



Consolidation and Transformation of the Big Plans

2014-2016 Fiscal Management Strategy June 10, 2014

Prepared by: Financial Planning Branch
Financial Services Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 3 |
| ASSUMPTIONS AND ANALYSIS LIMITATIONS | 4 |
| CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY | 6 |
| REVENUE SUMMARIES | 7 |
| <i>2014-2016 Revenue Strategy</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>Property Taxes</i> | <i>11</i> |
| <i>Sales to Other Governments</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Sale of Goods & Services</i> | <i>18</i> |
| <i>Other Revenue from Own Sources</i> | <i>19</i> |
| <i>Grants</i> | <i>20</i> |
| <i>Other Transfers</i> | <i>21</i> |
| EXPENSE SUMMARIES | 22 |
| <i>2014-2016 Expense Strategy</i> | <i>26</i> |
| <i>Salaries, Wages & Benefits</i> | <i>27</i> |
| <i>Contracted & General Services.....</i> | <i>28</i> |
| <i>Purchases from Other Governments</i> | <i>29</i> |
| <i>Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities</i> | <i>30</i> |
| <i>Small Equipment & Furnishings.....</i> | <i>31</i> |
| <i>Transfers & Grants</i> | <i>32</i> |
| <i>Financial Services Charges</i> | <i>33</i> |
| <i>Other Expenses.....</i> | <i>34</i> |
| MUNICIPAL CORPORATE UTILITY | 35 |
| DEBT AND DEBT SERVICE | 36 |
| <i>Debt Limit</i> | <i>38</i> |
| <i>Debt Service Limit.....</i> | <i>38</i> |
| FISCAL STABILITY RESERVES | 39 |
| <i>Emerging Issues Reserve</i> | <i>40</i> |
| <i>Capital Infrastructure Reserve.....</i> | <i>41</i> |
| INVESTMENTS | 43 |
| FINANCIAL CONDITION INDICATORS | 46 |
| <i>Sustainability.....</i> | <i>46</i> |
| <i>Flexibility</i> | <i>47</i> |
| <i>Vulnerability.....</i> | <i>48</i> |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Fiscal Management Strategy (FMS) is to provide a high-level financial overview of the Municipality's operating and capital needs and provide context for setting property tax rates, user fees and other Municipal service charges. As part of long term planning, the FMS is updated annually.

The FMS assumes two likely scenarios:

- **Property Tax Revenue Neutral Plus Construction Growth—“LOW RISK”:** *conservative* outlook on projected property assessment growth, supporting operating costs as approved in the 2014-2016 Operating Plan and the 2014-2019 Capital Budget and Plan.
- **Property Tax Revenue Neutral Plus Construction Growth—“HIGH RISK”:** *optimistic* outlook on projected property assessment growth, supporting operating costs as approved in the 2014-2016 Operating Plan and the 2014-2019 Capital Budget and Plan.

What Does Tax Revenue Neutral Mean?

The property taxes remaining at neutral levels means that the Municipality will collect the same property tax revenue for the 2014 tax year as it did in the 2013 tax year on properties which existed in 2013. Tax rates are adjusted to collect the same tax revenue as in 2013, and growth (newly assessed property) is the only contributor to any increase in tax revenue.

In summary, the 2014-2016 FMS forecasts the following:

- Using the revenue neutral plus new construction growth assumption model, the Municipality will be able to meet its recurring operating expenses.
- In both Low Risk and High Risk scenarios, the Municipality will be able to maintain its \$50M minimum requirement for the Emerging Issues Reserve (EIR) and the Capital Infrastructure Reserve (CIR).
- There is \$459M of unfunded capital projects from 2015 to 2018, which will remain unfunded due to debt, reserve and grant limitations. A redistribution and reprioritization of financial resources would need to occur to fund these projects.
- Debt and debt service levels will be within Council's approved limit of 85% of *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) limits, in accordance with the Debt Management Policy FIN-120.
- Retain investment strategies being adopted by the Municipality in compliance with Investment Policy FIN-140.

- Transition to the Municipal Corporate Utility (MCU) is in progress and will need to be monitored and phased in, if necessary, to preserve existing debt capacity. The impact on revenue and expenses is included in 2015 and 2016 of the FMS.
- Funding requirements for the new Regional Recreation Corporation has not been quantified therefore the impact has not been reflected in the FMS.
- Exploration of Alternative Capital Financing (ACF) strategies will continue as a possible funding method for certain capital projects. Due to the varied arrangements, the capital and operational impacts of these potential private partnerships have not been quantified nor reflected in the FMS.

ASSUMPTIONS AND ANALYSIS LIMITATION

In order to prepare accurate capital and operating budgets and other financial plans for Council's review, consistent assumptions are established to ensure comparability. Assumptions and constraints followed in constructing the report include:

- Property tax "revenue neutral plus new construction growth" is assumed with low risk / high risk scenarios.
- Low risk scenario assumed for property tax revenue.
- Debt and Debt Service limits are 85% of the MGA limit as approved by Council.
- The Municipality has \$634M of undrawn, committed debt as at December 31, 2013. In 2015, \$377M will be drawn, and thereafter debt will be drawn within three years of commitment or approval by Council, depending on the rate of construction. The draw downs on debt will be on an as-needed basis, in line with the cash flow requirements for capital projects.
- There will be an increase in debt service as result of the drawdown which will take place in 2015.
- Interest rate of 3.5% is assumed for future debt amortization.
- Any changes to the current user fees will be based on completion of the comprehensive user fees study and will be brought to Council in the fall of 2014 for approval.

- Franchise fee and dividends from the MCU are part of the revenue in 2015 and 2016 financial plan. All expenses and revenues attributed to the MCU in 2015 and 2016 are excluded from the financial plan.

