## Financial Issues

## Agenda:

- Inflation
- Finance Policy
$\rightarrow$ Surplus calculation
$\rightarrow$ Capital calculation
- Income Equalisation Reserve
- New Planning Model
$\rightarrow$ Base case
- Debt Period
- Development Contributions



## Operating Surpluses

The Long Term Financial Strategy, adopted in July 2001, made provision for operating surpluses. These surpluses were increased to fund additional capital expenditure and repay debt. A formula was established which ensures that the funds generated from a combination of depreciation (less funds appropriated back to reserves and separate accounts) plus the balance of the operating surplus (in excess of the debt repayment provision) is sufficient to fund $56 \%$ of the average annual forecast capital expenditure over the next 20 -year period. This funding percentage increases from $57 \%$ in 2003/04 to $66 \%$ by 2011/12.

Quote from 2004/05 Draft Annual Plan

## Capital Expenditure Financing as per 2004/14 LTCCP

Capital expenditure, including "term" investments and debt repayment, will continue to be financed as in the past and disclosed in the Financial Summary of the Annual Plan. The financing sources to be used are:

- Depreciation funds and retained surpluses including capital revenues.
- Sale of assets.
- Special funds set aside for capital expenditure; and finally
- Borrowing.

The financial management principles of the Council mandate several key elements of capital expenditure financial management. They are a continuation of past policies, and include:

- Debt will be repaid within 20 years of raising to ensure intergenerational equity.
- At least $59 \%$ of average annual capital expenditure will be funded from depreciation and operating surpluses.
- The balance of capital expenditure will be funded from reserves, sale of assets and lastly, loans.
- Operating expenditure will be funded from operating revenue.
- The Council will budget for an operating surplus each year which will be used in part to repay debt.
- Financial management will be based on maintaining projections within the five financial ratios, and on ensuring the Council continues to receive at least an AA credit rating from Standard and Poor.


## Current Policy Intent

- Ensure an adequate surplus was budgeted for that would ensure rates contributed to capital expenditure and repayment of debt.
- Rate for depreciation.
- Try and smooth the impact on rates of the capital programme (avg capex approach).
- Manage debt (20 year period and ratios).
- Phase in the approach ( $56 \%$ to $66 \%$ ).



## Capital Programme Funding

- 60\% Capital Programme (funded from depreciation and rates)
- $40 \%=$ Balance
- Less Capital Contributions
- Less Reserves Transfers
- Less DRR (choice)
$\rightarrow$ Borrowings


## Surplus must contain:

- Non-rated activity results, e.g. housing / dogs
- Capital revenues, e.g. LTNZ
- Development contributions
- Non-rated income, eg special dividend
- Vested assets
- Rates requirement from capital funding (60\% depreciation)
- Loan repayment provision ( $3 \% \rightarrow 1.4 \%$ )
- Interest not available for rates, e.g. CEF inflation protection, special funds.


## Impact of Policy

- Average approach meant any project in the 10 year period would result in an increase in year 1 regardless intergenerational issue??
- Moving from $56 \%$ to $66 \%$, ie $1 \%$ increase each year meant a $.6 \%$ (increasing to .7\%) increase in rates year upon year.


## Issues with Application of Policy

- 20 years possible but in reality not practical only use was to measure ratios for years 10 20.
- Average was a calculated figure - average of first 10 years was used as the actual numbers for years 11-20.
- Big projects treated differently.
- Policy is very general in nature and it is open to a number of interpretations.
- It appears simple, but there are complex components within it requiring judgement.



## Income Equalization Reserve

- This reserve is build up from "extra surpluses".
- It has been used as a tool to smooth rates.
- Solves short-term issues but can hide issues and eventually will be used up.


## Use of IER

As part of the 04/14 LTCCP, \$28m was spread over 04/05 to 06/07.


## Suggested Guidelines for IER

- As IER reflects extra surpluses which one could argue means the rates were too high, then any extra surplus should be applied against rates for the subsequent year.
- As there will be years when we fail to achieve our budgeted surplus, it would be unwise to fully apply positive years' surpluses.
- A logical approach is to look at $50 \%$ being applied to rate reductions with the balance going to reserves to be available to cover the years that the surplus was not achieved.


## Suggested Guidelines for IER (cont...)

- To ensure that the reserves do not build up to excessive levels, it would be prudent to "cap" the amount at say $\$ 10 \mathrm{~m}$.
- For the above to work we would need to be able to forecast our year end position around Feb. to incorporate into an annual plan/LTCCP.
- The $50 \%$ level would provide a buffer to our forecast being significantly out.
- You need to note that as we get better at our budgeting, the amounts of "extra surplus" will lessen considerably.


## New Planning Tool BPS

Our old financial model was based upon a spreadsheet developed 10 years ago. This:

- Had become extremely complex as it has been modified over the years.
- Is NOT well understood.
- Had many interdependencies
- Had started to produce results that were contrary to our expectations.
- In designing BPS we went back to basics and have looked at what the intent was and what is sound accounting practice.
- We believe it CRITICAL that our process is as transparent as possible.
- Currently the Surplus calculation is managed outside the system.


## Basis for Current LTCCP

Our current $15.7 \%$ increase is based upon:

1. No average capital approach.
2. Ensuring the surplus provides for any Ioan repayments.
3. Depreciation does not subsidise rates.
4. Debt levels are identified and managed but the model only covers 10 years.
5. Full transparency.


