A New Funding Solution for Energy Infrastructure Replacement



CONNECT TO **RESULTS**



NAHRO 2019 Summer Conference July 11 – 13, 2019 Boston Park Plaza Hotel, Boston, MA

Today's Discussion Panel

Z.			

Moderator	Michael Nail President and CEO and Co-Founder Enlightened Enterprises, Inc. <u>enlightened1on1@gmail.com</u> 301-639-3767
Panel Member	Dick Santangelo, P.E., President, CEO, Founder Apollo Engineering Solutions, LLC <u>rsantangelo@apolloengsol.com</u> 703-627-7161
Panel Member	Patrick Landers, Sustainability Partners Investment Development Officer <u>planders@s.partners</u> 413-544-8881

Learning Objectives

 Review an alternate approach to debtfinancing or CapX to address infrastructure replacements.

2. Define the "as a Service" approach compared to traditional infrastructure replacement programs.

Agenda

- 4
 - State of Play in Public Housing Authorities
 - What Are the Capital Infrastructure Issues Facing PHAs?
 - What Are the New Solutions?
 - > How Would "as a Service" Work for your PHA?
 - How Do We Pay for "as a Service"?
 - Mitigating Risk; Why Is "as a Service" a Viable Option for the MUSH Market?
 - Summarize "as a Service"; Q&A

Public Housing Infrastructure Replacement –State of Play

- PHAs, first and foremost, are real estate development company
 - Core mission is to develop and maintain decent, safe housing
 - Collect rent; pay bills
 - Comply with HUD regulations
- Facilities management and maintenance expend 35+ percent of PHAs resources, annually; an additional 21 percent are expended for utilities
- \$26B in PHA backlog; \$25B alone for NYCHA (2018)
- Infrastructure replacement including elevators, windows, roofs, boilers, enhanced resiliency, etc. would require Capital funds or new debt

Traditional Funding Sources

- Lease-purchase agreements
- Lines of credit
- Energy financed funds (Bonds)
- Power Purchase Agreements (PPA)
- Capital/Reserve Funds
- Affordable Housing Market
 - Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program
 - Tax credits
 - Capital Fund Financing (CFFP)
 - Operating Fund Financing (OFFP)

Historical Perspective

- Energy Performance Contract (EPC) 135 + projects;
 \$1.4B investment
- Budget neutral solution
- Replace obsolete energy/water systems
 - Reduce costly system repairs and maintenance costs
- Consolidate parts inventories, e.g., uniformity in single procurement purchase for toilets
- Improve health and comfort
- Leverage energy and water savings; leaving capital funds for more emergent needs
- Reduce Greenhouse effect by lowering the consumption of coal, gas and oil
- Create local green jobs

Barriers to Traditional Funding Sources

- Some banks unwilling to commit capital w/o collateral
- Energy Efficiency is not generally valued in real estate evaluation and appraisal
- Process is too complicated 12 to 18 month to get installation
- Lack of education on the part of lenders
- Energy conservation is not core mission
- Investors perceive a lack of investment opportunities at scale with attractive returns, strong risk management and sufficient volume

What is "as a Service" Approach?

- New marketplace emerging to address infrastructure needs in Municipalities, Universities, School, Hospitals (MUSH) and Public Housing Authorities
- Investors looking for opportunities to invest in sustainability, resiliency
 - Like Brookfield, Ares, Hastings, Allianz, Alliance Bernstein, Goldman Sachs, etc.
- Investors through Service Providers (SP) assume ownership responsibilities and risks for essential critical services
 - Modernizing infrastructure while taking on responsibility of keeping it reliable, safe and efficient
- "as a Service" value proposition, an alternative to traditional financing reducing the cycle of RFQ/RFP, Budgeting, Financing, Bond, Taxes, Rental, PPA's, Leases and Shared Savings arrangements
- With "as a Service" approach, your PHA commits to <u>no long term contract</u>, and <u>no debt</u>
- Your PHA simply pays for use



What is "As A Service" Solution

Utility Model Approach

What matters most to a utility client? When I need service, flip of a switch away! I pay only, for what I use! My utility service is reliable! My fees are reasonable, affordable!

How "as a Service" Work?