The analysis is restricted and guided by:

- *Municipal Government Act* RSA 2000 cM-26
- Municipal Development Plan 2011-2030
- 2012-2016 Strategic Plan
- Fiscal Responsibility Policy FIN-160
- Investment Policy FIN-140
- Approved 2014 Operating and Capital Budgets
- 2015-2016 adjusted operating plan
- 2015-2019 Capital Plan
- Debt Management Policy FIN-120
- Alternative Capital Financing FIN-200

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

Figure 1 2014 Amended Operating Budget and 2015-2016 Operating Plan Summary

| | 2012 - Actual (Audited) | 2013 - Actual (Audited) | 2014 - Amended Budget* | 2015 - Adjusted Financial Plan** | 2016 - Adjusted Financial Plan** |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Revenues | | | | | |
| Property Taxes * | 495,526,167 | 548,213,399 | 649,566,261 | 673,060,414 | 684,547,136 |
| Sales To Other Governments | 5,341,330 | 2,960,403 | 3,370,300 | 3,370,300 | 3,370,300 |
| Sales of Goods & Services | 56,839,141 | 65,011,597 | 56,089,986 | 28,176,186 | 25,037,986 |
| Other Revenue From Own Sources | 44,070,581 | 42,628,786 | 39,055,406 | 48,116,470 | 53,680,335 |
| Grants | 12,957,476 | 14,938,974 | 7,234,263 | 7,054,263 | 6,868,863 |
| Other Transfers | 39,361,542 | 8,619,410 | 686,000 | 253,400 | 254,100 |
| | 654,096,236 | 682,372,569 | 756,002,216 | 760,031,033 | 773,758,720 |
| Expenses | | | | | |
| Salaries, Wages & Benefits | 163,243,798 | 178,487,423 | 201,228,500 | 175,200,833 | 175,515,133 |
| Contracted & General Services | 125,815,581 | 129,111,390 | 151,113,397 | 173,043,977 | 176,910,686 |
| Purchases From Other Governments | 22,922,173 | 22,877,551 | 24,735,500 | 25,743,000 | 26,489,880 |
| Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities | 26,986,073 | 28,147,658 | 32,490,600 | 18,078,224 | 18,433,140 |
| Small Equipment & Furnishings | 4,720,086 | 3,823,437 | 5,069,900 | 2,382,854 | 2,418,154 |
| Transfers & Grants | 44,354,310 | 48,637,443 | 39,363,706 | 39,251,603 | 39,262,138 |
| Financial Services Charges | 33,461,068 | 32,275,279 | 31,428,400 | 75,881,324 | 75,960,055 |
| Other Expenses | 1,516,992 | 13,421,894 | 858,500 | 869,500 | 867,902 |
| | 423,020,081 | 456,782,075 | 486,288,503 | 510,451,315 | 515,857,088 |
| TRANSFERS TO RESERVES | | | | | |
| Capital Infrastructure | 229,119,377 | 220,601,530 | 269,713,713 | 249,579,718 | 257,901,632 |
| Emerging Issues Reserve | 1,956,777 | 4,988,965 | | | |
| | 231,076,155 | 225,590,494 | 269,713,713 | 249,579,718 | 257,901,632 |
| SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) | - | - | - | - | - |

* Based on approved Property Tax Rate Bylaw; includes Grants in Lieu of Taxes; net of provision for potential appeal losses

**includes the proposed change in MCU and Financial Service Charges

REVENUE SUMMARIES

The Municipality has six major revenue categories:

- taxes
- sales to other governments
- sales of goods/services
- other revenue from own sources
- grants
- other transfers

On January 17, 2014, Council approved revenue for 2014 of \$706.4, which included Property Tax revenue of \$617.9M. After that date, it had been determined that new construction growth would exceed the budgeted expectations for 2014, and \$57.6M additional property tax revenue was added, bringing the tax revenue to \$675.5M. On May 13, 2014, Council approved a reduction of the residential property taxes, in order to offset the impact of the provincial education tax increase on the property owners in the Municipality, reducing the net tax revenue by \$7.7M. The amended Budget now reflects a net property tax increase of \$49.6M, as noted in Figure 2. This represents a 10.8% increase from the 2013 actual revenue, and a 7.1% increase over the 2014 Operating Budget that was approved by Council on January 17, 2014. Council has decided that the new net tax revenue will be transferred to the CIR.

Local Improvement Plan (LIP) levies budgeted as part of taxes includes \$418,100 each year for 2014, 2015 and 2016.

Figure 2 2014 Amended Operating Budget Revenue Composition, \$756,002,216

| | 2014 - Approved Budget | 2014 - Amended Budget | Additional Revenue |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Property Taxes * | 599,949,700 | 649,566,261 | 49,616,561 |
| Sales to Other Governments | 3,370,300 | 3,370,300 | - |
| Sales of Goods/Services | 56,089,986 | 56,089,986 | - |
| Other Revenue From Own Sources | 39,055,406 | 39,055,406 | - |
| Grants | 7,234,263 | 7,234,263 | - |
| Other Transfers | 686,000 | 686,000 | - |
| Total | \$ 706,385,655 | \$ 756,002,216 | \$ 49,616,561 |

*includes Grants in Lieu of Taxes; net of provision for potential appeal losses

Figure 3 2014 Amended Operating Budget Revenue Composition Chart, \$756,242,180




Figure 4 Revenue Trend Analysis 2012-2016

| | 2012 - Actual (Audited) | 2013 - Actual (Audited) | 2014 - Amended Budget | 2015 - Adjusted Financial Plan | 2016 - Adjusted Financial Plan |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Revenue | | | | | |
| Property Taxes * | 495,526,167 | 548,213,399 | 649,566,261 | 673,060,414 | 684,547,136 |
| Sales to Other Governments | 5,341,330 | 2,960,403 | 3,370,300 | 3,370,300 | 3,370,300 |
| Sales of Goods & Services | 56,839,141 | 65,011,597 | 56,089,986 | 28,176,186 | 25,037,986 |
| Other Revenue From Own Sources | 44,070,581 | 42,628,786 | 39,055,406 | 48,116,470 | 53,680,335 |
| Grants | 12,957,476 | 14,938,974 | 7,234,263 | 7,054,263 | 6,868,863 |
| Other Transfers | 39,361,542 | 8,619,410 | 686,000 | 253,400 | 254,100 |
| Total | 654,096,236 | 682,372,569 | 756,002,216 | 760,031,033 | 773,758,720 |
| Original Budget and Plan - Jan 17, 2014 | | | 706,385,655 | 735,376,119 | 752,035,484 |
| Additional Revenue | | | 49,616,561 | 24,654,914 | 21,723,236 |

*includes Grants in Lieu of Taxes; net of provision for potential appeal losses

Figure 4a Reconciliation of Additional Revenue, 2014-2016

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Revenue, Original Budget and Plan - Jan 17, 2014 | 706,385,655 | 735,376,119 | 752,035,484 |
| Less: Planned revenue reallocated to MCU | - | (27,934,000) | (31,082,000) |
| Add: Franchise fee and dividend to be paid by MCU | - | 9,190,000 | 14,662,000 |
| Add: Net property tax increase* | 49,856,525 | 43,398,914 | 38,143,236 |
| Revenue, Amended Budget and Plan - May 13, 2014 | 756,242,180 | 760,031,033 | 773,758,720 |
| Net increase, from Original to Amended Budget and Plan | 49,856,525 | 24,654,914 | 21,723,236 |

* As approved in the 2014 Tax Bylaw.


