## Rating Agency Methodology

## February 7, 2022

## Rating Agency

- GRU is rated by the 3 major agencies
- Investors use these ratings reports as a means to judge and compare GRU to other bonds available in the municipal market
- GRU's credit ratings directly relate to the cost of GRU's debt:
- Fixed rate bonds: rates determined once, at pricing
- Variable Rate bonds: cost of the credit facility supporting the variable rate debt increases as GRU's ratings are lowered
- Some reputational risk associated with a rating downgrade
- Ratings analysts do their work throughout the year


## Rating Agency Process

- Three major rating agencies
- FitchRatings
- Standard \& Poor's
- Moody's
- Rating agencies assess publicly held companies (Pepsico) across the globe to include the United States government, counties, cities, utilities...
- These agencies work on behalf of investors and bondholders not the debt issuing entities
- They assess financial \& operational status of debt issuers in order to communicate to prospective investors the relative level of risk associated with a potential investment


## Rating Agency Process

- They accomplish this financial review by analyzing the metrics of a company
- Metrics are financial ratios that serve as measures of quantitative assessment used for assessing, comparing and tracking performance
- In determining ratings, each rating agency uses
- slightly different metrics
- slightly different formulas to calculate these metrics
- applies slightly different weights to these metrics
- Agencies conduct a full review of frequent issuers annually
- Can provide a formal report or just a generic update


## FitchRatings Key Ratings Drivers

| REVENUE DEFENSIBLITY | OPERATING RISK |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Exposure todemand voatility | - Operating cost burden |
| - Flexibility within ratesesting framework | - Operating costflexibility |
| torecover costs of service | - Current \& future capital requirements |



Criteria as of: April 2019

## S \& P Global Ratings



Criteria as of: September, 2018

## Moody's

## RATING METHODOLOGY

Primary Rating Factors

|  |
| :---: |
| Cost Recovery |
| Framework Within |
| Service Territory |
| $25 \%$ |


| Willingness \& Ability |
| :---: |
| to Recover Costs |
| with Sound Financial |
| Metrics |
| $25 \%$ |



| Adjusted Days |  | Adjusted Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liquidity on hand | Debt Ratio | Coverage Ratio |
| $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

## Criteria as of: November 2017

## Rating Agency Process

- Specific analyst (and backup) is assigned to an issuer
- This analyst team conducts reviews, meets virtually and/or on site with GRU management team
- The same analyst team typically rates GRU each time
- The analyst team prepares a rating note which is presented by the lead analyst to the agency's Credit or Rating Committee
- Credit Committee is a group constituted by the rating agency charged with assigning ratings to securities
- Can be "cross sector" - meaning the analyst that works with the City of Gainesville could be in the committee working on GRU's ratings


## Rating Agency Process

- Credit Committee issues rating and rating report
- GRU has an opportunity to comment on the report, comments that the rating agency can take into account or not at their discretion
- Rating report is disseminated to the investment community and GRU at the same time


## Rating Agency Process

- The system is designed to provide independence and critical review
- It is imperative that rating agencies maintain the trust and credibility of their customers in the investment community
- Again, GRU is not their customer

Rating Agency Process


## Current GRU rating

Prior ratings before downgrades


Each agency has downgraded GRU since 2010
5 downgrades over past decade
Lower credit ratings equals increased cost

- Higher cost when issuing debt
- Less refunding / restructuring savings
- Greater counterparty risk
- Collateral posting requirements (use of cash)
- Higher cost for credit facilities (bank loans \& fees)


## Rating Agency Process

- 5 downgrades over the past decade
- Primary factors high leverage and high general fund transfer
- 2012 - restructure to offset bill impacts of PPA for the biomass plant
- 2019 - restructure to offset dis-savings from 2012 restructure, bolster reserves and pay cash for CIS/AMI and DH2 gas conversion


## Rating Agency Process

- Important to maintain ongoing relationships with the rating agencies
- Doctrine of "No Surprises"
- Proactively report significant issues, financial or operational
- Before they become public knowledge if possible
- Builds credibility with analyst and Credit Committee
- Perform quarterly ratio analysis internally to monitor our financial metrics in accordance with the metrics, formulas, and calculations of each agency


## FitchRatings

## September 30, 2021 Pre Audit Review <br> Financial Metrics

## Fitch's rating: A+

## FitchRatings Key Ratings Drivers

| REVENUE DEFENSIBILITY | OPERATING RISK |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Exposure todemand volatiliy | - Operating costburden |
| - Flexibiliy within rate-seting framework | - Operating costflexibility |
| to recover costs of service | - Curent \& future capital requirements |



Fitch's rating: A+

## SUMMARY: FY21 FITCHRATINGS FINANCIAL METRICS

|  | LIQUIDITY |  | LEVERAGE |  |  |  | DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE |  | OTHER FINANCIAL \& OPERATING METRICS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Days Cash <br> On Hand | Liquidity Days On Hand | Debt/FADS | Leverage | Net Debt/Net Capital Assets | Equity/ Capitalization | Debt Service Coverage | Coverage of Full Obligations | Operating Margin | GFT/Operating Revenue | CAPEX/Dep. \& Amortization | Debt Service/ Cash Op. Expense | Retail Electric Rev (cents)/KWH Sold |
| GRU |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FY14 | 226 | 311 | 9.16 | 10.14 | 79.90\% | 19.52\% | 1.88 | 1.55 | 16.17\% | 9.19\% | 67.48\% | 32.71\% | 14.66 |
| FY15 | 219 | 297 | 8.56 | 9.61 | 80.77\% | 19.45\% | 1.90 | 1.62 | 13.97\% | 8.19\% | 67.47\% | 36.51\% | 14.94 |
| FY16 | 228 | 312 | 8.65 | 9.77 | 76.43\% | 20.62\% | 1.83 | 1.55 | 12.41\% | 8.07\% | 77.61\% | 35.64\% | 13.71 |
| FY17 | 235 | 315 | 8.43 | 9.43 | 82.85\% | 21.32\% | 1.69 | 1.42 | 13.86\% | 7.78\% | 66.12\% | 36.55\% | 16.65 |
| FY18 | 58 | 249 | 9.59 | 11.06 | 79.53\% | 19.67\% | 1.89 | 1.51 | 18.29\% | 9.04\% | 874.40\% | 29.21\% | 15.00 |
| FY19 |  |  | 9.46 | 11. | 80.76\% | 18.97\% | 2.05 | 1.66 | 20.83\% | 9.19\% | . $67.28 \%$ | 27.07\% | 14.91 |
| FY20 | $258$ | 1518 | 9.13 | $9.89$ | 81.87\% | 18.90\% | 2.11 | 1.71 | 20.12\% | 9.80\% | - $88.86 \%$ | 28.17\% | 10.35 |
| FY21 | 259 | 496 | - 9.43 | $10.24$ | 83.46\% | 17.74\% | 2.12 | 1.71 | 18.94\% | 9.37\% | 89.47\% | 26.92\% | 9.91 |
| Fitch 20 AA - Median | - 238 | 249 | - | - 5.15 |  | 63.00\% | 2.04 | 1.38 |  | 5.74\% | 153.00\% |  |  |
| Fitch $20 \mathrm{~A}+$ Median | - 171 | - 204 | $\square$ | - 5.96 | - | 49.00\% | 2.17 | 1.59 |  | 5.70\% | 155.00\% |  |  |
| Florida 20 peer group median | 256 | 1256 |  | 14.40 | / | 46.00\% | 1.99 | 1.87 |  | 13.66\% | 115.00\% |  |  |

TAKE AWAY: Liquidity \& coverage metrics have been consistently sound. Leverage and GFT as a \% of operating revenue are high and represent the primary challenge to our rating.

Fitch's rating: A+

## Liquidity <br> Days Cash on Hand <br> Liquidity Days on Hand

| GRU LIQUIDITY METRICS TREND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DAYS CASH ON HAND | LIQUIDITY DAYS ON HAND |
| FY14 | 226 | 311 |
| FY15 | 219 | 297 |
| FY16 | 228 | 312 |
| FY17 | 235 | 315 |
| FY18 | 158 | 249 |
| FY19 | 176 | 407 |
| FY20 | 258 | 518 |
| FY21 | 259 | 496 |

FY17 forward includes UPIF per Fitch updated formula

| SUMMARY OF LIQUIDITY METRICS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GRU FY21 | Fitch FY20 AA- Median | Fitch 20 <br> A+ Median | FY20 <br> Florida Peer Group |
| Days Cash on Hand | 259 | 238 | 171 | 256 |
| Days Liquidity on Hand | 496 | 249 | 204 | 256 |
| Florida peer group = JEA, OUC, Tallahassee and Lakeland |  |  |  |  |

Fitch \& Florida peer group medians per Fitch U.S. Public Power: Peer Review published June 21, 2021

## Liquidity

- Days cash on hand up from 258 days to 259 days
- $\$ 14.6 \mathrm{M}$ increase in unrestricted cash
- Offset to some degree by increase in average daily expense - Fuel expense up \$24.7M
- Days liquidity on hand down from 518 days to 496 days
- Liquidity metrics do not include available but undrawn lines of credit (total \$75M with Truist Bank)
- Take away: GRU liquidity metrics exceed Fitch AA- medians and serve to counter the high leverage metrics


DAYS CASH ON HAND: Unrestricted Cash / Average Daily Operating Expense COMBINED

Unrestricted Cash
Operating cash \& investments
UPIF cash \& investments
Rate Stabilization Fund cash \& investments
= Unrestricted Cash
Average Daily Operating Expense
Total operating expense
Less depreciation \& amortization
Less capital lease payments - GREC
= Operating expense
Divided by 365 or days in FY
= Average Daily Operating Expense
Unrestricted Cash
Divided by Average Daily Operating Expense
= Days Cash on Hand

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $64,756,240$ | $53,539,963$ | $62,635,050$ | $49,488,170$ | $26,793,420$ | $27,505,536$ | $34,499,741$ | $24,583,092$ |
| - | - | - | $35,418,075$ | $14,716,405$ | $27,687,286$ | $51,667,909$ | $66,319,739$ |
| $64,030,121$ | $72,104,746$ | $74,262,078$ | $62,431,906$ | $57,703,806$ | $56,941,703$ | $62,945,910$ | $74,450,555$ |
| $128,786,361$ | $125,644,709$ | $136,897,128$ | $147,338,151$ | $99,213,631$ | $112,134,525$ | $149,113,560$ | $165,353,386$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $340,246,921$ | $366,437,027$ | $379,977,926$ | $396,702,379$ | $328,936,572$ | $329,899,343$ | $311,973,248$ | $331,093,674$ |
| $(84,449,419)$ | $(95,454,204)$ | $(99,343,149)$ | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | $(97,336,684)$ | $(101,046,520)$ | $(100,355,464)$ |
| $(48,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(6,300,000)$ | - | - | - |
| $207,597,502$ | $209,782,823$ | $219,434,777$ | $230,099,667$ | $228,556,439$ | $232,562,659$ | $210,926,728$ | $230,738,210$ |
| 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 |
| 568,760 | 574,747 | 601,191 | 630,410 | 626,182 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |
| $128,786,361$ | $125,644,709$ | $136,897,128$ | $147,338,151$ | $99,213,631$ | $112,134,525$ | $149,113,560$ | $165,353,386$ |
| 568,760 | 574,747 | 601,191 | 630,410 | 626,182 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |
| 226 | 219 | 228 | 234 | 158 | 176 | 258 | 262 |