11



Adds focus and proprietary capital for upgrading essential services



You don't purchase any product or installation



Service Provider pays for everything: materials, installation, maintenance & upgrades



You only pay a small fee for usage

"as a Service" Can Deliver...



How "as a Service" Works?



How Does Client Pay For "as a Service"?

Financially Self-	Monitor and verify	Direct meter
Sufficient	our upgrades	billing
Service Provider	Service Provider meters	Service Provider is
has our own	all of the upgrades by	repaid by invoicing
capital (just like	installing their own	you directly from the
any other utility	usage meters on each	new product meters.
company).	major device.	-

	Cost/KwH	KwH Usage	Billing	Total	
Old Lighting	\$0.09	71,964	\$6,476.76	\$6,476.76	
New Lighting Utility	\$0.09	30,000	\$2,700.00	58%	6 Energy Savings
Service Usage Fee	\$0.03	30,000	\$900.00	\$3,600.00	
			Total Savings	\$2,876.76 449	6 Utility Cost Savings

You keep the benefits from reductions in utility bills, maintenance costs, disruption to operations and improved systems!

How Does SP Get Paid for "as a Service"?



You keep the benefits from reductions in utility bills, maintenance costs, disruption to operations and improved systems!

Mitigating Risk to PHA

- PHA Can Exit
 Agreement at Any
 Time with Zero
 Penalties or
 Surprises
- Risk to PHA mitigated if Service Provider, Investor or Manufacturer Fails



PHA-Centric Agreement



Why Is "as a Service" a Viable Option?

- 18
- 1. Investors with Service Providers (SP) bring capital to table; taking risk
- 2. PHA pays usage fee (e.g. utility company)
- 3. SP and PHA looking for high performance, high value equipment that is reliable and maintenance free, including safety for its residents
- 4. Existing equipment (HVAC, elevators, etc.) may be eligible for purchase by investors, offsetting some of debt payoff
- 5. Simplifies procurement through Cooperative Purchasing Agreement or RFQ for investment
- 6. Equipment is installed in 6-9 months
- 7. SP mitigates PHA's risk by owning/maintaining equipment
- 8. SP requires no minimums or multi-year contracts
- 9. All efficiency utility savings goes to the PHA

Program Comparisons

19

NOT a loan, lease, financing agreement, bond, ESCO, installment purchase, rental, or ordinary sharing-agreement; **Service Provider pays 100% of materials, installation**, **maintenance and upgrades.** You are protected from economic risk and can lower your infrastructure costs at the same time.

		Minimum						
		Monthly	Agreement		Maintenance	Upgrades	Fees to	Required
	Term Length	Charge	Complexity	ls it CAPEX	Included	included	Cancel	Guarantees
"As A Service"	Monthly	NO	7 page	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Loan	5-20 years	YES	15 page	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
Lease	5-10 Years	YES	20 page	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
Financing agreement	3-10 Years	YES	25 page	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
ESCO	7-30 Years	YES	120 page	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
Ordinary sharing-agreement	10+ years	YES	7 page	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES

A lot of companies offer to help you implement energy savings solutions, but how many also offer to pay for them?

Maximizing MTW Opportunities, Securing PHAs' Future

- •MTW-PHAs and PHAs contemplating MTW could propose use of "as a Service" approach as part of its MTW demonstration program demonstration
- MTW language provides expanded flexibility

 MTW agencies have the flexibility to apply fungibility across their HCV, Operating Funds, and Capital Funds
 MTW agencies are also able to flexibly administer their public housing and HCV programs. MTW designated agencies are granted exemptions from existing public housing and voucher rules. Because of the exemptions provided, designated MTW agencies can create policies that address local needs.

Implementation of "as a Service" Process



- Current regulations and statute offer a pathway for implementation of "as a Service"
 - 24 CFR § 990.170 Operating Fund regulations
 - Shared Savings 75% PHA/25% HUD;
 - Sec. 9 of '37 Housing Act
 - "procedures and systems to maintain and ensure the efficient management and operation of public housing units"
 - All PHAs eligible to employ "as a Service"

• HUD guidance permits 3 options:

- Traditional RFP/RFQ; must re-compete after
 5 years
- Use of PILOT, city provided services
- Cooperative Agreement between City and SP; PHA can buy services off the Cooperative Agreement