Note that in Figure 4 on the previous page, the 2015 and 2016 projected revenues are net of the MCU impact. Figure 4a above reconciles the amounts on the “Additional Revenue” line in Figure 4.

Other Transfers in 2012 were comparatively high, and include:

- \$15.5M transferred from capital projects that was deemed to be operating in nature
- \$10.4M developer contributions/offsite levies

Approximately \$28M and \$31M revenues attributable to the MCU for 2015 and 2016 are not included in revenues noted in Figure 4. The assumptions included were based on information provided in the initial business case to support the formation of the MCU presented in 2012. Any changes in the future versions of this business case will be incorporated into revised versions of the FMS.

Figure 5 Revenue Profile 2012-2016



Increased revenue forecasted for 2014-2016 is attributed to increased tax revenue due to new construction growth. Since Council approval of the 2014 Operating Budget in early 2014, property taxation revenue estimates for 2014-2016, based on tax revenue neutral plus new construction growth approach, have exceeded original projections.

2014-2016 REVENUE STRATEGY

Diverse revenue sources are adopted by the Municipality and appropriate recovery levels are established for municipal services. The level of community resources that is dedicated toward municipal services is directly related to the extent of benefit to the community and the Municipality's ability to pay.

Higher rates of cost recovery for certain services are achieved by charging fair market value for services when it is appropriate to do so and by using prudent cost control measures. User fees and charges are reviewed for the level of cost recovery and reasons for not recovering full costs are identified and explained. The Municipality relies on the User Fees and Charges recovered to offset some of the costs related to service delivery. However, the user fees policies recognize and seek to protect vulnerable segments of the population such as youth and seniors and make attempts to balance need for service with ability to pay.

The Municipality is finalizing a comprehensive user fee study. The recommended general strategy for user fees and charges is:

- Full cost recovery imposed to recover full cost of providing the service, good or access to amenity where it is determined that a service or good or access to an amenity provided by the Municipality provides a direct benefit to individuals, group of individuals or businesses.
- Partial cost recovery imposed where it is determined that a service or good or access to an amenity provided by the Municipality provides a direct benefit to individuals, groups of individuals or businesses but also results in benefits to the general public. Such will also be partially funded by means of a public subsidy from general property tax revenue.

The recommended property tax revenue strategy is:

- Establishment of tax rates that are governed by the three core principles of predictability, stability and transparency that is sustainable for the long term.
- Establishment of rates that contribute to the affordability of living and working in the Municipality while supporting long term infrastructure needs.

PROPERTY TAXES

In 2014, property taxes are projected to be 85.9% of revenue for the Municipality. A fraction (0.1%) of this is from the rural residential class, 2.1% from urban non-residential, 4.3% from urban residential, and 93.5% from rural non-residential. The category also includes grants in lieu of taxes of approximately 0.3%.

For the past five years, the unfavorable variances between the actual and budget are due to a provision for the potential impact of assessment appeals which are at various stages of the appeal process. To further mitigate the impact from 2014-2016, the provision for potential appeal losses has increased from 2% to 3% of total property tax revenue. The increase in the provision reflects the unique assessment environment in the Municipality and the risks associated with it. As a result of this provision, the variance between the actual and budgeted property tax revenue is insignificant, supporting a conservative budget approach.

The increase in property tax revenue is primarily due to an increase in new construction growth, and not due to increases in property tax rates or market value increases. The Municipality maintains competitive property tax rates in the residential class compared to other municipalities.

Figure 6 Property Taxes 2010-2016






Figure 7 Property Tax Revenue Projections 2014-2016



The 2014-2016 property tax revenues presented in Figure 7 are different from the approved 2014 budget and 2015-2016 financial plan based on revised estimates of additional revenue from growth arising from the low risk scenario, and the reduction in residential property tax to offset the Education Tax increase. Figure 7 above includes LIP levies, budgeted as \$418,100 for 2014 through 2016, and provision for estimated assessment appeal losses of about \$20.1M in 2014, \$20.8M in 2015 and \$21.2M in 2016.

It is assumed that the tax revenue projections are the same under the low risk and high risk for 2014 because the tax philosophy followed only offers the low risk and high risk scenarios for future budget years and not the current year.

Figure 8 Municipal Property Tax Rates 2010-2014



Tax rate facts in the Municipality:

- Tax rates are levied per \$1,000 of assessed value.
- Urban residential property tax rates have decreased by 32.2% from 2.66 in 2010 to 1.81 in 2014.
- Urban non-residential rates have decreased by 40.6% from 6.76 in 2010 to 4.02 in 2014.
- Multi-residential rates decreased by 29.4% from 5.74 in 2010 to 4.05 in 2014.
- Rural-residential represents the least amount of property tax revenue. The tax rates have decreased by 38.9% from 1.58 in 2010 to 0.96 in 2013.
- Rural non-residential property rate class generates the highest tax revenue. The property tax rates in this category have decreased by 0.1% from 18.03 in 2010 to 18.02 in 2014.

The Municipality's non-residential and residential property tax cost per square foot in 2013 were competitive compared to other municipalities in the province. Figures 9 and 10 on the next page compare the Municipality's tax cost for urban residential and non-residential per square foot.

Figure 9 Urban Residential Property Tax Cost Comparison per Square Foot 2012-2013¹





Figure 10 Urban Non-Residential Property Tax Cost Comparison per Square Foot, 2012-2013



¹ Source: Primary research conducted by Assessment & Taxation Department, Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo

To remain revenue neutral, the property tax rates often need to change. For the 2014 amended budget, the approved property tax rates and tax revenue distributions are shown in Figures 11 and 12.

Figure 11 Municipal Property Tax Rates, 2013-2014





Figure 12 Property Tax Revenue Contribution by Source 2013-2014



The estimated unadjusted property tax revenue (gross) for 2014 is projected to be approximately \$669.5M based on the revenue neutral assumption. In projecting property tax revenue, two scenarios are assumed: *low risk* and *high risk*.