DAYS LIQUIDITY ON HAND: Unrestricted Cash / Average Daily Operating Expense COMBINED Unrestricted Cash

```
Operating cash \& investments
UPIF cash \& investments
Rate Stabilization Fund cash \& investments
Authorized but Unissued CP/LOC
= Total Liquidity
```

Average Daily Operating Expense
Total operating expense
Less depreciation \& amortization
Less capital lease payments - GREC
= Operating expense
Divided by 365
= Average Daily Operating Expense
Total Liquidity
Divided by Average Daily Operating Expense
= Days Liquidity on Hand

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $64,756,240$ | $53,539,963$ | $62,635,050$ | $49,488,170$ | $26,793,420$ | $27,505,536$ | $34,499,741$ | $24,583,092$ |  |
| - | - | - | $35,418,075$ | $14,716,405$ | $27,687,286$ | $51,667,909$ | $66,319,739$ |  |
| $64,030,121$ | $72,104,746$ | $74,262,078$ | $62,431,906$ | $57,703,806$ | $54,361,703$ | $62,945,910$ | $74,450,555$ |  |
| $48,000,000$ | $45,100,000$ | $50,500,000$ | $51,100,000$ | $57,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ |  |
| $176,786,361$ | $170,744,709$ | $187,397,128$ | $198,438,151$ | $156,213,631$ | $259,554,525$ | $299,113,560$ | $315,353,386$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $340,246,921$ | $366,437,027$ | $379,977,926$ | $396,702,379$ | $328,936,572$ | $329,899,343$ | $311,973,248$ | $331,093,674$ |  |
| $(84,449,419)$ | $(95,454,204)$ | $(99,343,149)$ | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | $(97,336,684)$ | $(101,046,520)$ | $(100,355,464)$ |  |
| $(48,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(61,200,000)$ | $(6,300,000)$ | - | - | - |  |
| $207,597,502$ | $209,782,823$ | $219,434,777$ | $230,099,667$ | $228,556,439$ | $232,562,659$ | $210,926,728$ | $230,738,210$ |  |
| 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 |  |
| 568,760 | 574,747 | 601,191 | 630,410 | 626,182 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |  |
| $176,786,361$ | $170,744,709$ | $187,397,128$ | $198,438,151$ | $156,213,631$ | $259,554,525$ | $299,113,560$ | $315,353,386$ |  |
| 568,760 | 574,747 | 601,191 | 630,410 | 626,182 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |  |
| 311 | 297 | 312 | 315 | 249 | 407 | 518 | 499 |  |

Fitch's rating: A+

## Leverage

## Net Adjusted Debt/Adjusted Funds Available for Debt Service (Leverage) <br> Total Debt/Funds Available for Debt Service Net Debt/Net Capital Assets <br> Equity/Capitalization

| GRU LEVERAGE METRICS TREND |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEBT/FADS | LEVERAGE | NET DEBT/NET CAPITAL ASSETS | EQUITY/CAPITALIZATION |  |
| FY14 | 9.16 | 10.14 | $79.90 \%$ | $19.52 \%$ |  |
| FY15 | 8.56 | 9.61 | $80.77 \%$ | $19.45 \%$ |  |
| FY16 | 8.65 | 9.77 | $76.43 \%$ | $20.62 \%$ |  |
| FY17 | 8.43 | 9.43 | $82.85 \%$ | $21.32 \%$ |  |
| FY18 | 9.59 | 11.06 | $79.53 \%$ | $19.67 \%$ |  |
| FY19 | 9.46 | 11.12 | $80.76 \%$ | $18.97 \%$ |  |
| FY20 | 9.13 | 9.89 | $81.87 \%$ | $18.90 \%$ |  |
| FY21 | 9.43 | 10.24 | $83.46 \%$ | $17.74 \%$ |  |


| SUMMARY OF LEVERAGE METRICS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GRU FY21 | Fitch FY20 <br> AA- Median | Fitch 20 <br> A+ Median | FY20 <br> Florida Peer Group |
| Debt/FADS | 9.43 |  |  |  |
| Leverage | 10.24 | 5.15 | 5.96 | 4.40 |
| Net Debt/Net Capital Assets | 83.46\% |  |  |  |
| Equity/Capitalization | 17.74\% | 63.00\% | 49.00\% | 46.00\% |
| Florida peer group = JEA, OUC, Tallahassee and Lakeland |  |  |  |  |

Fitch \& Florida peer group medians per Fitch U.S. Public Power: Peer Review published June 21, 2021

## Leverage

- All leverage ratios declined slightly from FYE20
- Approximately $\$ 90 \mathrm{M}$ net increase in debt related to Series 2021A bonds
- GRU is too highly leveraged
- leverage ratios are well above Fitch AA- and A+ medians
- High leverage due to 2017 Biomass transaction




NET DEBT/NET CAPITAL ASSETS:Net Debt divided by Net Capital Assets

## Combined

Net Debt
Current Portion of Long-Term Debt Long-Term Debt
Commercial Paper
Unamortized Bond Premium
=Total Debt
Less Operating Cash \& investments
Less RSF Cash \& investments
Less Debt Service Fund Cash \& investments Less Construction Fund Cash \& Investments
= Net Debt
Divided by Net Capital Assets
$=$ Net Debt/Net Capital Assets

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38,308,193 | 39,806,233 | 49,544,781 | 43,275,473 | 27,885,000 | 22,105,000 | 27,090,000 | 25,685,000 |
| 1,846,850,085 | 1,848,753,852 | 1,722,809,071 | 1,775,433,598 | 1,506,455,000 | 1,665,165,000 | 1,637,880,000 | 1,707,955,000 |
| 56,900,000 | 59,500,000 | 45,900,000 | 53,000,000 | 93,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 10,229,836 | 19,078,029 | 17,990,208 | 16,902,387 | 83,758,385 | 102,411,008 | 91,865,654 | 112,666,439 |
| 1,952,288,114 | 1,967,138,114 | 1,836,244,060 | 1,888,611,458 | 1,711,098,385 | 1,789,681,008 | 1,756,835,654 | 1,846,306,439 |
| (64,756,240) | (53,539,963) | $(62,635,050)$ | $(49,488,170)$ | $(26,793,426)$ | $(27,505,536)$ | (34,499,741) | $(24,583,092)$ |
| (64,030,121) | $(72,104,746)$ | $(74,262,078)$ | $(62,431,906)$ | $(57,703,806)$ | $(56,941,703)$ | (62,945,910) | $(74,450,555)$ |
| $(39,682,742)$ | $(40,816,148)$ | (41,714,440) | $(42,322,319)$ | (59,269,274) | $(56,094,239)$ | $(60,083,857)$ | (66,319,739) |
| $(29,034,046)$ | (51,108,130) | (18,258,514) | $(8,828,762)$ | $(35,197,090)$ | $(125,749,489)$ | (67,152,924) | $(125,707,236)$ |
| 1,754,784,965 | 1,749,569,127 | 1,639,373,978 | 1,725,540,301 | 1,532,134,789 | 1,523,390,041 | 1,532,153,222 | 1,555,245,817 |
| 2,196,230,910 | 2,166,088,317 | 2,144,929,363 | 2,082,742,196 | 1,926,451,932 | 1,886,223,139 | 1,871,400,482 | 1,863,541,611 |
| 79.90\% | 80.77\% | 76.43\% | 82.85\% | 79.53\% | 80.76\% | 81.87\% | 83.46\% |



EQUITY / CAPITALIZATION: Net Position/ (Net Position + Total Debt)
Combined Net Position
Total Assets \& Deferred Outflows of Resources Less Total Liabilities
Less Total Deferred Inflows of Resources =Net Position
Total Debt
Current Portion of Long-Term Debt
Long-Term Debt
Commercial Paper
Unamortized Bond Premium
=Total Debt
Equity Capitalization = Net Position/(Net Position + Total Debt)

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,64,550,355 | 2,770,487,010 | 2,73,296,442 | 2,633,316,564 | 2,398,868,717 | 2,537,713,450 | 2,574,515,680 | 2,598,124,459 |
| (2,106,77, 254 ) | $(2,223,666,853)$ | $(2,17,509,800)$ | $(2,116,114,005)$ | $(1,901,027,352)$ | $(2,55,001,816)$ | $(2,09,159,993)$ | $(2,12,207,663)$ |
| (64,117,259) | (71,71,541) | $(79,822,698)$ | $(8,075,386)$ | (78,72,423) | $(55,312,354)$ | $(65,98,473)$ | (77,73,644) |
| 473,659,142 | 475,105,16 | 476,963,944 | 509,126,373 | 419,11,942 | 423,39,280 | 409,73,214 | 398,181,152 |
| 38,30,193 | 39,806,233 | 49,544,781 | 43,275,473 | 27,885,00 | 22,105,000 | 27,090,000 | 25,68,000 |
| 1,846,850,085 | 1,888,75, 855 | 1,722,809,071 | 1,775,433,598 | 1,506,455,000 | 1,665,165,000 | 1,637,880,000 | 1,707,955,00 |
| 56,900,000 | 59,500,000 | 45,900,000 | 53,00,000 | 93,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 10,229,836 | 19,078,029 | 17,990,208 | 16,902,387 | 83,758,385 | 102,411,08 | 91,865,654 | 112,666,439 |
| 1,952,28,114 | 1,967,138,114 | 1,886,444,060 | 1,888,611,458 | 1,711,098,385 | 1,789,681,008 | 1,756,835,654 | 1,846,306,439 |
| 19.52\% | 19.45\% | 20.62\% | 21.23\% | 19.67\% | 19.13\% | 18.90\% | 17.74\% |

## Debt Service Coverage <br> Debt Service Coverage Coverage of Full Obligations

| GRU DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE METRICS TREND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE | COVERAGE OF FULL OBLIGATIONS |
| FY14 | 1.88 | 1.55 |
| FY15 | 1.90 | 1.62 |
| FY16 | 1.83 | 1.55 |
| FY17 | 1.69 | 1.42 |
| FY18 | 1.89 | 1.51 |
| FY19 | 2.05 | 1.66 |
| FY20 | 2.11 | 1.71 |
| FY21 | 2.12 | 1.71 |



Fitch \& Florida peer group medians per Fitch U.S. Public Power: Peer Review published June 21, 2021

## Debt Service Coverage

- FYE21 coverage ratios remained consistent with FYE20 levels
- Coverage levels are "strong" for a utility such as GRU


DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE: Funds Available for Debt Service/Annual Debt Service Combined

Funds Available for Debt Service
Operating Income
Less/Plus Transfers to/from Rate Stabilization
BABS Subsidy
Depreciation \& Amortization
Interest Income
GREC lease payment
= Funds Available for Debt Service
Annual Debt Service
Interest paid (cash flow interest paid + cap lease interest in fuel cost) Interest expense on long-term debt - cash flow statement
Prior year current maturities of debt
Prior year current maturities - capital lease
= Debt Service
Funds Available for Debt Service
Divided by Annual Debt Service
= Debt Service Coverage

