# * 人 <br> <br> CONNECTIONS <br> <br> CONNECTIONS <br> $\rightarrow$ S UMMIT - 

## Financial Assessment for Sustainability



Speaker:
Dawn Lund
Vice President
Utility Financial Solutions, LLC dlund@ufsweb.com


## Utility Financial Solutions, LLC

- International consulting firm providing cost of service and financial plans and services to utilities across the country, Canada, Guam and the Caribbean
- Instructors for cost of service and financial planning for APPA, speakers for organizations across the country.
- Hometown Connections partner for Cost of Service and Financial Planning


## Introduction

- Overview of basic indicators to determine overall financial health
- Concepts we talk about are what we repeatedly see working in the industry - there are exceptions to everything in this presentation
- Being out of the "range", doesn't necessarily mean you have a problem!
- Methodical review the same any size of utility
- Review can apply to other utility types


## Do You Know What I'm Talking about?

- We haven't had a rate increase in XX years
- Board/Council avoids rate adjustments
- Operating at a loss
- Spending down cash
- Foregoing capital investment
- System aging
- Have to borrow for regular capital
- Need major improvements
- All this keeping rates artificially low
- We want to be the lowest cost provider....

"We"re in good shape.
Nobody undersatads our financal statement


## Where Do I Find the Information?

- Income Statement
- Balance Sheet
- Cash Flow Statement
- Fixed Asset Listing

- Debt Schedule
- Most of the time a pretty accurate picture of financial health can be determined from the financial statements after a quick review


## Some Key Indicators



A

## Days Cash on Hand

- Pay expenses
- Fund system improvements help ensure reliability

- Pay Debt Service
- Maintain stable rates for customers
- Fund unanticipated cost contingencies
- Phase in large rate adjustment
- Keep utility healthy for future Management


## Calculate Days Cash on Hand



Find this information on your income statement \& balance sheet
Establish a Cash reserve policy for each utility
Typical Range 90-120+ days of O\&M
High Bond Rating 200 Days+

## Rate of Return \%

- Adequate rate of return on investment to help ensure current customers are paying their fair share of the use of the infrastructure and not deferring the charge to future generations
- Typical range for a municipal 4-7\%


## Realized Rate of Return



## Debt Coverage Ratio

- Identifies cash generated from operations on a yearly basis above the debt service payment
- Debt coverage ratios mandated by covenants and established in bond ordinances
- Know your requireme with the yearly budge



## Build in Safety Factor

- When setting rates a safety factor must be built into the coverage ratio for planning purposes
- Electric sales dependent on weather
- Unexpected expense can occur
- Potentially causes the utility to fall below coverage requirements
- Safety factor of 0.2 is typically added to Bond Coverage requirement

|  |  | Minimum <br> Target Level <br> Bond Covenent <br> Requirement |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.10 | 0.20 | 1.30 |
| 1.20 | 0.20 | 1.40 |
| 1.25 | 0.20 | 1.45 |

## Not Meeting Debt Coverage

- DEFAULT
-Technically in default even if making
payment but not meeting
Debt Coverane
Ratio
- Can affect ratings and ability to issue bonds in future
- Can affects interest rate in the future $=$ higher risk


## Calculate Debt Coverage Ratio

|  |  |  |  | Comments: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Electric |  |  | I |
| A | \$ (1,071,944) | Net Income |  | I |
| B | 1,936,076 | Depreciation |  | I |
| C | 511,963 | Interest |  |  |
| (Sum A-C) | \$ 1,376,095 | Cash from operations to pay Debt |  | I |
| D | \$ 760,000 | Yearly Debt Payment |  | I |
| Sum (A-C)/D I ${ }_{\text {I }}^{\text {I }}$ (- |  |  |  | IAcceptable |

## Comments:

Revenue Bonds 1.20 or Higher (GO recommended 1.0 minimum)
Know your specific requirements!
Not include PILOT - Really??
Info available on Balance Sheet, Income Statement, Cash Flow Statement

## Debt \% of NBV

- Identifies the amount of debt outstanding against the remaining Net Book Value
- How "leveraged" is the system
- What we typically see:
- Generation and distribution between $50-70 \% ; 70 \%$ MAX
- Distribution only 30 to $50 \%$
- Obviously, we've seen utilities with no debt to highly leveraged