Figure 13 Unadjusted Property Tax Revenue Projection 2014-2016 (Gross Revenue)




Figure 13 above does not include Local Improvement Plan (LIP) levies budgeted as \$418,100 for 2014 to 2016 and allocation for potential appeal losses of \$20.1M in 2014, \$20.8M in 2015 and \$21.2M in 2016.

Movement from year to year represents tax revenue estimates using projected property assessment growth conservative outlook (low risk) and an optimistic outlook (high risk).

Property Tax Strategy

The Municipality's taxation strategy is guided by the underlying principles of predictability, stability and transparency.

The taxation strategy seeks to achieve:


- **The Urban Residential Taxation Class:** this class will have one of the lowest total tax burdens per square foot as compared to major Alberta cities.
- **The Rural Residential Taxation Class:** this class will have an equal or lower tax burden per square foot as Urban Residential Taxation Class.
- **The Urban Non-Residential Taxation Class:** this class will have one of the lowest total tax burdens per square foot as compared to major Alberta cities.
- **Rural Non-Residential Taxation Class:** this class will have a tax burden that allows the Municipality to maintain a revenue neutral methodology as a result of growth in assessment.

The property taxation strategy contributes to the affordability of living and working in the region while supporting long term capital infrastructure needs. The strategy also takes into account the growth facing the region and the underlying growth drivers.

SALES TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS

This category includes revenue arising from transactions between the Municipality and other public entities such as Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC).

Figure 14 Sales to Other Governments 2010-2016




In the 2014 approved Budget, revenue generated from Sale of Goods & Services to Other Governments is \$3.37M. It is expected that the Municipality will maintain 2014 revenue levels in 2015 and 2016.

SALE OF GOODS & SERVICES

Sale of Goods & Services is a category that includes various items such as revenue from utility rates, ambulance fees, community program and facility fees.

Figure 15 Sales of Goods & Services 2010-2016




Actual revenue from the Sale of Goods & Services has increased in the past four years and is attributed to increase in volume rather than increase in charges and rates. The decline in 2014 is attributed mainly to transit fares, which are now collected by the service provider.

Approximately \$28M and \$31M revenues attributable to the MCU for 2015 and 2016 are not included in revenues outlined in Figure 15, per the business case to support formation of the utility.

OTHER REVENUE FROM OWN SOURCES

This category includes revenue from permits, fines and penalties, franchise fees, and interest from investments. The revenue from this category is approximately \$39M—about 5% of the total 2014 amended revenue budget—the major contributors to this category being revenue from building permits and investment income. The revenue from own sources have consistently exceeded budget expectations in the past.

Figure 16 Other Revenue from Own Sources 2010-2016




Dividend and franchise fees from the MCU of approximately \$9M for 2015 and \$14M for 2016 have been included as part of revenues in Figure 16 above, as outlined in the business case to support formation of the utility.

GRANTS

Grants include both conditional and unconditional funds secured from federal and provincial government such as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Grant. Budget variances in this category signify the excess funding received over the budgeted amounts.


Figure 17 Grants 2010-2016



OTHER TRANSFERS

The two main revenue items that are recorded in this category are internal charge allocations and transfers from reserves. The 2011 variance is largely comprised of the \$95M transfer from the EIR, which was due to prior year surpluses that accumulated in the EIR balance. The rest of the variances are due to transfer of amounts deemed to be operating in nature transferred from approved capital project budgets. Planned balances in 2014-2016 are transfers from the Photo Radar Enforcement Program. Net revenue from the Photo Radar Enforcement Program are held in the Community Initiatives Reserve and then allocated to preventive programs and community grants. Other components of the variances are transfer from reserves to offset program costs.

Figure 18 Other Transfers 2010-2016



EXPENSE SUMMARIES

The Municipality has eight expense categories:

- salaries, wages & benefits
- contracted & general services
- purchases from other governments
- materials/goods/supplies & utilities
- small equipment & furnishings
- transfers & grants
- financial service charges
- other expenses

The 2014 amended budget increased due to increased costs for maintaining current level of services provided to the region, growth and delivery of new services.

Figure 19 2014 Amended Operating Budget Expense Composition, \$486,288,503

| | 2014 - Approved Budget | 2014 - Amended Budget | Variances |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Expenses | | | |
| Salaries, Wages & Benefits | 201,228,500 | 201,228,500 | - |
| Contracted & General Services | 151,113,397 | 151,113,397 | - |
| Purchases From Other Governments | 24,735,500 | 24,735,500 | - |
| Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities | 32,490,600 | 32,490,600 | - |
| Small Equipment & Furnishings | 5,069,900 | 5,069,900 | - |
| Transfers & Grants | 39,363,706 | 39,363,706 | - |
| Financial Services Charges | 31,428,400 | 31,428,400 | - |
| Other Expenditures | 858,500 | 858,500 | - |
| Subtotal | \$ 486,288,503 | \$ 486,288,503 | - |
| Transfer to Reserve | 220,097,152 | 269,713,713 | 49,616,561 |
| Total | \$ 706,385,655 | \$ 756,002,216 | \$ 49,616,561 |

Figure 20 2014 Amended Operating Budget Expense Composition Chart, \$486,288,503




Figure 21 on the next page shows the expense trend from 2012-2016. The increases are largely due to salaries, wages and benefit increases, as well as costs incurred for providing additional contracted services.

Approximately \$67M in 2015 and \$68M in 2016 expense amounts in various categories attributable to the MCU are not included in expenses in Figures 19 and 20. However, the service fees of \$39M in 2015 and \$40M in 2016 have been included, thereby incorporating assumptions from the business case to support the formation of the MCU.

Additional debt service amounts of approximately \$45.3M in 2015 and \$46.2M in 2016 have been included.

