# 2016 Demand Forecast <br> Presentation to the Board of Commissioners <br> <br> August 26, 2015 

 <br> <br> August 26, 2015}


## Agenda

- New 2015 and 2016 Demand (Usage) Forecasts
- Impact to 2015 and 2016 Revenues
- Long-term Rate Forecast Scenarios
- Conservation Message to Customers


2015-2016 Demand (Usage) Forecasts Single Family

2015-2016 Projected Single Family Usage


Reduced 2015 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


Reduced 2016 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


Multi-Family


Reduced 2015 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


Reduced 2016 MF Usage Compared to Forecast

$2015-2016$ Demand (Usage) Forecasts Non-Residential


Reduced 2015 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


Reduced 2016 NR Usage Compared to Forecast


2015-2016 Projected Irrigation Usage


Reduced 2015 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


Reduced 2016 Usage Compared to Forecast Usage


# Revised 2015-2016 Usage Compared to Previous Forecast 

Total Usage Demand Forecasts for 2015 and 2016

| Original 2015 \& 2016 | Revised 2015 |  | Revised 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 754,666 Total ccf | 741,182 Total ccf $-2 \%(13,484)$ Reduction |  | 673,361 Total ccf |  |
| 11,990 IRR ^ |  |  | -11\% (81,305) |  |
|  | 17,594 IRR ^ | 47\% | Total Reduction |  |
| 136,546 MFR | 134,505 MFR | -1\% | 6,018 IRR ^ | -50\% |
|  |  |  | 122,997 MFR | -10\% |
|  | 86,567 NR | -1\% |  | -10\% |
| 39,981 SF Blk 3 | 38,023 SF Blk 3 | -5\% | 79,074 NR |  |
|  |  |  | 26,625 SF Blk 3 | -33\% |
| 126,935 SF Blk 2 | 114,923 SF Blk 2 | -9\% | 93,327 SF Blk 2 | -26\% |
| 351,482 SF Blk 1 | 349,570 SF Blk 1 | -1\% | 345,320 SF Blk 1 | -2\% |

## Revised 2015-2016 Usage Revenue Compared to Previous Forecast

Total Usage Revenue Forecasts for 2015 and 2016

| Original 2015 | Revised 2015 |  | Original 2016 | Revised 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$2,641,660Total Rev | \$2,593,655 Total Rev <br> $-2 \%(49,821)$ Reduction |  | \$2,720,909 Total Rev | \$2,356,640 Total Rev <br> $-13 \%$ \$(364,269) |  |
|  |  |  | 71,134 IRR ^$479,591 ~ M F R ~$ |  |  |
| 69,062 IRR ^ |  | 47\% |  | Total Reduction |  |
| 465,622 MFR | $458,078 \text { MFR }$ | -1\% |  | 35,651 IRR ^ | -50\% |
| 354,437 NR | 349,731 NR | -1\% | 365,070 NR | 431,452 MFR | -10\% |
|  |  |  | 1,010,054 SF Blk 3 | 329,043 NR | -10\% |
| 980,635 SF BIk 3 | 975,300 SF Blk 3 | -5\% |  | 992,346 SF Blk 3 | $-33 \%$ |
| 542,012 SF Blk 2 | 490,721 SF Blk 2 | -9\% | 558,273 SF Blk 2 |  |  |
| 229,891 SF Blk 1 | 218,632 SF Blk 1 | -1\% | 236,787 SF Blk 1 | 157,687 SF Blk 1 |  |

## Revised 2015-2016 Total Revenue Compared to Previous Forecast

## Total Revenue Forecasts for 2015 and 2016



In 2015, even with a $50 \%$ reduction in usage for the irrigation class, and a 10\% for all other classes for the Sept-Dec billing periods, the total reduction in revenue is less than $\$ 50 k$, which can easily be covered by the use of reserves.

In 2016, if irrigation goes down by 50\% and all other classes by $10 \%$ for the entire year, the impact to services rates could be $6 \%$ or nearly $\$ 400 \mathrm{k}$. If this should happen, the future forecast needs to be adjusted to prevent revenue shortfalls - this could be in the form of higher rate increases, lowering costs or both.

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast Scenario 1



Note declining reserve levels.

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast

 Scenario 1
## 2014-2020 Rate Increases and Operating Reserve Balance with Reduced Usage Scenario 1: Costs and Rate increases Projected in 2015 Budget

| $\$ 2,000,000$ |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast Scenario 2



Note reserves levels are maintained - even slightly above required level by 2020.

