly challenging for Hawaii's tourism-

based economy since both national and international visitation has been affected at the same time. Hawaii is likely to remain a premier tourism destination over the long term although near term economic prospects were muted earlier in the year by the natural disasters in Japan and high oil prices that in part drove airfares up. On a positive note, Hawaii's unemployment rate of 6.4% in September remained well-below the national average (9.1% the same month) and the state's employment trends are less volatile than in other tourism dependent states such as Florida and Nevada. In addition, visitor arrivals increased 2.7% in the first nine months of 2011, visitor expenditures are up 14.7%, and hotel occupancy rates are rising.

Federal defense spending in Hawaii, dictated by the island's strategic geographic importance, plays a large part in the state's economy. Federal activity amounts to about 13% of Hawaii's gross state product, with much of it defense related. The large federal defense presence provides a continuing and stable source of employment and income which helps to offset the state's dependence on tourism. This is augmented by federal transfer payments for Social Security and federal retirement benefits which also support the state's economy. The state economy has benefit from military expansion plans and the privatization of military housing. However, even with these significant investments, Hawaii could be hurt by federal spending cuts, particularly reductions to the federal defense budget.

DEBT BURDEN REMAINS AMONG THE HIGHEST IN NATION; LOW PENSION FUNDED RATIO

Hawaii compares unfavorably with other states on measures such as debt ratios that are among the highest in the nation, pension funding levels that are below average, and OPEB liabilities that are nearly twice the size of the state's annual operating budget. The state employees' retirement system had a 61.5% funded ratio as of June 30, 2010, continuing a decade-long declining trend driven by weak market performance and changes in actuarial assumptions for life expectancy, future salary increases, and investment returns. The state generally makes its statutorily required contributions to the retirement system but has not always met the actuarially required contribution, which also contributes to the low funded ratio.

Recently adopted pension reforms are expected to improve the funding levels of the state's retirement system over the long term. Benefits will be reduced for new hires after June 30, 2012, and employer contributions will incrementally grow from 15% to 17% of payroll. However, by delaying the increase in contributions the state saves money and funded ratios are projected to decline to a new low of 58.6% in 2015. Even after twenty years, the funded ratio is still expected to be less than 70%. A moratorium on enhancement of retirement benefits remains in effect until the funded ratio reaches 100%.

While Hawaii does not engage in short-term borrowing for cash flow purposes, some liquidity strain is indicated by payment deferrals at the end of fiscal 2009 and the delay of fiscal 2010 personal income tax refunds until fiscal 2011. Hawaii has no exposure to variable rate debt or derivative products, and payout of the state's general obligation debt is relatively rapid with 95% of principal repaid in 15 years.

Hawaii's OPEB obligation is quite sizeable at \$7.2 billion for state employees and \$1.6 billion for teachers, reflecting full health benefits paid by the state. These amounts are larger than the size of Hawaii's annual general fund revenues which totaled about \$4.8 billion in fiscal year 2010. For the present time, the state plans to continue funding these obligations on a pay-go basis as is the case in many other states.

Outlook

The rating outlook for Hawaii is stable at the Aa2 rating level reflecting expectations of revenue growth beginning in fiscal 2012; recent signs of economic stabilization as tourism rebounds; a decreased reliance on one-time resources to balance the 2012-2013 biennial budget; and the state's proactive measures to improve the funded status of its retirement systems. The stable outlook also reflects our expectation that the state will manage its budget challenges and make appropriate adjustments as needed to restore budget balance in the event that the economic recovery is more prolonged and/or weaker than currently projected, resulting in revenue shortfalls.

WHAT COULD CHANGE THE RATING UP

- Rebuilding and maintenance of strong reserve levels.
- Reduced economic volatility and sustained job growth.
- Restoration and maintenance of structural budget balance.
- Significant improvement in pension funded ratios, and sooner than currently projected.

WHAT COULD CHANGE THE RATING DOWN

- Economic weakening leading to employment erosion.
- Further deterioration of revenue trends leading to budget imbalance, liquidity pressure, and narrowing of financial position.
- Increased use of non-recurring solutions to balance budget.
- Deterioration of pension funded ratios below already low levels

The principal methodology used in this rating was Moody's State Rating Methodology published in November 2004. Please see the Credit Policy page on www.moody.com for a copy of this methodology.