## Calculate \% Debt to NBV

|  | Outstanding Debt \% |  |  |  | Comments: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | - | I |
|  | Elec |  |  |  | I |
| A |  | 33,057,749 | NBV |  | I |
| B | \$ | 10,030,000 | Principal |  | I |
| (B/A) |  | 30\% |  |  | Acceptable |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

(Distribution only less than 50\%; Produce \& Dist less than 70\%) Find Info on your Balance Sheet

## Age of System

- Depends on accuracy of depreciation rates used
- Individual asset components can be different (trucks VS distribution system)
- Regular Investment in system?
- Ever cut capital to keep rates low?
- Over 60\% watch for



## Calculate Age of System

|  |  |  | Comments: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Electric |  | i |
| A | \$ 63,263,861 | Historical Investment | I |
| B | \$ 29,370,067 | Accum Depreciation | , |
| (B/A) | 46\% | Percent Depreciated | Acceptable |
|  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

50\% or less = Newer Over 65\% should be watched for aging
In general; Reinvest in Capital at least rate of depreciation Info Available on Balance Sheet

## Capital Investment

-"Pay as you go" for regular capital

- Future reinvesting in the system (at least depreciation, can be age dependent)
- Accuracy of depreciation rates?
~as convectiberding for extra-ordinary


## Calculate Investment Analysis

| Electric Yearly Depreciation |  | Comments: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 1,863,509 | Depreciation |  |
| \$1,500,000 | Average Capital | Acceptable |
|  |  |  |

# PILOT Payment <br> (Contribution to the City) 

## PILOT Payment

- Contribution to the City - Formula - Is it a percentage based on revenues?
- Is it based on NBV?
- Need to plan for those large investments
- Exposure to "one time" transfers
- What is the cost of "free services" to the city
- Are allocations for city pro services appropriate: Mete Billing, Customer Services, Administration



## Contribution to City

- National average of cash-only contributions approximately 3.9\% of Revenues (APPA survey)
- National average including free service about 5.9\% Revenues (APPA Survey)
- What we see: 7\%
- Disguising a tax as a utility rate?



## Calculate PILOT



## Cost of Service and Rate Structure

A

## When was the last time your utility had a COS?

- Was the study used?
- Key indicator can be the monthly customer charge


A

## Cost of Service Studies

- Cost of Service studies should be completed every three to five years or when substantial changes in costs occur
- Change in power supply contract,
- Adding additional gen resources
- Major distribution or
 transmission ungrade or


## Customer Charge



## A

## Customer Charges

- Costs that do not vary with usage:
- Meter operation, maintenance al replacement costs
- AMR installation costs
- Meter reading
- Billing Costs
- Customer Service
- Portion of Distribution System (3550\%)


## Typical Residential Cost Based Customer Charge

- Typical cost based residential customer charges:
- Typical Municipal System - \$12\$17/Month
- Rural Utilities - \$15-\$25/Month
- Density of the service territnnu ran affect the monthly custom



## Customer Charges

- Increasing customer charges helps stabilize revenues
- Declining sales
- Reduces subsidy between yearround customers and seasonal customers
- Low income not necessarily the same as low use
- At most utilities, low income customers tend to be higher than average users. A higher customer charge may benefit low income (depends on housing mix - calculate for your utility)


## Importance of Demand Charges

## Correction of Demand Charges Distribution Recovery

- For demand rate customers, most inaccurate method of distribution cost recovery is through a kWh charge
-Economic Development



## Distribution Cost Recovery



## Rate Adjustments Assessment

NA CONNECTIONS SUMMIT

## Consequences of Avoiding Increase

- Need doesn't go away
- Decline in Cash

- Larger future increases
- Don't push off capital improvements
- (at least depreciation for)
- "Pay as you go" for regular capital
- Bond for extra-ordinary capital
- Financially burdened when improvements are needed