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast

 Scenario 2
## 2014-2020 Rate Increases and Operating Reserve Balance with Reduced Usage

 Scenario 2: Costs as Projected in 2015 Budget and One Large Rate Increase

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast Scenario 3

|  | Cash Flow Forecast - Scenario 3 - Delay Debt Service Progressively Higher Rate Increases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Progressively higher rate increases. This is a cumulative increase of 31.4\% from 2015-2020, which is nearly the same as with one large increase. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014-2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 015-2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources: <br> BEGINNING BALANCE | \$ 789,669 | \$ | 828,870 | \$ | 828,724 | \$ | 1,081,468 | \$ | 1,301,374 | \$ | 1,284,980 | \$ | 1274,814 | \$ | 828,870 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate Revenve Increase | 0.0\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 4.0\% |  | 5.0\% |  | 6.0\% |  | 5.0\% |  | 5.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cumulative Rate increase REVENUE | 0.0\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 7.1\% |  | 12.5\% |  | 19.2\% |  | 252\% |  | 31.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Interest Earnings | 2,990 |  | 12,433 |  | 16,574 |  | 27,037 |  | 39,041 |  | 44,974 |  | 50,993 |  | 191,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Serice Revenues | 6,065,938 |  | 6,310,688 |  | 6,256,886 |  | 6,569,730 |  | 6,963,914 |  | 7,312,110 |  | 7,677,715 |  | 41,091,043 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Other Revenues | 253,065 |  | 261,679 |  | 254,322 |  | 265,010 |  | 277,426 |  | 289,133 |  | 301,354 |  | 1,648,923 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total revenue | 6,321,993 |  | 6,584,800 |  | 6,527,782 |  | 6,861,777 |  | 7,280,381 |  | 7,646,217 |  | 8,030,061 |  | 42,931,018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Sources | \$ 7,111,662 | \$ | 7,413,670 | \$ | 7,356,506 | \$ | 7,943,245 | \$ | 8,581,755 | \$ | 8,931,197 | \$ | 9,304,875 | \$ | 43,759,888 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| operating costs <br> Total Adm in/Planning/Cust Service/T a | 1,998,989 | \$ | 1,979,711 | s | 2,052,748 | \$ | 2,134,060 | \$ | 2,265,636 | S | 2,338,436 | S | 2,446,008 |  | 13,216,599 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPU Rate Increase | 0\% SPU Inc |  | -6\% SPU hc |  | 0\% SPU Inc |  | 0\% SPU Inc |  | 20\% SPU hc |  | 0\% SPU Inc |  | 0\% SPU Inc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water Purchases | 1,534,077 |  | 1,446,194 |  | 1,446,194 |  | 1,446,194 |  | 1,735,433 |  | 1,735,433 |  | 1,735,433 |  | 9,544,883 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All other 08 M costs | 986,993 |  | 1,003,681 |  | 1,053,204 |  | 1,052,187 |  | 1,289,560 |  | 1,352,825 |  | 1,353,283 |  | 7,104,740 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING COSTS | 4,520,059 |  | 4,429,587 |  | 4,552,146 |  | 4,632,442 |  | 5,290,629 |  | 5,426,694 |  | 5,534,725 |  | 29,866,222 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPITAL COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | bond issue in 2018. Note th \$400k delay in debt service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transter CIC Revenues to Capital | 241,486 |  | 248,688 |  | 266,747 |  | 280,085 |  | 296,890 |  | 311,734 |  | 327,321 |  | 1,731,464 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transterto Vehicle Replacement Acco | 120,000 |  | 122,000 |  | 125,000 |  | 129,000 |  | 134,000 |  | 139,000 |  | 145,000 |  | 794,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transterto Capital in Lieu of Deprecia: | 800,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 500,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 300,000 |  | 500,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 3,800,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Debt Service (Net of Capitalizatio | 651,280 |  | 621,711 |  | 831,145 | ) | 1,000,345 |  | 1,275,256 |  | 1,278,956 |  | 1,080,906 |  | 6,088,318 | $\leftarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer in from PWTF Account | (50,032) |  | 62,960 |  |  |  | 20093 |  | 2006145 |  | 222960 |  | 2252 |  | 62,960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total capital costs | 1,762,734 |  | 2,155,359 |  | 1,722,892 |  | 2,009,430 |  | 2,006,145 |  | 2,229,690 |  | 2,353,26 |  | 12,476,742 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Uses | \$ 6282,792 | \$ | 6,584,945 | \$ | 6,275,038 | \$ | 6,641,871 | \$ | 7,296,774 | \$ | 7,656,383 | \$ | 7,887,951 | \$ | 42,342,964 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ENDING BALANCE. OPERATING ACCOUU | \$ 828,870 | s | 828,724 | \$ | 1,081,468 | \$ | 1,301,374 | \$ | 1,284,980 | \$ | 1,274,814 | \$ | 1,416,924 | \$ | 1,416,924 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note reserves levels are maintained.