REGULATORY DISCLOSURES

The Global Scale Credit Ratings on this press release that are issued by one of Moody's affiliates outside the EU are considered EU Qualified by Extension and therefore available for regulatory use in the EU. Further information on the EU endorsement status and on the Moody's office that has issued a particular Credit Rating is available on www.moody.com.

For ratings issued on a program, series or category/class of debt, this announcement provides relevant regulatory disclosures in relation to each rating of a subsequently issued bond or note of the same series or category/class of debt or pursuant to a program for which the ratings are derived exclusively from existing ratings in accordance with Moody's rating practices. For ratings issued on a support provider, this announcement provides relevant regulatory disclosures in relation to the rating action on the support provider and in relation to each particular

rating action for securities that derive their credit ratings from the support provider's credit rating. For provisional ratings, this announcement provides relevant regulatory disclosures in relation to the provisional rating assigned, and in relation to a definitive rating that may be assigned subsequent to the final issuance of the debt, in each case where the transaction structure and terms have not changed prior to the assignment of the definitive rating in a manner that would have affected the rating. For further information please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page for the respective issuer on www.moody's.com.

Information sources used to prepare the rating are the following: parties involved in the ratings, public information, confidential and proprietary Moody's Investors Service's information, confidential and proprietary Moody's Analytics' information.

Moody's considers the quality of information available on the rated entity, obligation or credit satisfactory for the purposes of issuing a rating.

Moody's adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a rating is of sufficient quality and from sources Moody's considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, Moody's is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process.

Please see the ratings disclosure page on www.moody's.com for general disclosure on potential conflicts of interests.

Please see the ratings disclosure page on www.moody's.com for information on (A) MCO's major shareholders (above 5%) and for (B) further information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities as well as (C) the names of entities that hold ratings from MIS that have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%. A member of the board of directors of this rated entity may also be a member of the board of directors of a shareholder of Moody's Corporation; however, Moody's has not independently verified this matter.

Please see Moody's Rating Symbols and Definitions on the Rating Process page on www.moody's.com for further information on the meaning of each rating category and the definition of default and recovery.

Please see ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on www.moody's.com for the last rating action and the rating history.

The date on which some ratings were first released goes back to a time before Moody's ratings were fully digitized and accurate data may not be available. Consequently, Moody's provides a date that it believes is the most reliable and accurate based on the information that is available to it. Please see the ratings disclosure page on our website www.moody's.com for further information.

Please see www.moody's.com for any updates on changes to the lead rating analyst and to the Moody's legal entity that has issued the rating.

Analysts

Nicole Johnson
Analyst
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

Nicholas Samuels
Backup Analyst
Public Finance Group
Moody's Investors Service

Contacts

Journalists: (212) 553-0376
Research Clients: (212) 553-1653

Moody's Investors Service, Inc.
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
USA



© 2011 Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and/or its licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. ("MIS") AND ITS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND

DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources Moody's considers to be reliable, including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process. Under no circumstances shall MOODY'S have any liability to any person or entity for (a) any loss or damage in whole or in part caused by, resulting from, or relating to, any error (negligent or otherwise) or other circumstance or contingency within or outside the control of MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees or agents in connection with the procurement, collection, compilation, analysis, interpretation, communication, publication or delivery of any such information, or (b) any direct, indirect, special, consequential, compensatory or incidental damages whatsoever (including without limitation, lost profits), even if MOODY'S is advised in advance of the possibility of such damages, resulting from the use of or inability to use, any such information. The ratings, financial reporting analysis, projections, and other observations, if any, constituting part of the information contained herein are, and must be construed solely as, statements of opinion and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, sell or hold any securities. Each user of the information contained herein must make its own study and evaluation of each security it may consider purchasing, holding or selling. NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody's.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Any publication into Australia of this document is by MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657, which holds Australian Financial Services License no. 336969. This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, credit ratings assigned on and after October 1, 2010 by Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") are MJKK's current opinions of the relative future credit risk of entities, credit commitments, or debt or debt-like securities. In such a case, "MIS" in the foregoing statements shall be deemed to be replaced with "MJKK". MJKK is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO.

This credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness or a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be dangerous for retail investors to make any investment decision based on this credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.