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213,230,212 | 229,813,778 | 222,789,472 | 224,050,911 | 178,403,123 | 189,161,567 | 192,415,756 | 195,691,773 |
| 65,647,693 | 59,504,174 | 53,839,881 | 63,838,347 | 73,617,547 | 86,793,557 | 78,596,848 | 77,377,052 |
| 8,867,764 | 7,703,682 | 2,362,847 | $(11,708,349)$ | $(3,839,787)$ | $(4,954,864)$ | 4,578,087 | 11,753,171 |
| 5,350,928 | 5,345,162 | 5,372,529 | 5,308,201 | 5,259,227 | 5,211,950 | 5,154,906 | 5,112,590 |
| 84,449,419 | 95,454,204 | 99,343,149 | 105,402,712 | 94,080,133 | 97,336,684 | 101,046,520 | 100,355,464 |
| 714,408 | 606,556 | 661,066 | - | 2,986,003 | 4,774,240 | 3,039,395 | 1,093,496 |
| 48,200,000 | 61,200,000 | 61,210,000 | 61,210,000 | 6,300,000 | - | - | - |
| 213,230,212 | 229,813,778 | 222,789,472 | 224,050,911 | 178,403,123 | 189,161,567 | 192,415,756 | 195,691,773 |
| 74,089,064 | 82,339,699 | 81,701,113 | 82,992,140 | 51,018,627 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 64,300,121 | 69,209,863 | 66,522,499 |
| 26,845,000 | 21,480,000 | 22,205,000 | 31,135,000 | 24,020,000 | 27,885,000 | 22,105,000 | 25,685,000 |
| 12,700,000 | 16,828,193 | 17,601,233 | 18,409,781 | 19,255,473 | - | - | - |
| 113,634,064 | 120,647,892 | 121,507,346 | 132,536,921 | 94,294,100 | 92,185,121 | 91,314,863 | 92,207,499 |
| 213,230,212 | 229,813,778 | 222,789,472 | 224,050,911 | 178,403,123 | 189,161,567 | 192,415,756 | 195,691,773 |
| 113,634,064 | 120,647,892 | 121,507,346 | 132,536,921 | 94,294,100 | 92,185,121 | 91,314,863 | 92,207,499 |
| 1.88 | 1.90 | 1.83 | 1.69 | 1.89 | 2.05 | 2.11 | 2.12 |

GRU Combined: Coverage of Full Obligations


COVERAGE OF FULL OBLIGATIONS: Adjusted Funds Available for Debt Service/Total Fixed Obligations Combined Adjusted Funds Available for Debt Service

Operating Income
Less/Plus Transfers to/from Rate Stabilization
BABS Subsidy
Depreciation \& Amortization
Interest Income
GREC lease payment
= Funds Available for Debt Service
Add Fitch adjustment for purchased power \& gas
Less GFT
=Adjusted Funds Available for Debt Service
Total Fixed Obligations
Interest paid (cash flow interest paid + cap lease interest in fuel cost)
Interest expense on long-term debt - cash flow statement
Prior year current maturities of debt
Prior year current maturities - capital lease
= Debt Service

+ Purchased power adjustmen
= Total Fixed Obligations
Adjusted Funds Available for Debt Service
Divided by Total Fixed Obligations
= Coverage of Full Obligations

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65,647,693 | 59,504,174 | 53,839,881 | 63,838,347 | 73,617,547 | 86,793,557 | 78,596,848 | 77,377,052 |
| 8,867,764 | 7,703,682 | 2,362,847 | $(11,708,349)$ | $(3,839,787)$ | $(4,954,864)$ | 4,578,087 | 11,753,171 |
| 5,350,928 | 5,345,162 | 5,372,529 | 5,308,201 | 5,259,227 | 5,211,950 | 5,154,906 | 5,112,590 |
| 84,449,419 | 95,454,204 | 99,343,149 | 105,402,712 | 94,080,133 | 97,336,684 | 101,046,520 | 100,355,464 |
| 714,408 | 606,556 | 661,066 | - | 2,986,003 | 4,774,240 | 3,039,395 | 1,093,496 |
| 48,200,000 | 61,200,000 | 61,210,000 | 61,210,000 | 6,300,000 | - | - | - |
| 213,230,212 | 229,813,778 | 222,789,472 | 224,050,911 | 178,403,123 | 189,161,567 | 192,415,756 | 195,691,773 |
| $(37,316,841)$ | $(34,892,425)$ | $(34,994,591)$ | $(35,814,010)$ | $(36,379,080)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,451,000 \\ (38,285,000) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,840,000 \\ (38,285,000) \end{gathered}$ | $(38,285,000)$ |
| 175,913,371 | 194,921,353 | 187,794,881 | 188,236,901 | 142,024,043 | 153,327,567 | 155,970,756 | 157,406,773 |
| 74,089,064 | 82,339,699 | 81,701,113 | 82,992,140 | 51,018,627 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 64,300,221 | 69,209,863 | 66,522,499 |
| 26,845,000 | 21,480,000 | 22,205,000 | 31,135,000 | 24,020,000 | 27,885,000 | 22,105,000 | 25,685,000 |
| 12,700,000 | 16,828,193 | 17,601,233 | 18,409,781 | 19,255,473 | - | - | - |
| 113,634,064 | 120,647,892 | 121,507,346 | 132,536,921 | 94,294,100 | 92,185,221 | 91,314,863 | 92,207,499 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 113,634,064 | 120,647,892 | 121,507,346 | 132,536,921 | 94,294,100 | 92,185,221 | 91,314,863 | 92,207,499 |
| 175,913,371 | 194,921,353 | 187,794,881 | 188,236,901 | 142,024,043 | 153,327,567 | 155,970,756 | 157,406,773 |
| 113,634,064 | 120,647,892 | 121,507,346 | 132,536,921 | 94,294,100 | 92,185,221 | 91,314,863 | 92,207,499 |
| 1.55 | 1.62 | 1.55 | 1.42 | 1.51 | 1.66 | 1.71 | 1.71 |

## Other Financial \& Operating Metrics

> Operating Margin
> GFT/Operating Revenue
> Capex/Depreciation \& Amortization
> Debt Service/Cash Operating Expense
> Retail Electric Revenue/kWH Sold

| OTHER FINANCIAL \& OPERATING METRICS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OPERATING MARGIN $\quad$ GFT/OPE | VS REVENUE | CAPEX/DEPR 'CIA, ON \& AMORT. | DEBT SVC./CASH OPERATING EXP | RETAIL ELECTRIC REV./kWH SOLD |
| FY14 | $16.17 \%$ | \% | 67.48\% | 32.71\% | 14.66 |
| FY15 | 13.97\% | \% | 67.47\% | 36.51\% | 14.94 |
| FY16 | 12.41\% | \% | 77.61\% | 35.64\% | 13.71 |
| FY17 | $13.86 \%$ - | \% | -66.12\% | 36.55\% | 16.65 |
| FY18 | 18.29\% | \% | $2-874.40 \%$ | 29.21\% | 15.00 |
| FY19 | 20.83\% | \% | 67.28\% | 27.07\% | 14.91 |
| FY20 | 20.12\% | \% | 88.86\% | 28.65\% | 10.35 |
| FY21 | 18.94\% | \% | 89.47\% | 26.92\% | 9.91 |
|  |  |  | $1$ |  |  |
|  | SUMMARY OF OTHER FINANCIAL \& OPERATING METRICS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | GRU FY21 | Fitch FY20 AA- Median | Fitch 20 <br> A+ Median <br> Florida P | er Group |
|  | Operating Margin | 18.94\% |  |  |  |
|  | GFT/Total Operating Revenue | 9.37\% | 5.74\% | 5.70\% 13.6 |  |
|  | Capex/Dep. \& Amort. | 89.47\% | 153.00\% | 155.00\% 115. |  |
|  | Debt Svc/Cash Operating Exp. | 26.92\% |  |  |  |
|  | Electric Rev./KWH Sold | 9.91 |  |  |  |
|  | Florida peer group = JEA, OUC, Tallahassee and Lakeland |  |  |  |  |

Fitch \& Florida peer group medians per Fitch U.S. Public Power: Peer Review published June 21, 2021

## Other Financial \& Operating Metrics

- Operating margin decreased from 20.12\% to 18.94\%
- GFT as a \% of operating revenue fell from $9.80 \%$ to $9.37 \%$
- Debt service expense as a \% of operating expense fell from 28.65\% to 26.92\%
- Generally, CAPEX is below peer utilities


|  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OPERATING MARGIN: OpertingIncome/Operating Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMBINED | Operating Income | 65,67,693 | 59,504,174 | 53,83, 881 | 63,838,347 | 73,617,547 | 86,793,55 | 78,596,848 | 77,377,052 |
|  | Divided by Operating revenue | 405,894,614 | 425,941,201 | 433,817,807 | 460,540,726 | 402,554,119 | 416,692,900 | 390,570,096 | 408,470,726 |
|  | = Operating Margin | 16.17\% | 13.97\% | 12.41\% | 13.86\% | 18.29\% | 20.83\% | 20.12\% | 18.94\% |

Operating Revenue does not account for debt service


## TRANSFERSAS A\%OFTOTALOPPRATING REVENE:GFT divided by yotal operating revenue

Combined GFT
Divided by Yotal Operating Revenue
=GFT as $\%$ \% of Total OperatingRevenue

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 202 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37,316,841 | 34,892,225 | 34,994,591 | 35,814,010 | 36,37,080 | 38,285,00 | 38,885,00 | 38,28, 000 |
| 405,894,614 | 425,941,201 | 433,817,807 | 460,540,726 | 402,54,119 | 416,692,90 | 300,570,06 | 408,470,726 |
| 9.19\% | 8.19\% | 8.07\% | 7.78\% | 9.0\% | 9.19\% | 9.80\% | 9.37\% |

Biomass Transaction

 Combined Capital expense

Divided dy Deprecaition \& Amotization
$=$ CAPEX to \& \& A

| 204 | 2015 | 2016 | 2018 | 2019 | 200 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56,900,40 | 64,40,846 | 7,099,95 | 822,636,97 | 65,48,418 | 89,78,174 | 99,7927,36 |
| 84,499419 | 95,54, 204 | 99,34, 149 | 94,400,133 | 97,36,684 | 101006,50 | 100,555,64 |
| 61.8\% | 6.7.7\% | 7.61\% | 87,40\% | 6.72\% | 8888\% | 99.44\% |




|  | 20.4 | 20.5 | 2016 | 2017 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 200 | 202 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eletric GPV | 14.66 | 1494 | 13.71 | 16.65 | 15.0 | 14.91 | 10.35 |  | 9019 |

S\&P's rating: A

## S \& P Global Ratings

## September 30, 2021 Pre Audit Review

Financial Metrics

## S\&P's rating: A

## S \& P Global Ratings

## Financial Profile Assessment



## S\&P’s rating: A



TAKE AWAY: Liquidity and coverage metrics are extremely strong. High debt to capitalization ratio puts GRU in the vulerable range for leverage.