## Capital Changes Impact

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 2007 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 2009 | 2010 |
| Scenario - push \$20m capex out 2 years |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change in rate funded Capex |  | -20 m | $+/-20 \mathrm{~m}$ | +20 m |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Opex Change effects |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change in interest expense @ 6.85\% |  | $-575,400$ | $-1,370,000$ | $-794,600$ | 0 |
| Change in Depn @ 4\% |  | $-400,000$ | $-800,000$ | $-400,000$ | 0 |
| Change in Loan Repayment Reserve @ 3\% |  |  | $-600,000$ | $-600,000$ | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Total Opex Rating change |  | $-975,400$ | $-2,770,000$ | $-1,794,600$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $-1.03 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Change \% based on \$1.75m $=1 \%$ |  | $-0.56 \%$ | $-1.58 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  | $-0.56 \%$ | $-1.03 \%$ | $0.56 \%$ | $1.03 \%$ |
| Year on year change |  |  |  |  |  |

What this says is if you delay $\$ 20 \mathrm{~m}$ you will get a $0.5 \%$ rate saving in year 1 and a further $1 \%$ saving in year 2. $\$ 20 \mathrm{~m}$ reduction = total saving of $1.5 \%$ which equates to the $\$ 12.5 \mathrm{~m}=1 \%$.
The above is reversed when the $\$ 20 \mathrm{~m}$ is added back in in $2009,0.5 \%$ increase in 2009 and a further $1 \%$ in 2010.

## Basis for Current LTCCP (cont...)

- The result is that this move WILL provide a robust and solid methodology to manage the Council 10 year LTCCP finances that has a better outcome over a ten year period.
- What it does however produce, is a one time financial adjustment to address the "adjustments" made in recent years that have resulted in the current policy limitations.


## Way Forward

As the approach is a change in policy, the adjustment required can be:

- Fully absorbed in 06/07
- Phased in over 3 years
- Fully implemented for 06/07 but the impact spread over 3 years by utilising funds from the IER that accrued in 04/05.



## Debt Period

- Currently the policy is that debt will be repaid within 20 years of raising to ensure intergenerational equity.
- This sees us creating a "reserve" by charging rates $3 \%$ of the debt total.
- $3 \%$ over 20 years will provide for the full repayment because of the interest earned on the put aside funds.


## Debt Period (continued...)

- The Audit \& Risk Committee recently reviewed and approved for referral to Council the liability management policy. This forms part of the LTCCP financial policies.
- This policy included a change in term of debt from 20 years to 30 years.
- This equates to a charge against rates of $1.4 \%$ compared to the $3 \%$ previous.
- The impacts are shown on the next slide. Please note this change is not yet incorporated into the financials we have been reviewing this week.
- In considering the length of period of debt, one must consider the asset base it is covering. We have a mixture of asset lives ranging from three years (PCs etc.), to 80 years for pipes, to hundred's of years for land.
- As we DO NOT raise debt against specific assets, ie we manage our total portfolio, we reviewed the mix of our asset lives excluding land and believe that anything beyond 30 years is not logical or sound financial management.


## Development Contributions

Indicative Only

| $2006 / 07$ | $2007 / 08$ | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2011 / 12$ | $2012 / 13$ | $2013 / 14$ | $2014 / 15$ | $2015 / 160$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,591 | 11,083 | 12,681 | 17,051 | 19,182 | 19,527 | 19,566 | 19,584 | 19,642 | 19,699 |

## 10 year total $\$ 168$ million



## MCTS Change from $\$ 85 \mathrm{~m}$ to $\$ 160 \mathrm{~m}$

Based on fully rating for depreciation
Capex
Less LTNZ Revenues
Less Development Contributions
Less Depreciation rated
Amount to Borrow
Rating Impact
Interest Expense $6.85 \%$
Depreciation
Loan Repayment $3 \%$
Rates required
Percentage Rate Increase
Cumulative Rate Increase
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}2006 / 07 & 2007 / 08 & 2008 / 09 & 2009 / 10 & 2010 / 11 & 2011 / 12 & 2012 / 13 & 2013 / 14 & 2014 / 15 & 2015 / 16\end{array}$ Total

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}429,156 & 1,341,255 & 1,424,856 & 10,813,528 & 10,008,435 & 10,941,314 & 9,443,077 & 9,761,857 & 10,441,289 & 10,125,980 & 74,730,748\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}-224,477 & -152,465 & -331,564 & -4,884,230 & -3,894,311 & -3,074,719 & -3,884,029 & -6,805,985 & -6,023,745 & -4,158,215 & -33,433,739\end{array}$ | -400 | $-15,336$ | $-10,120$ | $-325,200$ | $-276,795$ | $-323,614$ | $-242,405$ | $-254,663$ | $-309,600$ | $-240,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $-1,998,133$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-4,322$ | $-35,641$ | $-77,846$ | $-268,509$ | $-603,619$ | $-980,303$ | $-1,392,486$ | $-1,787,441$ | $-2,176,835$ | $-2,557,648$ |
| $-9,884,649$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 199,958 | $1,137,813$ | $1,005,326$ | $5,335,589$ | $5,233,711$ | $6,562,678$ | $3,924,157$ | 913,768 | $1,931,109$ | $3,170,118$ | $29,414,227$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