Figure 21 Expense Trend Analysis 2012-2016

| | 2012 - Actual (Audited) | 2013 - Actual (Audited) | 2014 - Amended Budget* | 2015 - Adjusted Financial Plan** | 2016 - Adjusted Financial Plan** |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Expenses | | | | | |
| Salaries, Wages & Benefits | 163,243,798 | 178,487,423 | 201,228,500 | 175,200,833 | 175,515,133 |
| Contracted & General Services | 125,815,581 | 129,111,390 | 151,113,397 | 173,043,977 | 176,910,686 |
| Purchases From Other Governments | 22,922,173 | 22,877,551 | 24,735,500 | 25,743,000 | 26,489,880 |
| Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities | 26,986,073 | 28,147,658 | 32,490,600 | 18,078,224 | 18,433,140 |
| Small Equipment & Furnishings | 4,720,086 | 3,823,437 | 5,069,900 | 2,382,854 | 2,418,154 |
| Transfers & Grants | 44,354,310 | 48,637,443 | 39,363,706 | 39,251,603 | 39,262,138 |
| Financial Services Charges | 33,461,068 | 32,275,279 | 31,428,400 | 75,881,324 | 75,960,055 |
| Other Expenses | 1,516,992 | 13,421,894 | 858,500 | 869,500 | 867,902 |
| Total Expenses | 423,020,081 | 456,782,075 | 486,288,503 | 510,451,315 | 515,857,088 |
| Original Budget and Plan - Jan 17, 2014 | | | 486,288,503 | 494,150,517 | 498,116,576 |
| Increased Expenses | | | - | 16,300,798 | 17,740,512 |
| Original Transfer to Reserves - January 17, 2014 | 231,076,155 | 225,590,494 | 220,097,152 | 241,225,602 | 253,918,908 |
| Amended Transfer to Reserves | | | 269,713,713 | 249,579,718 | 257,901,632 |
| Additional Transfer to Reserve | | | 49,616,561 | 8,354,116 | 3,982,724 |
| Total change from original budget and plan | | | 49,616,561 | 24,654,914 | 21,723,236 |

*Incorporates the proposed change in the property tax bylaw.

**includes the proposed change in MCU and Financial Service Charges

Figure 21a Reconciliation of Increased Expense, 2014-2016

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Expenses, Original Budget and Plan - Jan 17, 2014 | 486,288,503 | 494,150,517 | 498,116,576 |
| Less: Planned expenses associated with MCU | - | (67,226,282) | (68,011,755) |
| Add: Service fee to be paid to MCU | - | 38,851,000 | 40,165,000 |
| Add: Increased debt service | - | 44,676,080 | 45,587,267 |
| Expenses, Amended Budget and Plan - May 13, 2014 | 486,288,503 | 510,451,315 | 515,857,088 |
| Net increase, from Original to Amended Budget and Plan | - | 16,300,798 | 17,740,512 |

Figure 21 above displays a net increase in expenses in 2015 and 2016 since the approval of the financial plan on January 17, 2014. The expenses related to the MCU have been removed from the financial plan, but the service fee has been added to the contracted and general services category. The Financial Services Charges has also increased because of the projected increase in drawdown of debt. Figure 21a provides reconciliation of the difference between the amount budgeted on January 17, 2014, and the

amount of the amended budget approved by Council on May 13, 2014. Figures 22 and 23 provide more details of the variances in the operating plan years.


Figure 22 2015 Amended Operating Budget Expense Composition

| | 2015 - Approved Plan | 2015 - Adjusted Plan | Changes |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Expenses | | | |
| Salaries, Wages & Benefits | 206,766,633 | 175,200,833 | (31,565,800) |
| Contracted & General Services | 152,415,420 | 173,043,977 | 20,628,557 |
| Purchases from Government | 25,743,000 | 25,743,000 | - |
| Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities | 33,020,323 | 18,078,224 | (14,942,099) |
| Small Equipment & Furnishings | 4,868,594 | 2,382,854 | (2,485,740) |
| Transfers & Grants | 39,251,603 | 39,251,603 | - |
| Financial Services Charges | 31,215,444 | 75,881,324 | 44,665,880 |
| Other Expenses | 869,500 | 869,500 | - |
| Subtotal | 494,150,517 | 510,451,315 | 16,300,798 |
| Transfer to Reserve | 241,225,602 | 249,579,718 | 8,354,116 |
| Total | 735,376,119 | 760,031,034 | 24,654,914 |

Figure 23 2016 Amended Operating Budget Expense Composition

| | 2016 - Approved Plan | 2016 - Adjusted Plan | Changes |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Expenses | | | |
| Salaries, Wages & Benefits | 207,080,933 | 175,515,133 | (31,565,800) |
| Contracted & General Services | 155,332,558 | 176,910,686 | 21,578,128 |
| Purchases from Government | 26,489,880 | 26,489,880 | - |
| Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities | 33,746,365 | 18,433,140 | (15,313,225) |
| Small Equipment & Furnishings | 4,953,608 | 2,418,154 | (2,535,454) |
| Transfers & Grants | 39,262,138 | 39,262,138 | - |
| Financial Services Charges | 30,383,192 | 75,960,055 | 45,576,863 |
| Other Expenses | 867,902 | 867,902 | - |
| Subtotal | 498,116,576 | 515,857,088 | 17,740,512 |
| Transfer to Reserve | 253,918,908 | 257,901,632 | 3,982,725 |
| Total | 752,035,484 | 773,758,720 | 21,723,236 |

Figure 24 Expense Profile 2012-2016



2014-2016 EXPENSE STRATEGY

Monthly, quarterly and annual financial reports are prepared to compare the actual revenues and expenses to budgeted amounts. These reports are distributed to management for review.

Budgets must be in place for all expenses for both operating and capital costs. An expenditure may be made for an emergency that was not contemplated in the financial plan but the plan is amended, as soon as practical, to include the expense and the funding source.

Any unbudgeted expenses are approved by Council, while any reallocation of the approved Budget can be approved by administration, in accordance with Fiscal Policy Fin-160.

For the preparation of the FMS, certain expense assumptions have been made:

- Undrawn debt of \$377M at the end of 2013 will be drawn at the beginning of 2015 and thereafter all debt is drawn three years after commitment or approval.
- An interest rate of 3.5% has been assumed for future debt draws.

Salaries, Wages and Benefits usually account for about 41% of the Municipality's total approved Operating Budget. There is a labour agreement in place with the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) to the end of 2018, and negotiations are in process with the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF). Conservative increases are included in this category, subject to change based on the outcome of ongoing negotiations.

Exempt staff increases are based on annual performance reviews and market rate increases. Vacant positions are partially funded based on estimated hiring dates.

The Municipal debt strategy is:

- Debt limit is not to exceed 85% of the debt limit per Municipal Government Act and regulations.
- Debt service is not to exceed 85% of the debt service limit per Municipal Government Act and regulations.


SALARIES, WAGES & BENEFITS

Salaries, Wages & Benefits account for about 41.4% of the 2014 approved Operating Budget totaling \$201M. The budget has increased by 13% from the previous year actual, due to:

- Increase in salaries for the existing employees as per the union agreements.
- While the Municipality still faces difficulty filling some positions, recruitment efforts in the past two years have resulted in filling most of the vacancies.