## Liquidity

## Days Cash on Hand Total Days Liquidity

| GRU LIQUIDITY METRICS TREND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL DAYS LIQUIDITY | AVAILABLE RESERVES |
| FY15 | 304 | $225,767,910$ |
| FY16 | 320 | $246,189,210$ |
| FY17 | 249 | $198,438,151$ |
| FY18 | 282 | $181,213,637$ |
| FY19 | 451 | $287,134,525$ |
| FY20 | 647 | $374,113,560$ |
| FY21 | 615 | $388,753,386$ |


| SUMMARY OF LIQUIDITY \& RESERVE METRICS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Days Liquidity |  |  | Available Reserves |  |  |
| S\&P Class |  | GRU 9/30/21 | S\&P Cla | cation | GRU 9/30/21 |
| Extremely Strong | = > 270 | 615 | Extremely Strong | = > \$250M | \$388.8M |
| Very Strong | 150-270 |  | Very Strong | \$100M - \$250 |  |
| Strong | 90-150 |  | Strong | \$50M - \$100 |  |
| Adequate | 45-90 |  | Adequate | \$10M - \$50M |  |
| Vulnerable | 15-45 |  | Vulnerable | \$2M - \$10M |  |
| Highly Vulnerable | < $=15$ |  | Highly Vulnerable | < \$2M |  |

S\&P's rating: A

## Liquidity

- Available reserves up \$14.6M from FY20
- Combined operating \& RSF approximately the same
- UPIF cash \& investments up \$14.6M
- Lines of credit and authorized but unissued commercial paper remained the same
- Total days liquidity fell from 647 days to 615 days
- Increase in available reserves outweighed by increase in average daily expense ( $\$ 24.7 \mathrm{M}$ increase in fuel expense compared to FY20)
- These levels place GRU in S\&P's "extremely strong" classification for both of these measures
- Incredibly important to maintain as this partially offsets GRU's high leverage

Available Reserves


## Available Reserves

Operting Cash \& Investments
Rate Stabilization Fund Cash \& investments UPIF Cash \& Investments

Undrawn Letter Of Credit - SunTrust
Authorized but Unissued Commercial Paper
= Available Reserves

| FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $53,539,963$ | $62,635,050$ | $49,488,170$ | $26,793,426$ | $27,505,536$ | $34,499,741$ | $24,866,712$ |
| $72,104,746$ | $74,262,078$ | $62,431,906$ | $57,703,806$ | $56,941,703$ | $62,945,910$ | $72,566,935$ |
| $55,023,201$ | $58,792,082$ | $35,418,075$ | $14,716,405$ | $27,687,286$ | $51,667,909$ | $66,319,739$ |
| - | - | - | $25,000,000$ | $25,000,000$ | $75,000,000$ | $75,000,000$ |
| $45,100,000$ | $50,500,000$ | $51,100,000$ | $57,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ | $150,000,000$ |
| $225,767,910$ | $246,189,210$ | $198,438,151$ | $181,213,637$ | $287,134,525$ | $374,113,560$ | $388,753,386$ |



Total Days Liquidity
Operating Expenses
Less Depreciation \& Amortization
= Adjusted Operating Expense
Divided by 365
=Average Daily Expense
Available Reserves
Divided by Average Daily Expense
= Days Liquidity on Hand

| FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $366,437,027$ | $379,977,926$ | $396,702,379$ | $328,936,572$ | $329,899,343$ | $311,973,248$ | $331,093,674$ |
| $(95,454,204)$ | $(99,343,149)$ | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | $(97,336,684)$ | $(101,046,520)$ | $(100,355,464)$ |
| $270,982,823$ | $280,634,777$ | $291,299,667$ | $234,856,439$ | $232,562,659$ | $210,926,728$ | $230,738,210$ |
| 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 |
| 742,419 | 768,862 | 798,081 | 643,442 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |
| $225,767,910$ | $246,189,210$ | $198,438,151$ | $181,213,637$ | $287,134,525$ | $374,113,560$ | $388,753,386$ |
| 742,419 | 768,862 | 798,081 | 643,442 | 637,158 | 577,881 | 632,159 |
| 304 | 320 | 249 | 282 | 451 | 647 | 615 |

S\&P's rating: A

## Coverage

## Fixed Charge Coverage

Fixed Charge Coverage Net of Transfers to and from RSF Debt Service Coverage

| GRU COVERAGE METRICS TREND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FIXED CHARGE COVERAGE | FIXED CHARGE COVERAGE NET OF RSF | DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE |
| FY16 | 1.27 | 1.29 | 2.16 |
| FY17 | 1.31 | 1.23 | 2.29 |
| FY18 | 1.59 | 1.55 | 2.10 |
| FY19 | 1.53 | 1.47 | 1.95 |
| FY20 | 1.66 | 1.71 | 2.15 |
| FY21 | 1.60 | 1.73 | 2.10 |


|  |  | SUMMARY OF COVERAGE METRICS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FIXED CHARGE COVERAGE | FIXED CHARGE COVERAGE NET OF RSF |

## Coverage

- Slight changes in coverage ratios between FYE20 and FYE21
- Fixed Charge Coverage fell from 1.66 to 1.60
- Fixed Charge Coverage Net of Transfers to/from RSF rose from 1.71 to 1.73
- Debt Service Coverage fell from 2.15 to 2.10
- The Fixed Charge Coverage ratio and Fixed Charge Coverage Net of Transfers to/from RSF ratio puts us in the "extremely strong" category



## Fixed Cost \& Imputed Charge Coverage, Net of RSF Transfers



Fixed Cost \& Imputed Charge Coverage, Net of Transfers from RSF Total Operating Revenue
Less Transfers from RSF
Less Amounts to be Recovered from Future Revenue nterest Income
Other Non Operating Income - Cash Only (BABS, Other) = Total Revenue Net of RSF Transfers
Total Operating Expense
Less Depreciation \& Amortization
= Operating Expense Net of Depreciation
Total Revenue Net of RSF Transfers

|  | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 433,817,807 | 460,540,726 | 402,554,119 | 416,692,900 | 390,570,096 | 408,470,726 |
|  | 2,662,847 | $(11,708,349)$ | $(3,839,787)$ | $(4,954,864)$ | 4,578,087 | 11,753,171 |
|  | $(33,560,292)$ | $(33,560,292)$ | $(3,449,252)$ | $(18,071,378)$ | $(5,479,529)$ | $(5,350,573)$ |
|  | 661,066 | 2,798,693 | 2,986,003 | 4,774,240 | 3,039,395 | 1,093,496 |
|  | 15,466,000 | 5,308,201 | 5,259,227 | 5,211,950 | 5,154,906 | 5,112,590 |
|  | 419,047,428 | 423,378,979 | 403,510,310 | 403,652,848 | 397,862,955 | 421,079,410 |
|  | 379,977,926 | 396,702,379 | 328,936,572 | 329,899,343 | 311,973,248 | 331,093,674 |
|  | $(98,984,763)$ | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | $(97,336,684)$ | $(101,046,520)$ | $(100,355,464)$ |
|  | 280,993,163 | 291,299,667 | 234,856,439 | 232,562,659 | 210,926,728 | 230,738,210 |
|  | 419,047,428 | 423,378,979 | 403,510,310 | 403,652,848 | 397,862,955 | 421,079,410 |
|  | $(280,993,163)$ | $(291,299,667)$ | $(234,856,439)$ | $(232,562,659)$ | $(210,926,728)$ | $(230,738,210)$ |
| nsfers | 138,054,265 | 132,079,312 | 168,653,871 | 171,090,189 | 186,936,227 | 190,341,200 |
|  | $(34,994,591)$ | $(35,814,010)$ | $(36,379,080)$ | $(38,285,001)$ | $(38,285,000)$ | $(38,285,000)$ |
|  | 103,059,674 | 96,265,302 | 132,274,791 | 132,805,188 | 148,651,227 | 152,056,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5,820,513 | 6,661,020 |
|  | 76,608,000 | 84,402,000 | 9,223,000 | - | - | - |
| of RSF | 179,667,674 | 180,667,302 | 141,497,791 | 132,805,188 | 154,471,740 | 158,717,220 |
|  | 22,205,000 | 23,135,000 | 24,020,000 | 27,885,000 | 22,105,000 | 27,090,000 |
| nt | 40,463,217 | 39,714,579 | 58,034,716 | 62,247,527 | 62,588,476 | 57,906,796 |
|  | 62,668,217 | 62,849,579 | 82,054,716 | 90,132,527 | 84,693,476 | 84,996,796 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5,820,513 | 6,661,020 |
|  | 76,608,000 | 84,402,000 | 9,223,000 | - | - | - |
|  | 139,276,217 | 147,251,579 | 91,277,716 | 90,132,527 | 90,513,989 | 91,657,816 |
|  | 179,667,674 | 180,667,302 | 141,497,791 | 132,805,188 | 154,471,740 | 158,717,220 |
|  | 139,276,217 | 147,251,579 | 91,277,716 | 90,132,527 | 90,513,989 | 91,657,816 |
|  | 1.29 | 1.23 | 1.55 | 1.47 | 1.71 | 1.73 |



## Debt \& Liabilities

## Debt to Capitalization

| GRU DEBT \& LIABILITIES METRICS TREND |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DEBT TO CAPITALIZATION \% |
| FY15 | 80.39 |
| FY16 | 79.22 |
| FY17 | 81.09 |
| FY18 | 79.52 |
| FY19 | 79.78 |
| FY20 | 80.26 |
| FY21 | 81.32 |


| SUMMARY OF DEBT \& LIABILITIES METRICS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | to Capitalization \% |
| S\&P Classification |  | GRU 9/30/21 |
| Extremely Strong | < = 50 |  |
| Very Strong | 50-60 |  |
| Strong | 60-70 |  |
| Adequate | 70-80 |  |
| Vulnerable | 80-90 | 81.32 |
| Highly Vulnerable | $=>90$ |  |

S\&P's rating: A

## Debt to Capitalization

- S \& P's measure of leverage
- Ratio has been relatively steady over the past six years between $79 \%$ and $81 \%$
- FYE21 ratio of 81.32\% places us in S \& P's "vulnerable" range


Debt to Capitalization
Revenue Bonds - Current
Capital Lease - Current
Commercial Paper - Current
Revenue Bonds - Long Term
Capital Lease - Long term
Commercial Paper - Long term
Total Debt

+ Net Position
= Total Capitalization
Total Debt
Divided by Total Capitalization
= Debt to Capitalization Ratio

| FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $22,205,000$ | $17,535,000$ | $18,120,000$ | $27,885,000$ | $22,105,000$ | $27,090,000$ | $25,685,000$ |
| $17,601,233$ | $18,409,781$ | $19,255,473$ | - | - | - | - |
| - | $13,600,000$ | $5,900,000$ | - | - | - | - |
| $889,075,000$ | $781,540,000$ | $853,420,000$ | $1,506,455,000$ | $1,665,165,000$ | $1,637,880,000$ | $1,707,955,000$ |
| $959,678,852$ | $941,269,071$ | $922,013,598$ | - | - | - | - |
| $59,500,000$ | $45,900,000$ | $53,000,000$ | $93,000,000$ | - | - | - |
| $1,948,060,085$ | $1,818,253,852$ | $1,871,709,071$ | $1,627,340,000$ | $1,687,270,000$ | $1,664,970,000$ | $1,733,640,000$ |
| $475,105,616$ | $476,963,944$ | $436,496,373$ | $419,118,942$ | $423,399,280$ | $409,373,214$ | $398,181,152$ |
| $2,423,165,701$ | $2,295,217,796$ | $2,308,205,444$ | $2,046,458,942$ | $2,110,669,280$ | $2,074,343,214$ | $2,131,821,152$ |
| $1,948,060,085$ | $1,818,253,852$ | $1,871,709,071$ | $1,627,340,000$ | $1,687,270,000$ | $1,664,970,000$ | $1,733,640,000$ |
| $2,423,165,701$ | $2,295,217,796$ | $2,308,205,444$ | $2,046,458,942$ | $2,110,669,280$ | $2,074,343,214$ | $2,131,821,152$ |
| $80.39 \%$ | $79.22 \%$ | $81.09 \%$ | $79.52 \%$ | $79.94 \%$ | $80.26 \%$ | $81.32 \%$ |

