

# **FITCH RATES METRO WATER DIST OF SOUTHERN CA VAR RATE WATER REVS 'AA+'; OUTLOOK STABLE**

Fitch Ratings-Austin-13 June 2018: Fitch Ratings has assigned a 'AA+' rating to the following bonds issued by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan):

- Approximately \$105 million special variable rate water revenue refunding bonds, 2018 series A-1;
- Approximately \$105 million special variable rate water revenue refunding bonds, 2018 series A-2;
- Bank bond rating on both the 2018 series A-1 and A-2 bonds.

Bond proceeds will be used to refund a portion of Metropolitan's outstanding obligations and pay costs of issuance. Both series are expected to price on June 26, 2018.

The 2018 series A-1 and A-2 bonds will be issued initially in the daily mode with interest payments due monthly and final maturity in 2037. Payment of principal and interest on the bonds is secured by Metropolitan's water revenues. Bondholders have the right to tender the bonds on any business day. A standby bond purchase agreement with Toronto-Dominion Bank (Toronto) supports the purchase of tendered bonds in the event of a failed remarketing. Fitch expects to assign a short-term rating to the bonds that reflects Toronto's support in a failed remarketing.

The Rating Outlook is Stable.

## **SECURITY**

The special variable rate water revenue refunding bonds, 2018 series A-1 and A-2 are payable from a senior lien on net water revenues of Metropolitan.

## **KEY RATING DRIVERS**

**WHOLESALE SUPPLEMENTAL WATER SUPPLIER:** Metropolitan is the supplemental wholesale water supplier to 18.9 million people in southern California. Revenues are provided from 26 member agencies that rely on water purchased from Metropolitan to supply their retail customers, although there are no minimum annual purchase or payment amounts.

**REVENUE VARIABILITY:** Financial performance exhibits cyclicity as a result of Metropolitan's role as the supplemental supplier and its highly volumetric rate structure. Financial margins depend on the volume of water sales achieved in any given year, which fluctuate considerably. The variability may grow more pronounced over time as customers invest in alternative water supplies in order to reduce their purchases from Metropolitan.

**ROBUST RESERVES:** Metropolitan's credit profile is supported by the accumulation of robust cash reserves and stored water reserves during periods of strong water sales. Stored water reserves provide water supplies to meet higher member demand during a moderate drought or the initial years of a prolonged drought, and cash reserves help buffer the financial impact after those initial years when member demand declines.

**HIGH COST WATER SUPPLY:** Water is primarily provided from two independent supply sources, the State Water Project (SWP) and the Colorado River, and supply fluctuations occur on both supplies. The capital and operating costs associated with the import of these water supplies

across the state result in a relatively high treated water costs at \$1,015 per acre foot. Metropolitan still has rate flexibility, although some sensitivity and limitations exist given the varied reliance on Metropolitan by its members.

**ESCALATING DEBT PROFILE:** Debt levels are moderate but could climb rapidly over the next 10-15 years assuming construction of the \$16.7 billion California WaterFix for which Metropolitan has committed to fund 64.6% of the project. Although the scale of this obligation would put long-term pressure on leverage metrics, scheduled debt amortization and improving cash flow from operations should create additional debt capacity.

## RATING SENSITIVITIES

**WEAK OPERATING PERFORMANCE:** The 'AA+' rating and Stable Outlook anticipate a degree of cyclicity in Metropolitan's coverage and reserve levels. Stronger margins and reserves are needed to offset the periodic risk of lower revenues in years such as fiscals 2016 and 2017 during the recent drought. However, a sustained period of weaker operating performance and/or reserve levels could pressure the rating.

**WATERFIX PRESSURES:** Given the scale of the WaterFix and the cost to Metropolitan, the district's rating would be expected to be downgraded if, among other things, project costs escalate beyond current expectations or outpace anticipated rate and revenue increases, eroding financial margins well below historical norms.

## CREDIT PROFILE

Metropolitan is a wholesale water supplier in southern California to 26 member agencies, many of whom have some form of local water supply. The largest three member agencies (46% of water revenues in fiscal 2017) are San Diego County Water Authority (senior lien revenue bonds AA+), Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (water revenue bonds AA) and Municipal Water District of Orange County.

## DECLINING WATER SALES

Significant variation in member agency water sales has occurred over the past 10 years but the overall trend has been downward. Member agency transactions declined from levels of over 2 million acre-feet (maf) prior to 2008 to low points of 1.66 maf in fiscal 2011 and 1.64 maf in fiscal 2016 followed by 1.54 maf in fiscal 2017. These low points have occurred a few years into a drought period when member agency conservation efforts reduced retail water sales, which in turn led member agencies to cut purchases from Metropolitan. In most cases, Metropolitan's water supply is the most expensive source in a member agency's overall water supply portfolio. As a result, Metropolitan absorbs most of the regional demand variability from naturally occurring hydrological conditions that impact the member agencies' local supplies and demand.