Both 2015 and 2016 plan years are lower than the 2014 budget as a result of the formation of the MCU. See Figure 33 for further details.

Figure 25 Salaries, Wages & Benefits 2010-2016




The variances between Budget and actual Salaries, Wages and Benefits each year are primarily due to estimates for vacant positions: these are difficult to project, are dependent on the rate at which vacancies are filled, and are driven by the labour market.

CONTRACTED & GENERAL SERVICES

Contracted & General Services consist of various expense categories including recruitment, training, travel, telephones & internet, professional services, legal costs and other minor expense categories.

Figure 26 Contracted & General Services 2010-2016



This expense category is influenced by operating projects and changes in pricing of ongoing operations. The Contracted & General Services cost increased about 17% from last year actuals, due to factors such as additional professional services and an increase in transit contract costs.


The financial plan shows an increase in Contracted and General Services for 2015 and 2016: This is the net result of removing the costs related to the MCU and adding in the service fee that will be paid for those services. Details on the MCU impact are shown in Figure 33.

PURCHASES FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS

Purchases from Other Governments include transactions between other municipalities and other public agencies. A significant portion of these costs are related to RCMP contracts.

Purchases from Other Governments represent 5% of the 2014 approved Budget and are expected to remain relatively flat over the next few years.

Figure 27 Purchases from Other Governments 2010-2016




MATERIALS, GOODS, SUPPLIES & UTILITIES

The Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities category consists of expenses incurred to maintain and operate the Municipality on a daily basis. The major items in this category include fuel & lubes, chemicals & salts, natural gas and electricity.

As shown in Figure 28, the decrease in this category in 2015 and 2016 is a direct budget impact of the MCU being formed in 2015. See also Figure 33 for further information on the MCU.

Figure 28 Materials, Goods, Supplies & Utilities 2010-2016




SMALL EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS

The major categories in Small Equipment & Furnishing include office equipment, computer hardware and field equipment. The expenses in 2013 reduced as a result of expected slowdown in office equipment as most renovations have been completed.

The reduction of expenses in this category in 2015 and 2016 is a result of the MCU impact on the financial plan. See Figure 33 for further information about the MCU budget impact.


Figure 29 Small Equipment & Furnishings 2010-2016



TRANSFERS & GRANTS

Transfers to capital, reserves and other internal charges are recorded in this expense category. The amounts presented in Figure 30 are inclusive of reserve transfers and are different from Figure 18 presented in the revenue summaries section of the report.

Figure 30 Transfers & Grants 2010 -2016




The large variances in this category are a result of additional revenue that the Municipality generates, which are transferred to either CIR or EIR, as approved by Council. These transfers represent the amount transferred and committed to current and future funding requirements. The transfer of \$264M to the CIR is included in the 2014 amended budget.

FINANCIAL SERVICES CHARGES

Items included in this category are bank charges, debenture principal and debenture interest. Figure 31 is exclusive of amortization since the Municipality does not budget for amortization. Debt service budget provisions are based on actual debt drawn or expected to be drawn in future years.

Figure 31 Financial Services Charges 2010-2016




If the Municipality draws \$377M of committed debt in 2015, and implements the strategy to ensure all debt is drawn three years after commitment or approval, debt service would be \$75.9M in 2015 and \$76.0M in 2016. Based on the financial plan which was approved by Council, these potential debt services charges have not been included in the FMS. The impact on debt service limits is reflected in the section “Debt and Debt Service Limits”. Administration continues to monitor cash flow requirements as well as prevailing and projected interest rate levels.

OTHER EXPENSES

Charges related to internal services, bad debt expense, inventory shrinkage are some of the major expenses that are recorded in Other Expenses.

Figure 32 Other Expenses 2010-2016



The variance between 2012 and 2013 is attributed to transfers of operating costs relating to approved capital projects. These costs do not qualify to be recorded as Tangible Capital Assets, and have to be expensed as operating costs. Funding was provided within original capital project budgets.

The bulk of the actual cost in 2013 relates to: excess tax appeal loss, over budget, of \$8M related to the 2010 tax year; and \$3.7M allowance for doubtful debt.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATE UTILITY (MCU)

A presentation made to Council in December 2011 outlines the purpose of the MCU as providing alternative delivery method for those services now being provided by the Environmental Services Department, specifically water, wastewater, and solid waste services. It would also undertake to explore and promote the following opportunities:

- Implementation of green practices and operations on a regional basis with resultant potential for positive impact on climate change, waste diversion, renewable energy, water conservation and water quality.
- Generation of new sustainable income through innovative service agreements and partnerships.
- Local economic diversification and employment opportunities.
- Provision of value-added benefits with no increase in costs for residential services.
- Opportunity for partnerships with regional educational institutions.
- New sustainable skill set development and career opportunities for staff to maximize recruitment and retention efforts.²

The terms and conditions of the formation of the MCU have yet to be decided. The FMS has been prepared with the assumption that the MCU will proceed in 2015. However, the final impact on the financial plan cannot be determined until the MCU has been approved by the Province. At the time of publication, the financial impact for 2015 and 2016 is based on the MCU business case that was prepared in 2012 and summarized in Figure 33 on the next page.

The revenue and expenses related to the Environmental Services Department are removed from the financial plan as these will now be the responsibility of the MCU. The MCU will pay a dividend and franchise fee to the Municipality. In turn, the Municipality will incur a service fee as payment to the MCU for the provision of the utility services.

The impact on the financial plan is a net gain of \$9.6M in 2015 and \$11.4M in 2016.

² Investigation of a Municipal Controlled Corporate Utility Model for Environmental Services, Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo Council Meeting Minutes, December 13, 2011, www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca.

Figure 33 Impact of MCU on Financial Plan, 2015-2016

| | 2015 - Plan | 2016 - Plan |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Revenue | | |
| Sales-Goods-Services | (27,934,000) | (31,082,000) |
| Other Revenue From Own Sources - Dividend | 4,190,000 | 4,662,000 |
| Other Revenue From Own Sources - Franchise Fee | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| | (18,744,000) | (16,420,000) |
| Expenses | | |
| Salaries Wages and Benefits | (31,565,800) | (31,565,800) |
| Contracted and General Services | (18,222,443) | (18,586,872) |
| Contracted and General Services - Service Fee | 38,851,000 | 40,165,000 |
| Materials Goods Supplies | (14,942,099) | (15,313,225) |
| Fixed Asset Acquisition | (2,485,740) | (2,535,454) |
| Financial Service Charge | (10,200) | (10,404) |
| | (28,375,282) | (27,846,755) |
| Net gain | 9,631,282 | 11,426,755 |

DEBT AND DEBT SERVICE

The Debt Limit and Debt Service Limit for the Municipality are governed by Alberta Regulation 255/2000 of the MGA and Municipality's Debt Management Policy FIN-120.