Moody's rating: Aa3

## Moody's Investor Service

## September 30, 2021 Pre Audit Review

Financial Metrics

## Moody's rating: Aa3

## MOODY'S RATING METHODOLOGY

Primary Rating Factors

| Cost Recovery Framework Within Service Territory 25\% | Willingness \& Ability <br> to Recover Costs <br> with Sound Financial <br> Metrics <br> 25\% | Generation \& Power <br> Procurement Risk <br> Exposure <br> 10\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Adjusted Days |  | Adjusted Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liquidity on hand | Debt Ratio | Coverage Ratio |
| $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

## Moody's rating: Aa3

SUMMARY : MOODY'S FINANCIAL METRICS FY21

|  | LIQUIDITY |  | LEVERAGE | COVERAGE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Days Cash On Hand | Adjusted Days Liquidity on Hand | Debt Ratio | Fixed Obligation Charge Coverage | Debt Service Coverage Senior Lien Debt | Debt Service Coverage Total Debt | Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Senior Lien Debt | Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Total Debt |
| GRU |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FY12 | 182 | 267 | 69.5\% | 1.64 | 2.35 | 2.14 | 1.80 | 1.64 |
| FY13 | 196 | 278 | 68.6\% | 1.55 | 2.52 | 2.08 | 1.88 | 1.55 |
| FY14 | 196 | 264 | 79.5\% | 1.54 | 2.39 | 2.18 | 1.69 | 1.54 |
| FY15 | 182 | 242 | 79.4\% | 1.62 | 2.48 | 2.23 | 1.81 | 1.62 |
| FY16 | 192 | 259 | 78.6\% | 1.71 | 2.52 | 2.27 | 1.90 | 1.71 |
| FY17 | 162 | 230 | 80.7\% | 1.95 | 2.50 | 2.24 | 2.18 | 1.95 |
| FY18 | 146 | 235 | 74.6\% | 1.49 | 1.88 | 1.86 | 1.51 | 1.49 |
| FY19 | 150 | 395 | 74.9\% | 1.77 | 1.89 | 1.87 | 1.79 | 1.77 |
| FY20 | 178 | 429 | 75.1\% | 1.39 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 1.39 | 1.39 |
| FY21 | 167 |  | 76.1\% | 1.55 | 1.94 | 1.94 | 1.55 | 1.55 |
| Moody's categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's Aaa |  | $>250$ | <35\% | $>2.5$ |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's Aa |  | 150-250 | 35\%-60\% | 2.0-2.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's A |  | 90-150 | 60\% - 75\% | 1.5-2.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's Baa |  | 30-90 | 75\% - 90\% | 1.1-1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's Ba |  | 15-30 | 50\% $-06 \%$ | $1.0-1.1$ |  |  |  |  |
| Moody's B |  | <15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TAKE AWAY: Strong liquidity ratios \& solid coverage ratios. High leverage places GRU in Moody's Baa classification for this metric.

Moody's rating: Aa3

## Liquidity

## Adjusted Days Liquidity on Hand Days Cash on Hand

| GRU LIQUIDITY METRICS TREND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ADJUSTED DAYS <br> LIQUIDITY ON HAND | DAYS CASH ON HAND |
| FY12 | 267 | 182 |
| FY13 | 278 | 196 |
| FY14 | 264 | 196 |
| FY15 | 242 | 182 |
| FY16 | 259 | 192 |
| FY17 | 230 | 162 |
| FY18 | 235 | 146 |
| FY19 | 395 | 150 |
| FY20 | 429 | 178 |
| FY21 | 405 | 167 |


| SUMMARY OF LIQUIDITY METRICS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moody's Aaa | Moody's Aa | Moody's A | Moody's Baa | Moody's Ba | Moody's B | GRU FY21 |
| Adjusted Days Liquidity on Hand Days Cash on Hand | $>250$ | 150-250 | 90-150 | 30-90 | 15-30 | <15 | $\begin{aligned} & 405 \\ & 167 \end{aligned}$ |

1

## Liquidity

- Liquidity metrics declined from FYE20
- Adjusted Days Liquidity on Hand from 429 days to 405 days
- Days Cash on Hand from 178 days to 167 days
- Unrestricted cash approximately the same
- Moody's definition = operating cash, RSF \& utility deposits
- Average daily expense up $\$ 36,000$
- Fuel expense up \$24.7M
- Moody's liquidity metrics do not include authorized but undrawn lines of credit (total \$75M with Truist Bank)



## Adjusted Days Liquidity on Hand

Operating Cash
Utility Deposits
Rate Stabilization Fund Cash
=Unrestricted Cash
Plus Authorized but Unissued Commercial Paper
= Total Liquidity
Operating Expense
Less Depreciation \& Amortization
Plus Moody's Pension Adjustment
=Adjusted Expense
Divided by 365
$=$ Average Daily Expense
Total Liquidity
Divided by Average Daily Expense
= Days Liquidity on Hand

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32,464,543 | 50,725,104 | 64,756,240 | 53,539,963 | 62,635,050 | 49,488,170 | 26,793,426 | 27,505,536 | 34,499,741 | 24,866,712 |
| 8,067,395 | 8,314,035 | 8,322,368 | 9,256,442 | 9,891,380 | 9,998,718 | 9,078,180 | 7,663,091 | 8,481,812 | 8,411,696 |
| 62,735,370 | 56,154,695 | 64,030,121 | 72,104,746 | 74,262,078 | 62,431,906 | 57,703,806 | 56,941,703 | 62,945,910 | 72,566,935 |
| 103,267,308 | 115,193,834 | 137,108,729 | 134,901,151 | 146,788,508 | 121,918,794 | 93,575,412 | 92,110,330 | 105,927,463 | 105,845,343 |
| 48,000,000 | 48,000,000 | 48,000,000 | 45,100,000 | 50,500,000 | 51,100,000 | 57,000,000 | 150,000,000 | 150,000,000 | 150,000,000 |
| 151,267,308 | 163,193,834 | 185,108,729 | 180,001,151 | 197,288,508 | 173,018,794 | 150,575,412 | 242,110,330 | 255,927,463 | 255,845,343 |
| 262,522,653 | 273,601,369 | 340,246,921 | 366,437,027 | 379,977,926 | 396,702,379 | 328,936,572 | 329,899,343 | 311,973,248 | 331,093,674 |
| $(55,382,057)$ | $(59,135,363)$ | $(84,449,419)$ | $(95,454,204)$ | $(99,343,149)$ | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | $(97,336,684)$ | (101,046,520) | $(100,355,464)$ |
| - | - | - | - | $(2,228,000)$ | $(17,026,000)$ | $(980,439)$ | $(8,816,659)$ | 6,657,000 | - |
| 207,140,596 | 214,466,006 | 255,797,502 | 270,982,823 | 278,406,777 | 274,273,667 | 233,876,000 | 223,746,000 | 217,583,728 | 230,738,210 |
| 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 |
| 567,508.48 | 587,578.10 | 700,815.07 | 742,418.69 | 762,758.29 | 751,434.70 | 640,756.16 | 613,002.74 | 596,119.80 | 632,159.48 |
| 151,267,308 | 163,193,834 | 185,108,729 | 180,001,151 | 197,288,508 | 173,018,794 | 150,575,412 | 242,110,330 | 255,927,463 | 255,845,343 |
| 567,508.48 | 587,578.10 | 700,815.07 | 742,418.69 | 762,758.29 | 751,434.70 | 640,757.37 | 613,002.74 | 596,119.80 | 632,159.48 |
| 267 | 278 | 264 | 242 | 259 | 230 | 235 | 395 | 429 | 405 |

Total Days Cash on Hand


## Total Days Cash on Hand

Operating Cash
Utility Deposits
Rate Stabilization Fund Cash
= Unrestricted Cash
Operating Expense
Less Depreciation \& Amortization
Plus Moody's Pension Adjustment
= Adjusted Expense
Divided by 365
= Average Daily Expense
Unrestricted Cash
Divided by Average Daily Expense
= Days Cash on Hand

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32,464,543 | 50,725,104 | 64,756,240 | 53,539,963 | 62,635,050 | 49,488,170 | 26,793,426 | 27,505,536 | 34,499,741 | 24,866,712 |
| 8,067,395 | 8,314,035 | 8,322,368 | 9,256,442 | 9,891,380 | 9,998,718 | 9,078,180 | 7,663,091 | 8,481,812 | 8,411,696 |
| 62,735,370 | 56,154,695 | 64,030,121 | 72,104,746 | 74,262,078 | 62,431,906 | 57,703,806 | 56,941,703 | 62,945,910 | 72,566,935 |
| 103,267,308 | 115,193,834 | 137,108,729 | 134,901,151 | 146,788,508 | 121,918,794 | 93,575,412 | 92,110,330 | 105,927,463 | 105,845,343 |
| 262,522,653 | 273,601,369 | 340,246,921 | 366,437,027 | 379,977,926 | 396,702,379 | 328,936,572 | 329,899,343 | 311,973,248 | 331,093,674 |
| $(55,382,057)$ | $(59,135,363)$ | $(84,449,419)$ | (95,454,204) | (99,343,149) | $(105,402,712)$ | $(94,080,133)$ | (97,336,684) | $(101,046,520)$ | $(100,355,464)$ |
| - | - | - | - | $(2,228,000)$ | $(17,026,000)$ | $(980,439)$ | $(8,816,659)$ | 6,657,000 | - |
| 207,140,596 | 214,466,006 | 255,797,502 | 270,982,823 | 278,406,777 | 274,273,667 | 233,876,000 | 223,746,000 | 217,583,728 | 230,738,210 |
| 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365.0 |
| 567,508.48 | 587,578.10 | 700,815.07 | 742,418.69 | 762,758.29 | 751,434.70 | 640,756.16 | 613,002.74 | 596,119.80 | 632,159.48 |
| 103,267,308 | 115,193,834 | 137,108,729 | 134,901,151 | 146,788,508 | 121,918,794 | 93,575,412 | 92,110,330 | 105,927,463 | 105,845,343 |
| 567,508 | 587,578 | 700,815 | 742,419 | 762,758 | 751,434.70 | 640,756 | 613,002.74 | 596,119.80 | 632,159.48 |
| 182 | 196 | 196 | 182 | 192 | 162 | 146 | 150 | 178 | 167 |

Moody's rating: Aa3

## Leverage

## Debt Ratio

| GRU LEVERAGE METRICS TREND |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DEBT RATIO |
| FY12 | $69.5 \%$ |
| FY13 | $68.6 \%$ |
| FY14 | $79.5 \%$ |
| FY15 | $79.4 \%$ |
| FY16 | $78.6 \%$ |
| FY17 | $80.7 \%$ |
| FY18 | $74.6 \%$ |
| FY19 | $74.9 \%$ |
| FY20 | $75.1 \%$ |
| FY21 | $76.1 \%$ |



Moody's rating: Aa3

## Leverage

- Debt ratio, which under the Moody's formula is debt as a percentage of fixed assets net of depreciation plus net working capital, has remained relatively constant over the past several years
- FY19
- FY20
74.9\%
- FY21
75.1\%
76.1\%
- This $76.1 \%$ ratio places us in Moody's Baa category