## Impact of Usage Reductions on Future Forecast Scenario 3

## 2014-2020 Rate Increases and Operating Reserve Balance with Reduced Usage

 Scenario 3: Delay Debt Service Costs and Impose Progressively Higher Rate Increases

Note, these rate increases would only be needed if usage was reduced by the full 10\% (50\% for irrigation) for the entire year of 2016 and maintained at that lower level through 2020, and operating and capital costs were maintained at the same level as proposed in the 2015 operating and capital forecasts, except for the postponement of the debt service costs related to the bond issue that will be required when the maintenance building is constructed in 2018 instead of 2016.

# Message on Conservation for North City WD Customers 

## Table 2.4

Single Family Residential Consumption per Household by Wholesale Customer: 1994-2013
(in CCF per Household per Month)

|  | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bellevue* | 10.4 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 8.9 | 9.1 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 8.5 | NA | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 7.6 | NA | 7.7 | 7.6 |  |
| B othell | 8.5 | 7,9 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 8.0 | NA | 5.7 | 5.7 | 9.1 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.4 |  |
| BrynMawr | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | Mer | ged with | Skyw |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cedar River | 9.9 | 9.7 | $9: 7$ | 9.1 | 9.6 | 8.9 | 9.5 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 7.1 |  |
| Coal Creek | 10.1 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 8.5 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 7.3 |  |
| Duvall | NA | 8.6 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Highline | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 64 |  |
| Issaquah* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 5.7 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.2 K | $\leftarrow$ Lower than NCWD |
| Kirkland* | 8.8 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 8.2 | 9.3 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 6.8 | NA | 6.9 | 7.0 |  |
| Lake Forest Park | NA | NA | 11.4 | 12.8 | 10.7 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 10.4 | 11.3 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 10.2 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 7.3 | 7.4 |  |
| Mercer Island | NA | 10.7 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 10.5 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |
| North City | 8.3 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.9 | NA | 7.7 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 5,8 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.8 | $\leftarrow-4^{\text {th }}$ Lowest in region |
| Northshare | 9.6 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.6 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 8.4 | NA | 8.4 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.7 |  |
| OlympicView | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 8.4 | a: 0 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.6 |  |
| Redmond* | 9.4 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 8.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.2 |  |
| Renton | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6.8 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.5 |  |
| SammamishPlateau* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8.7 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 8.1 |  |
| Skyway* | 7.5 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.1 |  |
| Soos Creek | 8.7 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 7.1 |  |
| Tukwila* | 7.5 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 5.8 | NA | 6.6 | 6.2 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 6.0 |  |
| Woodinville | 12.0 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 11.7 | 10.7 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 11.6 | 10.4 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 8.2 |  |
| W.D. 20 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.0 |  |
| W D. 45 | NA | 8.9 | NA | NA | NA | 6.8 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.7 | $5.5<$ | - Lower than NCWD |
| W. D. 49 | 9.1 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  |
| W.D. 85 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 9.9 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  | Merged | with W | D 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| W.D. 90 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8.4 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.1 |  |
| W.D. 119 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8.1 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 7.1 | NA | 7.9 | 7.8 |  |
| W.D. 1.25 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.9 |  |
| Wholesale Average | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 8.9 | 9.5 | 8,9 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Seattle | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.36 | $\leftarrow$ Lower than NCWD |

Members of Gascade WaterAlliance. No history 1s available for ssaquah, and Sammamish Plateau pnorto2008. No history is available forRenton priorto 2008. Bellevue, Kirkland, andWD 119 didnot provide data for 2011.

North City Water District Customers currently are some of the lowest water users in the region. Therefore, we are not asking you to use even less for your year round base level in-door needs. But, by limiting your summer usage for irrigation and recreation, you will continue in your example of using water wisely.

## And