DEBT STRATEGY

The Municipality uses debt to fund capital projects based on two principles:

- Use debt to fund capital projects that have a longer useful life.
- Use debt finance as a funding source of "last resort."

The first principle respects the *inter-generational equity philosophy*, which states that each generation that benefits from an amenity must bear their fair share of financial burden, and the second principle indicates a conservative approach to debt use.

The Municipality considers the use of alternative sources of funding such as grants, developer contributions, off-site levies, donations, user fees, or reserves for capital asset acquisition or

construction to minimize the requirement for debt. The Alberta Capital Finance Authority (ACFA) is the lender of choice unless a more attractive loan arrangement is available from another acceptable lender.

For a municipality facing rapid population growth and the associated demand for new infrastructure and infrastructure rehabilitation, use of debt is a reality as general revenue growth typically lags infrastructure demand.

Figure 34 below outlines the Debt Limit and Debt Service calculations under both the low risk and high risk scenarios.

Figure 34 Debt Limit and Debt Service Calculations, Low and High Risk

| | LOW RISK (\$ Million) | | | HIGH RISK (\$ Million) | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| DEBT LIMIT | | | | | | |
| Revenue of Prior Year* | 689 | 756 | 760 | 689 | 756 | 770 |
| Debt Limit-Per MGA (2xRevenue) | 1,379 | 1,511 | 1,520 | 1,379 | 1,511 | 1,540 |
| Council Approved Limit (85% of MGA limit) | 1,172 | 1,284 | 1,292 | 1,172 | 1,284 | 1,309 |
| Actual Debt | 317 | 646 | 604 | 317 | 646 | 604 |
| Undrawn Debt | 778 | 491 | 502 | 778 | 491 | 502 |
| Actual Total Debt Percentage | 22.99% | 42.74% | 39.74% | 22.99% | 42.74% | 39.21% |
| Committed Debt (Actual & Undrawn) | 1,095 | 1,137 | 1,106 | 1,095 | 1,137 | 1,106 |
| Committed Debt Percentage | 79.39% | 75.26% | 72.81% | 79.39% | 75.26% | 71.84% |
| DEBT SERVICE | | | | | | |
| Debt Service Limit-Per MGA (0.35xRevenue) | 241 | 264 | 266 | 241 | 264 | 270 |
| Council Approved Limit (85% of MGA limit) | 205 | 225 | 226 | 205 | 225 | 229 |
| Actual Debt Service | 31 | 76 | 76 | 31 | 76 | 76 |
| Actual Debt Service Percentage | 12.77% | 28.70% | 28.57% | 12.77% | 28.70% | 28.19% |


* For calculating debt limit, revenue does not include Contributions of Tangible Capital Assets nor Grants. It is based on the prior year revenue, as required by the MGA.

DEBT LIMIT

The MGA states that a municipality cannot exceed the debt limit of two times its total revenue.³ Council has approved a Debt Management Policy FIN-120, which permits a debt limit up to 85% of the provincially legislated limit.

Actual debt refers to actual debentures drawn and outstanding by the Municipality while committed debt refers to total debt approved (through debenture bylaws) eligible to be drawn by the Municipality. Committed debt is an addition of actual debt drawn and undrawn debt.

Figure 35 Debt Limit Trend 2014-2016




DEBT SERVICE LIMIT

Debt Service is defined as annual principal and interest amounts owing on outstanding loans made by the Municipality plus annual principal and interest amounts that the Municipality will be liable to pay on loans guaranteed by the Municipality.

The MGA debt service limit is calculated as .35 times of the total revenue. The Municipality's Debt Management Policy establishes a limit as 85% of the legislated limit and was amended in 2012 increasing the limit from 75% to 85% of the legislated limit. As depicted in Figure 35 above, both the low risk and high risk outlook on debt service are under the prescribed limit of 85% of the MGA as set by Council.

³ Total revenue reported in the last year audited annual financial statement

Figure 36 Debt Service Comparison (%) 2014-2016



While total committed debt is being tracked, committed debt service is more difficult to project, as it is tied to unpredictable capital projects delivery and related backlog. Consequently, it is difficult to predict when the debt would be drawn. For planning purposes, debt is assumed to be drawn three years after Council’s approval.

FISCAL STABILITY RESERVES

GENERAL RESERVE STRATEGY

The Municipality has an established reserve strategy to meet future operations and capital expenses.

The reserve is in place to hedge against future risk factors including:

- Revenue shortfalls
- Unanticipated expense increases
- To ensure stable property tax rates

In compliance with the Fiscal Responsibility Policy FIN-160 (approved April 26, 2011), the Municipality holds two reserves: the Emerging Issues Reserve (EIR) and the Capital Infrastructure Reserve (CIR). Council approval is required to utilize funding from both reserves.

EMERGING ISSUES RESERVE (EIR)


The EIR was established by Council in 2002 to stabilize operating revenues in response to unanticipated loss of revenue as well as provide funding flexibility in responding to unplanned events and other significant price changes. Funding of the EIR comes from operating surplus (if any) at the end of the financial year.

The EIR is governed as follows:

- Maximum EIR balance equivalent to 15% of the audited prior year's net property tax revenue and is subject to a minimum uncommitted balance of \$50M.
- Council approval is required to utilize funding from the EIR.

As depicted in Figure 37 below, the \$50M minimum uncommitted balance is maintained in the EIR for the period 2014-2016.


Figure 37 Projected Emerging Issues Reserve Balances 2014-2016



CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESERVE (CIR)

The CIR has been established to provide a source for capital project funding with a minimum uncommitted balance of \$50M. The reserve funds unanticipated capital program requirements. The \$49.6M increase in the amended tax revenue for 2014 is also adjusted in the CIR balances. The forecasted capital infrastructure contributions are presented in Figure 38.

Figure 38 Projected Operating Budget Transfer to CIR 2014-2016




Based on the low/high risk scenarios, the projected balance in the CIR is found in Figure 39. In 2015, the CIR falls below the minimum balance—many capital projects were delayed to start in 2015 or later during the 2014 capital budget process. Council will decide the funding priorities for these projects, by removing, postponing or exploring alternative funding sources.