## Total Debt

Less Debt Service Funds
Less Interest Payable
= Debt
Fixed Assets Net of Depreciation(Net Capital Assets)
Plus Net Working Capital
= Adjusted Assets
Debt
Divided by Adjusted Assets
= Debt Ratio

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,006,694,998 | 974,795,000 | 1,942,058,278 | 1,948,060,085 | 1,908,253,852 | 1,871,709,071 | 1,627,340,000 | 1,687,270,000 | 1,664,970,000 | 1,733,640,000 |
| $(52,496,078)$ | $(45,852,407)$ | $(39,682,742)$ | $(40,816,148)$ | $(41,714,440)$ | $(42,322,319)$ | $(59,269,274)$ | $(56,094,239)$ | $(60,083,857)$ | $(58,412,082)$ |
| - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 954,198,920 | 928,942,593 | 1,902,375,536 | 1,907,243,937 | 1,866,539,412 | 1,829,386,752 | 1,568,070,726 | 1,631,175,761 | 1,604,886,143 | 1,675,227,918 |
| 1,202,100,960 | 1,207,642,644 | 2,196,230,910 | 2,166,088,317 | 2,144,929,363 | 2,082,742,196 | 1,926,451,932 | 1,886,223,139 | 1,871,400,482 | 1,863,541,611 |
| 171,727,000 | 146,187,000 | 196,658,000 | 234,559,000 | 229,806,000 | 184,217,000 | 176,022,000 | 291,048,374 | 264,446,468 | 337,262,766 |
| 1,373,827,960 | 1,353,829,644 | 2,392,888,910 | 2,400,647,317 | 2,374,735,363 | 2,266,959,196 | 2,102,473,932 | 2,177,271,513 | 2,135,846,950 | 2,200,804,377 |
| 954,198,920 | 928,942,593 | 1,902,375,536 | 1,907,243,937 | 1,866,539,412 | 1,829,386,752 | 1,568,070,726 | 1,631,175,761 | 1,604,886,143 | 1,675,227,918 |
| 1,373,827,960 | 1,353,829,644 | 2,392,888,910 | 2,400,647,317 | 2,374,735,363 | 2,266,959,196 | 2,102,473,932 | 2,177,271,513 | 2,135,846,950 | 2,200,804,377 |
| 69.5\% | 68.6\% | 79.5\% | 79.4\% | 78.6\% | 80.7\% | 74.6\% | 74.9\% | 75.1\% | 76.1\% |

## Coverage Metrics

## Fixed Obligation Charge Coverage

 Debt Service Coverage - Senior Lien Debt Service Coverage - Total Debt
## Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Senior Lien <br> Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Total Debt



Moody's rating: Aa3

## Coverage Metrics

- All five of our Moody's coverage ratios have improved between FYE20 and FYE21, driven largely by lower actual debt service expense per Moody's debt service formula in FY21 vs FY20
- FY21 actual debt service approximately $\$ 4.5 \mathrm{M}$ less than FY20, driven by decline in interest rates on variable rate debt. For FY21 vs FY20
- Principal down \$1.8M
- Interest down \$5.7M
- Net swap payments up \$3.0M



## Fixed Obligation Charge Coverage

Total Operating Revenues
Less Amount to be Recovered
Less GFT
Plus BABS Rebate
Interest income
Plus Other Income (Expense)
= Gross Revenues \& Income
Less Total Operating Expenses Net of Dep. \& Amort.
Plus Moody's Pension Adjustment
= Funds Available to Meet Fixed Obligations
Divided by Total Debt Service
= Fixed Obligation Charge Coverage

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 348,857,506 | 348,776,253 | 405,894,614 | 425,941,201 | 433,817,807 | 460,540,726 | 402,554,119 | 416,692,900 | 390,570,096 | 408,460,726 |
| - |  | $(26,433,241)$ | $(33,560,292)$ | $(33,560,292)$ | (33,560,292) |  |  |  |  |
| $(36,004,958)$ | $(36,656,458)$ | $(37,316,841)$ | $(34,892,425)$ | $(34,994,591)$ | (35,814,010) | $(36,379,080)$ | $(38,285,001)$ | $(38,285,000)$ | $(38,285,000)$ |
| 5,766,086 | 5,515,262 | 5,350,928 | 5,345,162 | 5,372,529 | 5,308,201 | 5,259,227 | 5,211,950 | 5,154,906 | 5,112,590 |
| 3,184,630 | 2,117,935 | 924,180 | 8,290,546 | 13,987,579 | (82,960) | $(3,030,651)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,440,000 \\ & (9,029,009) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,894,000 \\ (7,582,534) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,093,496 \\ (2,792,815) \end{gathered}$ |
| 321,803,264 | 319,752,992 | 348,419,640 | 371,124,192 | 384,623,032 | 396,391,665 | 368,403,615 | 385,030,840 | 351,751,468 | 373,588,997 |
| $(207,140,596)$ | $(214,466,006)$ | (255,797,502) | $(270,982,823)$ | $(280,634,777)$ | $(291,299,667)$ | $(234,856,439)$ | $(232,562,659)$ | (210,926,728) | (230,738,210) |
| - | - | - | - | 2,228,000 | 17,026,000 | 980,439 | 8,817,000 | $(6,657,000)$ | - |
| 114,662,668 | 105,286,986 | 92,622,138 | 100,141,369 | 106,216,255 | 122,117,998 | 134,527,615 | 161,285,181 | 134,167,740 | 142,850,787 |
| 69,793,875 | 67,889,965 | 60,042,322 | 61,638,072 | 62,027,441 | 62,571,817 | 90,095,336 | 91,095,669 | 96,710,070 | 92,312,499 |
| 1.64 | 1.55 | 1.54 | 1.62 | 1.71 | 1.95 | 1.49 | 1.77 | 1.39 | 1.55 |



| DebtService Coverage-Senior Lien Debt | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Revenue in Accordance with Bond Resolution (F/S) | 149,549,879 | 141,497,780 | 130,842,529 | 137,657,063 | 140,800,171 | 140,243,923 | 167,594,969 | 170,665,082 | 178,852,341 | 178,950,973 |
| Senior Lien Debt Service | 63,75,940 | 56,101,372 | 54,860,40 | 55,461,104 | 55,82, 582 | 55,98,,96 | 89,235,841 | 90,191,176 | 96,710,070 | 92,312,499 |
| DebtService Coverage - Senior Lien Debt | 2.35 | 2.52 | 2.39 | 2.48 | 2.52 | 2.50 | 1.88 | 1.89 | 1.85 | 1.94 |




Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Senior Lien Debt
Total Operating Revenues
Less Amount to be Recovered
Less GFT
Plus BABS Rebate
Interest income
Plus Other Income (Expense)
= Gross Revenues \& Income
Less Total Operating Expenses Net of Dep. \& Amort
Plus Moody's Pension Adjustment

## = Net Revenues

Divided by Senior Lien Debt Service
= Adjusted Debt Service Coverage - Senior Lien Debt

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 348,857,506 | 348,776,253 | 405,894,614 | 425,941,201 | 433,817,807 | 460,540,726 | 402,554,119 | 416,692,900 | 390,570,096 | 408,460,726 |
|  |  | $(26,433,241)$ | (33,560,292) | $(33,560,292)$ | $(33,560,292)$ |  |  |  |  |
| $(36,004,958)$ | $(36,656,458)$ | $(37,316,841)$ | $(34,892,425)$ | $(34,994,591)$ | ( $35,814,010$ ) | $(36,379,080)$ | $(38,285,001)$ | $(38,285,000)$ | $(38,285,000)$ |
| 5,766,086 | 5,515,262 | 5,350,928 | 5,345,162 | 5,372,529 | 5,308,201 | 5,259,227 | 5,211,950 | 5,154,906 | 5,112,590 |
| 3,184,630 | 2,117,935 | 924,180 | 8,290,546 | 13,987,579 | $(82,960)$ | $(3,030,651)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,440,000 \\ & (9,029,009) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,894,000 \\ (7,582,534) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,093,496 \\ (2,792,815) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 321,803,264 | 319,752,992 | 348,419,640 | 371,124,192 | 384,623,032 | 396,391,665 | 368,403,615 | 385,030,840 | 351,751,468 | 373,588,997 |
| $(207,140,596)$ | $(214,466,006)$ | (255,797,502) | $(270,982,823)$ | $(280,634,777)$ | $(291,299,667)$ | (234,856,439) | $(232,562,659)$ | $(210,926,728)$ | (230,738,210) |
| - | - | - |  | 2,228,000 | 17,026,000 | 980,439 | 8,817,000 | $(6,657,000)$ |  |
| 114,662,668 | 105,286,986 | 92,622,138 | 100,141,369 | 106,216,255 | 122,117,998 | 134,527,615 | 161,285,181 | 134,167,740 | 142,850,787 |
| 63,755,940 | 56,101,372 | 54,860,040 | 55,461,104 | 55,821,582 | 55,988,596 | 89,235,841 | 90,191,176 | 96,710,070 | 92,312,499 |
| 1.80 | 1.88 | 1.69 | 1.81 | 1.90 | 2.18 | 1.51 | 1.79 | 1.39 | 1.55 |



## Appendix

## 135256

# Gainesville Regional Utilities 

## 2021 Series A

Fitch Ratings June 11, 2021


## Participants

| Issuer: <br> Gainesville Regional Utilities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participant | Position | Contact Information |
| Lauren Poe | Mayor | (352) 334-5016 |
| Ed Bielarski | General Manager for Utilities | (352) 393-1032 |
| Thomas Brown | Chief Operating Officer | (352) 393-1032 |
| Claudia Rasnick | Chief Financial Officer | (352) 393-1313 |
| Financial Advisor: <br> Public Financial Management, Inc. |  |  |
| Participant | Position | Contact Information |
| Chris Lover | Managing Director | (704) 319-7922 |
| Rohil Chekuri | Senior Analyst | (704) 319-7940 |
| 2021 Series A Co-Senior Manager and Bookrunner: Barclays |  |  |
| Participant | Position | Contact Information |
| Brian Middlebrook | Director | (212) 526-4194 |
| Chaffin Snider | Director | (212) 526-4914 |
| Jinuk Hah | Vice President | (212) 412-3189 |
| 2021 Series A Co-Senior Manager: BofA Securities |  |  |
| Participant | Position | Contact Information |
| Andrew Hildreth | Director | (646) 743-1607 |
| Jill Sternthal | Associate | (646) 743-1417 |

## Transaction Overview

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{l|c|cc}\hline & \text { Utilities System Revenue Bonds } \\
\text { 2021 Series A }\end{array}
$$ \quad \begin{array}{c}Utilities System Forward Delivery Direct <br>

Purchase Bonds, 2022 Series A\end{array}\right]\)| \$101.525 million |
| :---: |

## City and GRU Governance

 Duncan-Walker Commissioner (Dist. 1)
 Commissioner (Dist. II)


David Arreola Commissioner (Dist. III)


Lauren Poe Mayor


Adrian
Hayes-Santos Commissioner (Dist. IV)


Reina Saco Commissioner (At-large)


Gail Johnson Commissioner (At-large)


- Gainesville's City Commission performs such duties as passing the City's budget, setting the millage rate and approving the ordinances and resolutions.
- The Commission consists of seven members: four Commissioners are elected from single member districts, two Commissioners are elected at-large, and one member is elected as Mayor.
- In the spring of 1998, Gainesville citizens voted for their first elected mayor in 72 years.