Metropolitan's member agencies are not required to buy minimum amounts of water from it but instead use the imported water supply to supplement their other sources. However, Metropolitan's role in the region is crucial in that, even with its reduced water transactions, it still supplies 40%-60% of southern California's water supply. Fitch expects Metropolitan to remain a key water supplier although over the long term the volume of water purchased by its member agencies will likely decline, placing additional competitive pressures on the cost of Metropolitan's supply. With drought conditions abated, Metropolitan expects water transactions to improve incrementally in fiscal 2018 and thereafter but is not forecasting a return to historical highs. Metropolitan continues to expect that it will supply around 1.65-1.80 maf annually to member agencies for the foreseeable future.

## REVENUE VARIABILITY

With Metropolitan's primarily volumetric rate structure, rates are set to achieve a strong financial cushion in order to absorb the revenue implications of a potential drop in the water sales component of Metropolitan's water transactions. As a result, Metropolitan's financial margins can vary from year to year. Budgets have traditionally been designed to achieve a fixed charge coverage (FCC) of at least 1.2x and revenue bond debt service coverage (DSC) of 2.0x in order to provide revenues to fund a portion of annual capital needs and to build reserves.

## STORED WATER SUPPORTED SALES DURING INITIAL YEARS OF DROUGHT

Metropolitan made substantial investment in its physical storage facilities and inter-agency water storage agreements over the past few decades. Storage capacity is around five times what it was in the early 1990s. Metropolitan currently has 6.04 maf in storage capacity. Strong hydrological conditions allowed Metropolitan to build its stored water reserves in 2011-2013. Storage reached a high point of 3.38 maf on Jan. 1, 2013 before declining to 1.55 maf as of Jan. 1, 2016. With lower member sales and an increased water allocation from SWP in calendars 2016 and 2017, storage increased to 3.0 maf as of Jan. 1, 2018.

Metropolitan's substantial stored water position allowed it to meet the increased water demand of members during the initial years of the recent drought. Financial performance in fiscals 2014 and 2015 exceeded budget expectations and Fitch calculated revenue bond DSC exceeded 2.4x. FCC in those years was over 1.8x, in excess of Metropolitan's internal target.

Fitch uses FCC as the key financial metric for Metropolitan (a proxy for total debt service coverage), and the district uses this calculation for internal rate-setting as well. FCC includes the amount of SWP costs that are a capitalized expense as if they were paid as debt service. This expense is paid to the state for SWP expenses and is a cash outflow, much as principal on debt-financed assets is paid but is not considered an operating expense of the system in its accounting treatment.

## FINANCIAL MARGINS DECLINED IN FISCALS 2016 and 2017; IMPROVEMENT EXPECTED

Water sales in fiscals 2016 and 2017 were around 10% less than budgeted amounts, affected by the state's very quick implementation of mandatory conservation requirements on Metropolitan's retail utility members. In addition, SWP costs were above budget in fiscal 2016 even with the power cost savings from pumping a lower allocation from the project. As a result, Fitch calculated revenue bond DSC excluding transfers in from reserves was 1.7x in fiscal 2017 and below 1.0x in fiscal 2016 based on audited revenues and expenditures; FCC in these years were similarly lower excluding transfers in. However, expenditures in these years included spending on one-time conservation programs (particularly in 2016) that were funded from reserves. Including the offset from reserves from these one-time expenditures, revenue bond DSC was 1.7x and 1.9x in fiscals 2016 and 2017, respectively.

With only modest improvement in expected water transactions, financial margins in fiscal 2018 are expected to be very similar to fiscal 2017 results. With recently adopted 3% annual adjustments in water rates for calendar years 2019 and 2020 coupled with expectations of incremental water transaction increases to 1.75 maf, revenue bond coverage and FCC are forecasted to improve to more normalized levels by fiscal 2020.

## CASH BALANCES ROBUST DESPITE UTILIZATION OF TARGET RESERVES DURING DROUGHT

The healthy water transactions in the initial years of the recent drought bolstered unrestricted cash and investments as shown on the balance sheet to over \$1 billion at the end of fiscals 2014 and 2015 (days cash on hand [DCOH] of 389 and 385, respectively). In fiscal 2016, a portion of cash reserves that exceeded Metropolitan's financial reserve policy target reserve level was used in conjunction with other cash balances to fund \$450 million of conservation programs during the drought. Despite the drawdown, Metropolitan has continued to exceed its minimum reserve level and total balance sheet unrestricted cash and investments has remained robust, equaling 288 and 327 DCOH for fiscals 2016 and 2017, respectively. Metropolitan's historically strong cash reserves have provided a high degree of financial flexibility that has helped mitigate variable water transactions.

In addition to cash balances, Metropolitan also has two liquidity facilities totaling \$400 million, which can be drawn for any purpose. Metropolitan currently has drawn \$198.3 million on these facilities, which are expected to be taken out in June through a variable rate debt issuance. Metropolitan may draw up to \$86 million in the near term to fund initial participation costs related to the WaterFix.