The CIR drawdown outlined in Figure 40 will require revision/reprioritization by Council to meet funding and resource capacity.


The projects that carry forward into multiple years that started in 2014 and prior have the CIR funding set aside—it is the new projects beginning in 2015 or 2016 that will be affected by the prioritization of projects.

Figure 39 Capital Infrastructure Reserve Projected Balance 2014-2016



* Excess from Low Risk (Cumulative)

Figure 40 Projected CIR drawdown 2014-2016



INVESTMENTS

INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Municipality's investment of funds is governed under Investment Policy FIN-140, as approved by Council. The general investment strategies adopted by the Municipality are to:

- Rebalance investment term such that fiscal reserves balances are invested in the medium and long term periods.
- Review current capital project backlog to establish cash flow which would determine term horizon.

The primary objectives of the policy, in order of priority, are:

- Safety of Principal: investments shall be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure the preservation of capital.
- Liquidity: the investment portfolio shall remain sufficiently liquid to meet all operating and capital cash requirements that may be reasonably anticipated.
- Return on Investment: the investments of the fund shall be structured with the objective of attaining a market rate of return.

The investment type is restricted to fixed income securities that are of high credit quality and meet the following maturity criteria:

- Short term investments: maturity of less than a year; 11% of the portfolio
- Medium term investments: maturity greater than one year, but less than ten less than five years; 89% of the portfolio

The Municipality's investments have various levels of oversight and governance. First of all, funds are managed by external fund managers. In addition, there is an Investment Advisory Committee that has oversight responsibility, and is comprised of the CFO (chair), the CAO/COO and the Director of Finance. Finally, a performance update is presented to Council annual.

Given the reclassification of the Short-Term and Medium-Term portfolios that occurred in Q2 2013, only one quarter of performance is available for the complements outlined in Figure 41. The securities distribution of the portfolio is allocated such that 88.7% of the holdings are allotted to the Medium-Term Portfolio and 11.32% to the Short-Term Portfolio.


The total amortized cost of the portfolio is \$523.4M at December 31, 2013. Overall portfolio performance has been above benchmark for the last four years, and ensures the safety of the capital and provides an above-market rate of return as prescribed in the investment policy.

Figure 41 Total Portfolio Performance Summary, December 31, 2013

| Market Value | | Annualized | | | Annual (1-year Ending) | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------|--------|--------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 3 months | 1 year | 4 year | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 |
| \$521.6 M | Total Portfolio | 0.45% | 0.01% | 2.03% | 0.01% | 2.22% | 3.50% | 2.43% |
| 100% | DEX 91 Day T-Bill Index | 0.25% | 1.01% | 0.89% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.00% | 0.54% |
| | Excess Return (%) | 0.20% | -1.00% | 1.14% | -1.00% | 1.21% | 2.50% | 1.89% |
| | DEX Short Term | 0.61% | 1.40% | 2.61% | 1.40% | 1.17% | 4.62% | 3.29% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| \$462.9 M | Medium Term Portfolio | 0.52% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 88.7% | Dex Short Term | 0.61% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Excess Return | -0.09% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Quartile | Q4 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | | | | | | | |
| \$511.1 M | Short Term Portfolio | 0.33% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 11.3% | DEX 91 Day T-Bill Index | 0.25% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Excess Return | 0.08% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Quartile | Q1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

The bulk of the Municipality's investment relate to funds for approved capital projects that are currently active. Further, the liquidity of the portfolio is also maintained as most of the investments can be readily converted or liquidated.

Figure 42 Total Investment Cost Trend, 2011-2013 (\$ Millions)



As illustrated in Figure 43 below, the quality of investment grade is also maintained while achieving an above-market rate of return.

Figure 43 Total Portfolio Investment Quality Analysis, December 31, 2013





Figure 44 Total Portfolio Sector Analysis, December 31, 2013



FINANCIAL CONDITION INDICATORS


The Municipality uses three sets of financial conditions to measure its overall financial health: sustainability, flexibility, vulnerability.

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability refers to the Municipality's ability to maintain existing programs and meet creditor requirements without the need to take on more debt.

Within this category, the Municipality uses two financial indicators to measure its performance: financial assets and liabilities. The *financial assets to liabilities ratio* measures whether the Municipality has adequate resources to pay its debts as they come due. The liabilities are adjusted for *deferred revenue* related to grant funding that is received but not yet expended according to the terms of the grant agreement. The ratio is continuing to decline which indicates that the Municipality is relatively leveraged for financing future capital projects.

Figure 45 Ratio of Financial Assets to Liabilities, 2011-2013 (\$ millions)



A ratio of 2:1 is desirable. This indicator includes long term debt of \$332M in 2013, \$347M in 2012, and \$362M in 2011. To ensure that the Municipality does not fall below this target, it needs to reprioritize existing capital projects, to ensure less reliance on debt as a source of funding, as well as consider extending time horizons of these projects.

FLEXIBILITY

In the flexibility category, the Municipality uses one measure to monitor performance, *public debt charges to maximum allowable debt*, which is a measure of resources spent on debt and debt service relative to the maximum allowable debt as prescribed in the MGA.

As illustrated in Figures 46 and 47 below, the debt and debt service limit are maintained at relatively stable levels without any major swings. This indicates that the debt levels are not negatively impacting the delivery of programs without compromising revenues for debt service. The debt included in this section contains actual debt and does not incorporate the expected debt that is to be drawn in future.

Figure 46 Debt Limit Usage 2011-2013 (\$ millions)






Figure 47 Debt Service Limit Usage 2011-2013 (\$ millions)



VULNERABILITY

To measure vulnerability of the Municipality's portfolio, two indicators are used: operating government transfers to operating revenues and total government transfers to total revenues: The *operating government transfers to operating revenues ratio* measures how much the Municipality is dependent on provincial and federal transfers relative to the operating revenue generated, and the *total government transfers-to-total revenues ratio* measures the level of provincial and federal grants to support both operating and capital programs at the Municipality.

Figure 48 Vulnerability Indicators 2011-2013



Operating transfers from provincial and federal governments are limited. The bulk of the transfers support community or not-for-profit organizations and the Municipality acts as a distributing agency. Total government transfers are a combination of operating and capital transfers. Most government transfers relate to capital grants.