## The Management Team has Extensive GRU and Utility Experience



## GRU is in a State of Renewal

V
Completed Electric System upgrade at Murphree Water Plant (60 year-old system)

Replaced 56 year-old turbine generator at original power plant (Kelly)

Retrofitted DH2 coal plant to operate at 100\% natural gas

Plans approved to replace over 200,000 meters as part of AMI program

Plans to upgrade Customer Information System software (13 year-old system)

Replaced older debt through refinancing which saved $\$ 134$ million in future debt

Responded to COVID by waiving customer fees and extending payment terms

Executed a 20-year solar PPA with Origis

## Outline

-Resiliency and Reliability
-Strategic Focus on Renewables
-Service Territory and Customers
-2021 Budget (Forecasts, rates and financial metrics)
-Debt Management and Plan of Finance
-Summary

## Resilience and Reliability

## COVID Impacts

- Minimal impact on unit sales
- Slight increase in residential sales, minimal decrease in commercial sales
- Increased liquidity with additional $\$ 50$ million taxable line of credit
- Refined \& improved continuity plans
- Seamless transition to remote work
- Waived customer fees, extended payment terms, offered installment payment plans


## COVID Impacts on Unit Sales

## FY20 UNIT SALES



## Risk Management - Gas Supply and Plant Winterization

- GRU's diversity of fuel sources paid dividends during the Florida 2020 winter event spawned by Texas power crisis.
- Remain less dependent on Natural Gas electric generation (State - 87\%, GRU 62\%)
- Unable to purchase gas for five days due minimal allocation. GRU switched to liquid fuel, wood and coal and remained on solid fuel the entire time
- Continued to supply gas to our LDC customers
- Able to export 100 MW's of excess generation capacity during the event netting additional revenue
- Participated in ERCOT lessons learned discussions as applicable to Florida
- Revisited the winterization protocols and procedures being used at the generation facilities


## Hurricane Preparation

- Hurricane preparation is a year round effort
- Looking for 2021 to return to normal hurricane response protocols
- Pandemic and continuity of business plans have all been updated
- GRU participates in the Statewide hurricane table top drills
- Physical storm inventories have been checked for adequacy
- Working with FEMA funds to remove tree cables in certain sections, hardening those areas
- Maintain a $\$ 3$ million tree trimming program to control vegetation outages
- Hurricane planning group meets regularly
- All employees assigned gray sky roles
- Managers participate in incident command workshops and training per FEMA guidelines


## Cybersecurity

GRU continues to take a proactive approach

- Incident Response Playbooks \& Tabletop Exercises
- Quarterly review and maintenance of Business Critical
- Diversification and Resilience of Internet Connectivity with a 3d party
- Aligning current policies, guidelines and standards to NIST Cybersecurity Framework 1.1
- Coordinate \& Facilitate Vulnerability Assessment's and Penetration testing
- Monthly Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity \& Infrastructure Agency External Vulnerability Assessments and also planned Bi-Annual Internal Penetration Testing
- Implement Real-Time Reporting aligned to Policy Requirements
- Getting the word out! Through communications and training across GRU
- April's Cybersecurity Week: 4 breakout sessions with cybersecurity topics, 5 separate communications
- October: National Cybersecurity Awareness Month: 8 or more breakout sessions with a guest speaker closing the event
- Continue to focus on training, both staff as well as the IT team


# Strategic Focus on Renewables 

## Continued Evolution to Net-zero Carbon Emissions

- State-wide leader producing over 30\% of our generation from net-zero carbon sources in April 2021
- Plans haven't stopped there:
- By 6/30/21 - DH-2 conversion to $100 \%$ gas capability expected to be completed by $6 / 30 / 21$ projecting to reduce CO2 production by $40 \%$
- By 6/15/21 - The retrofit of Kelly CC will reduce GRU's overall emissions and increase efficiency of the steam turbine and add an additional 4 to 6 MW's of output
- By 12/31/22-50 MW Origis solar project expected be in commercial operations
- Future Plans:
- Celebrate success of significantly reducing carbon footprint
- Educate community about the next technological step required (e.g. energy storage)
- Remove barriers towards reaching 2045 net-zero carbon emission goal


## Electric System: Promoting Fuel Diversification and Renewables

## Existing Generating Resources

| Plant | Primary Fuel | Alternative Fuel | In-Service Date | Expected Retirement | Net Summer Capability (MW) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owned Resources |  |  |  |  |  |
| J. R. Kelly |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steam Unit 8 | Waste Heat | - | 1965 / 2001 | 2035 | 36.0 |
| Combustion Turbine 4 | Natural Gas | Distillate Fuel Oil | 2001 | 2051 | 72.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 108.0 |
| Deerhaven Generating Station |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bituminous |  |  |  |  |
| Steam Unit 2 | Coal |  | 1981 | 2031 | 228.0 |
| Steam Unit 1 | Natural Gas | Residual Fuel Oil | 1982 | 2022 | 75.0 |
| Combustion Turbine 3 | Natural Gas | Distillate Fuel Oil | 1996 | 2046 | 71.0 |
| Combustion Turbine 2 | Natural Gas | Distillate Fuel Oil | 1976 | 2026 | 17.5 |
| Combustion Turbine 1 | Natural Gas | Distillate Fuel Oil | 1976 | 2026 | 17.5 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 409.0 |
| South Energy Center |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEC-1 | Natural Gas | - | 2009 | 2039 | 3.8 |
| SEC-2 | Natural Gas | - | 2017 | 2047 | 7.4 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 11.2 |
| Deerhaven Renewable (DHR Biomass Plant) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Biomass | - | 2013 | 2043 | 103.0 |
| Total Owned Resources |  |  |  |  | 631.2 |
| Power Purchase Agreements |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline Landfill | Landfill Gas | - | - |  | 3.7 |
| Total Available Capacity ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | 634.9 |
| Peak Load ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  | 425.0 |
| 1. Planned plant retirements expected to reduce available capacity to 559 MW over next five years <br> 2. FY20 peak load. Max projected load over next five years is 425.0 MW <br> 3. Net Energy Requirement by Fuel Source for the Period Ended March 31, 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2012 Dispatch by Fuel Source


## Existing Renewable Energy GRU Has a Very Strong Renewable Energy Portfolio

- GRU has a very strong renewable portfolio, which accounts for over $20 \%$ of delivered energy
- The Southeast is well behind with the penetration of renewables at $\sim 6 \%$
- Since 2006, renewable energy and carbon management strategies became a major component of GRU's long-term power supply acquisition program
- These renewable resources include the purchase of energy generated by landfill gas, biomass and solar
" First utility in the nation to adopt a European-style solar feed in tariff ("FIT") in March 2009. Approximately 18.6 MW of solar PV capacity was installed and continues to supply energy to the System

Dispatch by Fuel Source Comparision ${ }^{1}$

| Fuel | U.S. | Southeast | Florida | GRU |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Coal | $18.8 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |
| Petroleum | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Natural Gas | $39.6 \%$ | $48.7 \%$ | $76.0 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ |
| Nuclear | $19.2 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Renewable (incl. Hydro) | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 8 \%}$ | $0.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 2 \%}$ |

1. U.S., Southeast, and Florida data from 2020 Energy Information Administration; GRU data from 2021

## Significant Shift in Carbon Intensity Since 2010

|  | 2010 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CO2 from Owned Generation (metric tons) | 1,639,854 | 1,059,529 | 986,535 | 940,383 |
| CO2 from Contracted Generation (metric tons) | 127,486 | 8,309 | 33,181 | 37,926 |
| Total CO2 emissions (metric tons) | 1,767,340 | 1,067,838 | 1,019,716 | 978,309 |
| Change since 2010 | -45\% |  |  |  |
| Energy from Coal Resources (MWh) | 1,322,924 MWh | 460,291 MWh | 449,200 MWh | 215,493 MWh |
| Change since 2010 |  |  |  |  |

- GRU has seen significant reductions in CO2 emissions since 2010 (-45\%)
- Energy provided by coal is $84 \%$ lower in 2020 versus a decade ago
- Transition continues in earnest
- Continued integration of Deerhaven Renewables
- Solar development (50MWs)
- Gasification of Deerhaven 2
- Efforts of UAB and City Commission to move to 100\% renewable by 2045


## Service Territory and Customers

## Top Customers <br> Diverse Customer Base with Limited Concentration

- The top 10 and top 20 customers across all systems account for $17.1 \%$ and $21.5 \%$ of revenues respectively

| Electric System |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Customer | \% of Electric Revenue |
| 1 | GRU | 2.8\% |
| 2 | SHANDS | 2.2\% |
| 3 | Alachua County Public Schools | 2.1\% |
| 4 | VA Medical Center | 1.7\% |
| 5 | City of Gainesville | 1.7\% |
| 6 | North FL Regional Medical Center | 1.7\% |
| 7 | Publix Super Markets Inc | 1.7\% |
| 8 | University of Florida | 1.5\% |
| 9 | Alachua County Board of Comm | 1.2\% |
| 10 | Sivance, LLC | 0.7\% |
|  | Top 10 Electric Customers | 17.3\% |
|  | FY20 Electric Revenue ${ }^{1}$ (000) | \$274,426 |


| Gas System |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Customer | \% of Gas <br> Revenue |
| 1 | University of Florida | 7.1\% |
| 2 | VA Medical Center | 3.2\% |
| 3 | North FL Regional Medical Ctr | 2.7\% |
| 4 | WCA of Florida, LLC | 2.1\% |
| 5 | Alachua County Board of Comm | 1.4\% |
| 6 | Florida Power Corporation | 1.4\% |
| 7 | Sivance, LLC | 1.2\% |
| 8 | SHANDS | 1.2\% |
| 9 | Preferred materials Inc | 1.1\% |
| 10 | Ology Bioservices Inc | 1.1\% |
|  | Top 10 Gas Customers | 22.5\% |
|  | FY20 Gas Revenue ${ }^{1}$ (000) | \$24,819 |


| Water System |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| \# | Customer | $\%$ <br> \% of Water <br> Revenue |
| 1 | University of Florida | $5.4 \%$ |
| 2 | GRU | $1.4 \%$ |
| 3 | North FL Regional Medical CTR | $0.8 \%$ |
| 4 | City of Gainesville | $0.6 \%$ |
| 5 | SHANDS | $0.6 \%$ |
| 6 | Alachua County Public Schools | $0.6 \%$ |
| 7 | VA Medical Center | $0.6 \%$ |
| 8 | Celebration Pointe Holdings LLC | $0.5 \%$ |
| 9 | Alachua County Board of Comm | $0.5 \%$ |
| 10 | Sivance LLC | $0.4 \%$ |
|  | Top 10 Water Customers | $\mathbf{1 1 . 3 \%}$ |
|  | FY20 Water Revenue ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{( 0 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 3 5 5}$ |


| Wastewater System |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Customer | \% of Wastewater Revenue |
| 1 | University of Florida | 1.0\% |
| 2 | North FI Regional Medical Center | 0.9\% |
| 3 | Sivance LLC | 0.7\% |
| 4 | SHANDS | 0.7\% |
| 5 | Alachua County Board of Comm | 0.6\% |
| 6 | City of Gainesville | 0.6\% |
| 7 | ST of FL Dept of CH \& Fam SVC | 0.5\% |
| 8 | Beazer East Inc | 0.5\% |
| 9 | Celebration Pointe Holdings, LLC | 0.4\% |
| 10 | Cabot Carbon Oper Jump Start | 0.4\% |
|  | Top 10 Wastewater Customers | 6.3\% |
|  | FY20 Wastewater Revenue ${ }^{1}$ (000) | \$45,503 |


| GRUCom |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $\#$ | Customer | \% ofGRUCom <br> Revenue <br> 1 <br> Alachua County Board of Comm |
| 2 | GRU | $9.6 \%$ |
| 3 | City of Gainesville | $9.0 \%$ |
| 4 | Verizon Wireless Personall Comm | $7.1 \%$ |
| 5 | Alachua County Public Schools | $6.9 \%$ |
| 6 | AT\&T Wireless | $6.9 \%$ |
| 7 | T-Mobile USA Inc | $5.1 \%$ |
| 8 | Interstate Fibernet Inc | $4.4 \%$ |
| 9 | Florida Phone Systems | $2.8 \%$ |
| 10 | Accelerationnet | $2.3 \%$ |
|  | Top 10 GRUCom Customers | $2.0 \%$ |
|  | FY20 GRUCom Revenue ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{( 0 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 1 \%}$ |