### ESCALATING LEVERAGING EXPECTED FROM WATERFIX PROJECT

In July 2017, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), which owns and manages the SWP, approved the WaterFix, a plan that has been championed by the governor to improve the reliability of Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta (the delta) water supply. The WaterFix calls for \$16.7 billion (2017 \$s) in capital spending to construct three new intakes on the Sacramento River and two 45-foot diameter, 40 mile-long tunnels south under the delta to existing SWP and Central Valley Project pumping facilities. The project has been subject to strong opposition from potential participants, who cite high costs, as well as many environmental groups, local governments and others who have challenged the project through the legal process.

As a result of these setbacks, the state had indicated a willingness to consider downsizing or phasing the project as funding is secured. Metropolitan's board had originally voted in 2017 that it would be willing to support 26% (around \$4.3 billion) of the original project costs. However, to prevent potential permitting delays associated with a staged approach and to better meet the co-equal goals of supply reliability and environmental improvement of the delta, Metropolitan's board voted in April 2018 to increase its support for the original project to around 65% (\$10.8 billion). Metropolitan estimates that the resulting cost to individual households for construction and operation of the WaterFix will equal just under \$5 per month.

While there are still hurdles to overcome before the project can become a reality, Metropolitan's vote added a significant boost in moving the WaterFix forward. Since Metropolitan's vote, DWR has entered into an agreement with a newly-created joint action agency (of which the district is a member) to complete design and manage construction of the WaterFix, and initial financing for the project is contemplated within the next several months.

Metropolitan's financial obligation related to the WaterFix is expected to be from paying its proportionate share of DWR financing costs as a SWP contractor and through a combination of other forms of financial support. These are expected to include gap funding for continued work on the project over the coming months, support for obligations issued by a financing joint action agency, and the acquisition of transfers of SWP water supplies related to the project and acquisition of the unsubscribed portion (roughly 33%) of the project.

If the project moves forward as envisioned, the overall impact of Metropolitan's financial commitment will significantly increase the district's debt burden over the long term and lead to ongoing incrementally higher rate increases than previously contemplated. This will add further pressure to the district's cost competitiveness. Maintenance of the rating will depend of tight

management of project costs and Metropolitan's ability to sustain operating cash flow sufficient to maintain reasonable leverage.

For additional information on Metropolitan, see Fitch's report, 'Metropolitan Water District of Southern California', dated June 1, 2018.

Contact:

Primary Analyst  
Doug Scott  
Managing Director  
+1-512-215-3725  
Fitch Ratings, Inc.  
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 2010  
Austin, TX 78701

Secondary Analyst  
Kathy Masterson  
Senior Director  
+1-512-215-3730

Committee Chairperson  
Dennis Pidherny  
Managing Director  
+1-212-908-0738

Date of the Relevant Rating Committee: May 24, 2018

Media Relations: Sandro Scenga, New York, Tel: +1 212-908-0278, Email: [sandro.scenga@fitchratings.com](mailto:sandro.scenga@fitchratings.com).

Additional information is available on [www.fitchratings.com](http://www.fitchratings.com)

Applicable Criteria

Rating Criteria for Public-Sector, Revenue-Supported Debt (pub. 26 Feb 2018)

<https://www.fitchratings.com/site/re/10020113>

U.S. Water and Sewer Rating Criteria (pub. 30 Nov 2017)

<https://www.fitchratings.com/site/re/10010508>

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: [HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](https://www.fitchratings.com/understandingcreditratings). IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT [WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM](http://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM). PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. DIRECTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS RELEVANT INTERESTS ARE AVAILABLE AT [HTTPS://WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM/SITE/REGULATORY](https://www.fitchratings.com/site/regulatory). FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.

Copyright © 2018 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. 33 Whitehall Street, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings and in making other reports (including forecast information), Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification

sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings and reports should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating or a report will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings and its reports, Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings and forecasts of financial and other information are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings and forecasts can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating or forecast was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind, and Fitch does not represent or warrant that the report or any of its contents will meet any of the requirements of a recipient of the report. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion and reports made by Fitch are based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings and reports are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating or a report. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at any time for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.

For Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and South Korea only: Fitch Australia Pty Ltd holds an Australian financial services license (AFS license no. 337123) which authorizes it to provide credit ratings to wholesale clients only. Credit ratings information published by Fitch is not intended to be used by persons who are retail clients within the meaning of the Corporations Act 2001

Fitch Ratings, Inc. is registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (the "NRSRO"). While certain of the NRSRO's credit rating subsidiaries are listed on Item 3 of Form NRSRO and as such are authorized to issue credit ratings on behalf of the NRSRO (see <https://www.fitchratings.com/site/regulatory>), other credit rating subsidiaries are not listed on Form NRSRO (the "non-NRSROs") and therefore credit ratings issued by those subsidiaries are not issued on behalf of the NRSRO. However, non-NRSRO personnel may participate in determining credit ratings issued by or on behalf of the NRSRO.