Knowledge Check

- "as a Service" does not require debt service financing. True or False
- "as a Service" offers significant client savings with the least risk versus traditional debt service financing approaches. True or False
- Under "as a Service" approach, the client only pays for the utility it uses. True or False
- Under an "as a Service" approach, the equipment maintenance and upgrades are included. True or False



Business Case for "as a Service" Approach

Elevator Case Study

Terms and Definitions

- Value Engineering value engineering can be defined as an organized effort directed at analyzing designed building features, systems, equipment, and material selections for the purpose of achieving essential functions at the lowest life cycle cost consistent with required performance, quality, reliability, and safety. <u>Focus is on function at the lowest cost.</u>
- Robust Engineering is engineering design that allows for the voice of the customer to be translated into engineering requirements that optimize the functionality of the product or process and make it robust to common failure events/modes. Robust Engineering is characterized by optimum system performance, and low failure rates, resulting in longer life cycle and lower operating costs.

PHA Needs/Assumptions

- PHA requested Robust Engineering Solution for Elevator Replacement
 - Regen series of elevators Elevator line regeneration is a technology that allows energy from a traction elevator system to be returned to the building in overhauling situations. A Regen elevator reduces the overall energy consumption of the elevator and can contribute toward a building's LEED certification.
- Service Provider's (SP) Robust Engineering solution costs 50% more than Value Engineered design
- SP receives 30% discount equipment and materials for buying through a national account direct from manufacturer
- SP receives an additional cash discount of 10% on equipment and materials and 10% on installation
- Robust Engineering results in useful life of 30 years
- Because of the Robust Engineering approach, service costs are reduced by 30% compared to a Value Engineered solution
- Repair costs begin at 25% of useful life at 2% material costs and escalate 1% annually

Financing Solution

"Time is Money"

- CFFP rate 5%
- CFFP Transaction Cost 3%
- Annual construction Product Price Index 5%
- 12-18 months to operational status; HUD approval, procurement, purchase, install

- Cost of Capital 6%
- MGT Fee .8% annually
- Internal cost of closing \$40K
- Days to NTP to Delivery - 45
- Days to Install 60 Days to First Customer usage and payment - 60

Project Financing

CFFP		"as a Service"		
CFFP Rate	5%	SP Customer Rate	6.80% 🗪 6% + 80bp Fee	
Transaction Cost	\$97,649	Transaction Cost	\$40,000	
Total Cost of Capital	6.17%	Total Cost of Capital	6.93%	
Capital Expense	\$3,254,954	Capital Expense	\$2,951,366	
Annual Payment	\$329,269	Annual Payment	\$233,080	

"as a Service" Saves \$8,984,155 a 30 Year Period (NPV of \$3,726,835 Discounted @ 5%)



Cumulative Cash Out Comparison Robust Engineering ("as A Service") versus Value Engineering with CFFP Financing

\$20,000,000	
\$18,000,000	
\$16,000,000	
\$14,000,000	
\$12,000,000	
\$10,000,000	
\$8,000,000	
\$6,000,000	CFFP Financing
\$4,000,000	"as a Service"
\$2,000,000	
\$O	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

"as a Service" Saves \$8,984,155 a 30 Year Period

(NPV of \$3,726,835 Discounted @ 5%)

	Year	1	2		29	30
	SaaS Payment	- \$233,080	\$233,080		\$233,080	\$233,080
	SaaS O&M	\$3,864	\$3,864		\$102,638	\$107,528
	SaaS Deal Cost	\$40,000	\$0		\$0	\$0
	CFFP Payment	\$329,269	\$329,269	•	\$684,527	\$684,527
	O&M	\$5,520	\$5,520		\$119,362	\$127,269
	CFFP Deal Cost	\$97,649	\$0	,	\$0	\$0
	Year	1	2		29	30
Annual	SaaS	- \$276,944	\$236,944		\$335,717	\$340,608
Annual	CFFP	\$432,438	\$334,789		\$803,889	\$811,796
	Year	1	2		29	30
Cumulativa	SaaS	- \$276,944	\$513,887		\$7,870,561	\$8,211,168
Cumulative	CFFP	\$432,438	\$767,227		\$16,383,527	\$17,195,324
	Delta	\$155,494	\$97,846		\$468,172	\$471,189
Discount> 5%	NPV	\$3,726,835		•		
		Total Annual Cost				
	SaaS	\$8,211,168				
	CFFP	\$17,195,324				
	Total Delta	-\$8,984,155				