## Need Doesn't go Away = COMPOUNDS

| Fiscal Year | Projected Rate Adjustments |  | Projected Revenues |  | Projected Expenses |  | Operating Income |  | Projected Cash Balances |  | Capital mprovements |  | Bond Issues | Debt Coverage Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 3.5\% |  | 26,613,448 |  | 25,481,830 |  | $(593,382)$ |  | 11,894,226 |  | 1,700,000 |  | - | 1.70 |
| 2009 | 3.5\% |  | 27,100,028 |  | 27,262,643 |  | $(162,615)$ |  | 9,901,550 |  | 2,419,692 |  | - | 0.88 |
| 2010 | 3.5\% |  | 27,537,303 |  | 26,930,109 |  | 607,194 |  | 11,277,991 |  | 1,907,039 |  | - | - |
| 2011 | 0.0\% |  | 29,046,768 |  | 28,029,914 |  | 1,016,854 |  | 15,804,097 |  | 5,743,381 |  | 6,950,000 | - |
| 2012 | 0.0\% |  | 30,884,443 |  | 30,944,182 |  | $(59,739)$ |  | 12,406,020 |  | 5,151,597 |  | - | 2.82 |
| 2013 | 0.0\% | \$ | 31,276,116 | \$ | 32,310,794 | \$ | $(1,034,678)$ | \$ | 7,026,799 | \$ | 5,997,171 | \$ | - | 1.60 |
| 2014 | 8.5\% |  | 34,230,179 |  | 34,265,896 |  | $(35,717)$ |  | 6,911,091 |  | 1,859,500 |  | - | 2.70 |
| 2015 | 8.5\% |  | 37,646,341 |  | 35,404,131 |  | 2,242,210 |  | 8,863,022 |  | 2,131,000 |  | - | 4.98 |
| 2016 | 8.5\% |  | 41,348,948 |  | 36,647,148 |  | 4,701,801 |  | 12,226,141 |  | 3,279,000 |  | - | 7.46 |
| Recommended Target in 2014 |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,835,680 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommended Target in 2016 |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,840,329 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommended MINIMUM Target in 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 11,419,203 |  |  |  |  | 1.45 |
| Recommended MINIMUM Target in 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 11,857,050 |  |  |  |  | 1.45 I |

# Power of Small Yearly Increases 
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## Financial Projection Base Case - No Rate Increase



## Financial Projection Recommended Rate Track



## Best Practices - Rate Adjustments

- Small periodic increases to keep up with inflation
- 0-4.9\% - inflationary
- 5-9\% - a few large industrials
- Double digits = complaints


Phase in large increases over time

- When possible, implement Increases in the transition month =Transparent


## Survey - They WILL Ask

- Survey of rates is NOT a guide to determine if an increase is needed oOn a COS basis, it doesn't matter what the neighbor charges
oAre you comparing yourself to a financially burdened utility
- Do you really want to be like "them"? - "We can't get rate adjustments either"
- Surveys can be used to help guide rate design, not guide necessity for a rate adjustment

| City | Monthly |
| :--- | ---: |
| Community 1 | $\$ 45.02$ |
| Community 2 | $\$ 49.01$ |
| Community 3 | $\$ 50.35$ |
| Community 4 | $\$ 54.25$ |
| Community 5 | $\$ 59.00$ |
| Community 6 | $\$ 63.46$ |
| Community 7 | $\$ 63.80$ |
| Community 8 | $\$ 65.36$ |
| Community 9 | $\$ 68.00$ |
| Community 10 | $\$ 69.67$ |
| Community 11 | $\$ 71.47$ |
| Community 12 | $\$ 71.75$ |
| Community 13 | $\$ 72.20$ |
| Community 14 | $\$ 78.77$ |
| Community 15 | $\$ 82.88$ |
| Community 16 | $\$ 95.00$ |
| Community 17 | $\$ 95.80$ |
| Community 18 | $\$ 98.98$ |
| Community 19 | $\$ 100.64$ |
| Community 20 | $\$ 101.10$ |
| Community 21 | $\$ 104.60$ |
| Community 22 | $\$ 109.63$ |
| Community 23 | $\$ 113.30$ |
| Community 24 | $\$ 117.10$ |
| Community 25 | $\$ 117.23$ |
| Community 26 | $\$ 120.40$ |
| Community 27 | $\$ 120.80$ |
| Community 28 | $\$ 121.10$ |
| Community 29 | $\$ 122.59$ |
| Community 30 | $\$ 134.90$ |
| Community 31 | $\$ 140.40$ |
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## Educate your Board NOW

- Educate Board on importance of COS and financial targets
- Critical they understand
- Don't wait until an increase is needed - ongoing process
- Get input from them = "buy-in"
- Get Formal Approval on Targets

- More likely to act and support when needed


## Questions?



## A

## ELECTRICITIES

of NORTH CAROLINA, INC.
The energy behind public power
www.electricities.com

## FOLLOW US ON SOCIAL MEDIA:

(0) @ElectriCitiesNC
f @ElectriCitiesNC
(5) @ElectriCitiesNC
(in) /company/ElectriCitiesNC