[^0]
## Customer Mix



## Wastewater System ${ }^{1}$

Total: $\$ 45.5 \mathrm{~mm}$


1. Management prepared breakout of each business unit revenues (unaudited) for FY20 2. Numbers may not add due to rounding


## Natural Gas ${ }^{1}$

Total: \$24.8mm


## 2021 Budget (Forecasts, Rates and Financial Metrics)

## Sales History and 2021 Forecast <br> Promoting Conservative Budgeting

| Electric Sales (MWh) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,500,000 |  |  |  |
| 2,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 1,500,000 |  |  |  |
| 1,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 500,000 |  |  |  |
| $\nu^{2} \nu^{\nu^{3}} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2} \nu^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| Water Sales (kGal) |  |  |  |
| 10,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 8,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 6,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 4,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 2,000,000 |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Natural Gas Sales (Therms)
25,000,000
20,000,000
15,000,000
10,000,000
5,000,000

## Residential Average Use



Residential Natural Gas (Therms/Customer)


## Electric System

## Historical and Projected Bill Increases (\%)

| Total Residential Bill Percentage Increase/(Decrease) ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Historical (Fiscal Year Beginning): |  |
| October, 12015 | (5.24)\% |
| October, 12016 | (2.04)\% |
| October, 12017 | 0.88\% |
| February, $12018{ }^{2}$ | (8.02)\% |
| October, 12018 | 1.55\% |
| October, 12019 | 7.13\% |
| October, 12020 | (6.46)\% |
| Projected (Fiscal Year Beginning):3 |  |
| October, 12021 | 5.78\% |
| October, 12022 | 2.76\% |
| October, 12023 | 2.76\% |
| October, 12024 | 2.77\% |
| October, 12025 | 2.77\% |

[^1]2. Changes resulting from the acquisition of the DHR Biomass Plant
 budget

## Florida Utility Rate Comparison <br> Addressing Rate Competitiveness

| Total Monthly Cost of Electric, Gas, Water and Wastewater Services for Residential Customers in Selected Florida Locales ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Based Upon <br> Typical Average Usage by Residential Customers of the System ${ }^{2}$ | Based Upon Standard Industry Usage Benchmarks ${ }^{3}$ |
| Pensacola | \$223.01 | \$286.33 |
| Clay County | \$201.70 | \$241.42 |
| Ocala | \$201.39 | \$239.85 |
| Ft. Pierce | \$199.49 | \$252.96 |
| Orlando | \$195.11 | \$238.42 |
| Jacksonville | \$192.26 | \$240.47 |
| Lakeland | \$190.85 | \$232.65 |
| Tallahassee | \$189.76 | \$240.22 |
| Kissimmee | \$186.80 | \$227.78 |
| Tampa | \$184.74 | \$235.94 |
| Gainesville Regional Utilities | \$184.26 | \$239.92 |

[^2]More

## General Fund Transfers

## General Fund Transfer Formula

- The City Commission established a General Fund transfer formula for FY15 through FY19
- The formula established the base amount in FY15, less the amount of ad valorem revenue received annually by the City from the DHR Biomass Plant
- The FY15 base transfer amount increases each fiscal year by $1.5 \%$ though FY19
- The City Commission established the transfer amount at $\$ 38,285,000$ for FY20 and FY21
- The City Commission has established the transfer amount at $\$ 36,283,000$ for FY22
- During the FY22 budget hearings, the City Commission has asked staff to come back to the Commission with a resolution to reduce the transfer by $\$ 2$ million per year, each year though FY27


| FY19 General Fund Transfer as \% of Operating Revenue |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Tallahassee | 17.4 |
| Orlando Utilities Commission | 13.2 |
| Lakeland | 12.2 |
| Kissimmee | 9.4 |
| Gainesville Regional Utilities | 9.2 |
| Leesburg | 8.7 |
| JEA | 7.2 |
| Lincoln Neb. Electric System | 6.3 |
| Fort Pierce | 6.0 |
| Winter Park | 5.7 |
| Jacksonville Beach Combined Utility | 4.2 |
| Colorado Springs Utilities | 4.1 |
| Chattanooga Electric Power Board | 3.4 |
| Springfield Mo. Public Utility | 3.3 |
| Springfield Mo. Public Utility | 3.3 |

## Financial Metrics

|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Revenue | 410,203 | 395,465 | 411,600 | 422,962 | 427,948 | 431,369 |
| Total O\&M Expenses | 239,538 | 216,613 | 235,427 | 243,416 | 243,423 | 248,965 |
| Net Revenues | 170,665 | 178,852 | 176,173 | 179,546 | 184,525 | 182,404 |
| Uses of Net Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt Service | 91,096 | 96,711 | 94,213 | 97,013 | 102,387 | 100,552 |
| UPIF | 41,284 | 43,857 | 43,675 | 44,248 | 43,853 | 43,567 |
| General Fund Transfer | 38,285 | 38,285 | 38,285 | 38,285 | 38,285 | 38,285 |
| Total Uses of Net Revenues | 170,665 | 178,853 | 176,173 | 179,546 | 184,525 | 182,404 |
| Revenues in Excess of Targets | - | - | - |  |  | - |
| Debt Service Coverage | 1.87 | 1.85 | 1.87 | 1.85 | 1.80 | 1.81 |
| Fixed Charge Coverage | 1.45 | 1.45 | 1.46 | 1.46 | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| Operating Cash | 27,506 | 34,500 | 27,506 | 27,506 | 27,506 | 27,506 |
| Rate Stabilization Fund Cash | 56,942 | 62,946 | 50,703 | 63,179 | 67,535 | 78,042 |
| UPIF Cash | 27,687 | 51,668 | 47,320 | 18,336 | 11,939 | 19,106 |
| Total Cash | 112,135 | 149,114 | 125,529 | 109,021 | 106,980 | 124,654 |
| Total Days Cash on Hand | 176 | 258 | 195 | 163 | 160 | 183 |
| Total Cash | 112,135 | 149,114 | 125,529 | 109,021 | 106,980 | 124,654 |
| Authorized but Unissued Commercial Paper | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Authorized but Undrawn Lines of Credit | 25,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Total Liquidity | 287,135 | 374,114 | 350,529 | 334,021 | 331,980 | 349,654 |
| Total Liquidity Days on Hand | 451 | 647 | 543 | 501 | 498 | 513 |

## Debt Management and Plan of Finance

## Future Capital Plans and Funding Sources

| Summary of Capital Improvement Program - Sources and Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | Total |
| Use of Funds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 38,302,466 | 59,384,613 | 43,713,757 | 29,796,717 | 32,393,436 | 203,590,989 |
| Gas | 10,239,566 | 4,490,414 | 3,195,132 | 3,146,139 | 3,502,900 | 24,574,151 |
| Water | 19,936,447 | 12,127,680 | 10,922,117 | 11,852,500 | 11,777,500 | 66,616,244 |
| Wastewater | 31,307,711 | 25,516,492 | 29,908,552 | 28,172,000 | 24,226,000 | 139,130,755 |
| GRUCom | 1,563,810 | 1,180,801 | 1,110,442 | 2,032,644 | 3,100,164 | 8,987,861 |
| Total Construction | 101,350,000 | 102,700,000 | 88,850,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 442,900,000 |
| Sources of Funds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Financing | 38,600,000 | 38,600,000 | 38,600,000 | 38,600,000 | 38,600,000 | 193,000,000 |
| Revenues | 62,750,000 | 64,100,000 | 50,250,000 | 36,400,000 | 36,400,000 | 249,900,000 |
| Total Sources | 101,350,000 | 102,700,000 | 88,850,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 442,900,000 |

## Debt Management <br> Moving Towards a More Fixed Rate Portfolio

- GRU's overall debt structure remains rooted in a majority of fixed rate bonds
- Fixed and synthetically fixed debt accounts for $90 \%$ of total pro-forma debt


## Pre-2021 Series A <br> Total: $\$ 1.638$ billion



Post-2021 Series A
Total: $\$ 1.739$ billion


## 2021 Series A Transaction

## Purpose of 2021 Series A Transaction

- GRU's 2021 Series A financing will provide funds for
- paying the costs of the acquisition, construction and equipping of certain capital improvements to the System
- paying the costs of issuance related to the transaction

Anticipated Schedule ${ }^{1}$
Roadshow / POS

| Roadshow <br> Available | • July 12 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pricing | • July 20 |
| Closing | - August 11 |

- Ratings are expected by July 9, 2021

Debt Service ${ }^{1}$


[^3]
## Summary

Morethan Energy

## Summary

## GRU Continues to Adapt and Excel

- Providing resiliency and reliable service through COVID protocols, storm preparedness and cybersecurity
- Employing strategic focus on renewables
- Improving rate competitiveness
- Continuing to serve diverse and growing customer base

GRU Continues to Maintain its Historical Credit Strengths

- Continual support of the City Commission
- Strong debt service coverage and days cash (reflecting City Commission Cash Balance Study)
- Resourcing a significant portion of capital needs internally
- Continuing to exceed established liquidity targets
- Prudent mix of fixed and variable rate debt


[^0]:    1. Management prepared breakout of each business unit revenues (unaudited)
[^1]:    1. Based on residential monthly bill at $1,000 \mathrm{kwh}$
[^2]:    1. Based upon rates in effect for January 2021 by the actual providers of the specified services in the indicated locales, applied to the noted billing units. Excludes public utility taxes, sales taxes, surcharges, and franchise fees
    2. Monthly costs of service have been calculated based upon typical average annual usage by residential customers of the System as follows: for electric service: 800 kWh; for natural gas service: 20 therms; for water service: 5,000 gallons of metered water; and for wastewater service: 4,000 gallons of wastewater treated.
    3. Monthly costs of service have been calculated based upon standard industry benchmarks for average annual usage by residential customers, as follows: for electric service: $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$; for natural gas service: 25 therms; for water service: 7,000 gallons of metered water; and for wastewater service: 7,000 gallons of wastewater treated.
[^3]:    1. Preliminary and subject to change