Audit Cost	No audit costs with "as a Service" Approach
Buyout if PHA decides to discontinue services	Baseline fixed for determining savings. Client can purchase equipment at depreciated value. No markups or penalties.
Cancellation Penalties	Any time for depreciated costs with no markups or penalties.
Contract	Simple 8-page month-to-month service agreement
Decision Making	Project sized to meet PHA's needs. Tackle 1 upgrade at a time. No Capex needed. Short- term agreements.
Incentives	PHA keeps all energy savings with Service Provider. As an MTW Agency, all energy savings retained by PHA.
Liabilities	As a Service Agreement there is no debt, no financial obligations or commitments. Completely off-book.
Maintenance	Maintenance included in Service Provider's usage fee.
Monitoring	Discreet monitoring of circuits eliminating non-upgraded products. Real-time monitoring.
Project Viability	Project not dependent on savings. Funds available to expand project to meet PHA needs.

Compelling Argument to Consider "as a Service"

- 1. Investors bring funds to the table to pay for elevator, installation, maintenance and replacement
- 2. Availability of PHA's bond capacity remains untouched
- 3. Capital funds remain available to the PHA for emergent needs
- 4. 6-9 months to purchase, install, operate the elevator
- 5. Robust, reliable equipment compared to value engineered equipment:
 - 1. Greater equipment reliability and safety for residents
 - 2. Lower usage fees from longer amortization schedule
 - 3. Longer useful life before complete replacement is required
 - 4. Lower day-to-day overall maintenance costs
- 6. Lower "as A Service" costs than the Total Cost of Ownership (Histogram)
- 7. "as A Service" analysis estimates an NPV of approximately \$8.8M compared to traditional CFFP financing

Preserving Debt Capacity While Addressing Capital Improvement Plan

Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR) A ratio that measures the organization's ability to meet its debt repayments. A declining ratio number can indicate that an organization is in danger of becoming insolvent.



Minimizing Total Cost of Ownership <u>increases</u> net revenue. Avoiding debt <u>decreases</u> future principal and interest payments.

- Indicates available cash flow to pay current **debt** obligations
- Often additional bonds tests limit of PHA's ability to issue debt
 - Service contracts are <u>not debt</u>
- When investments in efficient infrastructure reduce operating costs, <u>Net Revenue</u> <u>increases</u>
- If numerator (Net Revenue) increases and the denominator (P+I) does not change the Debt Service Coverage Ratio improves
- Getting more infrastructure built while not consuming debt capacity is a <u>major</u> <u>benefit of utilizing a service contract</u>

Who is Considering "as a Service" Solutions?

- "as a Service" Potential Applications
 - Public Housing Authorities (9 PHAs expressed interest)
 - Airports, Highways, Streets, Parking
 - Cities, States, Parks, Recreation, Police, Fire Stations
 - Rail Systems
 - Shipping Ports
 - Hospitals
 - Schools and Universities
 - Water and Power Utilities

Ask Yourself - Client Self-Assessment

- 34
- What are my options for addressing capital infrastructure needs?
- What is the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) of existing equipment? What is the TCO of replacement equipment including Installation, maintenance, upgrades, insurance, finance charges, staff benefits, capacity; skills capability
- Is it less expensive to use "as a Service" vs own; least-purchase; bond financing, etc.?
- How important is equipment reliability to my portfolio?
- How long can I afford to wait for replacing critical components?
- At what point does TCO exceed total usage fee of "as a Service"?
- Am I willing to give up ownership and traditional debt-based financing for greater reliability, performance, and reduced maintenance costs?

Thank You



Michael Nail President and CEO and Co-Founder Enlightened Enterprises, Inc. Business Phone: 301-639-3767 <u>enlightened1on1@gmail.com</u>

Dick Santangelo, P.E. Apollo Engineering Solutions, LLC "We Engineer Energy Business Solutions" Business Phone: 703-627-7161 rsantangelo@apolloengsol.com Patrick Landers Sustainability Partners Investment Development Officer 413-544-8881 planders@s.partners

VOptions Create Opportunity"

Dick Santangelo