

# **Priorities Committee Meeting\_Sep15\_2020**

#### STRATEGIC INITIATIVE AND UPDATE

# **Financial Securities and Developer Agreements**

# **Report Purpose**

To provide information to the Priorities Committee on bonds as a form of financial security in developer agreements.

# **Our Prioritized Strategic Goals**

Goal 1 - Build strong communities to support the diverse needs of residents

Goal 2 - Manage, invest and plan for sustainable municipal infrastructure

# Report

Corporate Finance, Legislative & Legal Services and Planning & Development Services have worked together to provide the financial expertise, the legal expertise and the planning expertise in consideration of this matter.

#### Background

One of the various mechanisms to mitigate financial risks associated with contracts and agreements with third parties, is to require a form of financial security upon signing. If a third-party defaults on a contract or agreement, the financial security is available for the County to access in order to pay for and rectify the associated project costs.

The County currently accepts Irrevocable Letters of Credit (LOC), certified cheques, or bank drafts as financial security in developer agreements. In other County contracts such as larger scale construction projects, the County typically accepts certain forms of surety bonds, which is an industry standard.

A surety bond is an agreement between the County, a third party (including developers), and a surety company that issues the bond. The surety bond provides a guarantee that the third party will fulfill its obligations in the contracts and/or agreements with the County. Surety companies have an extensive process for prequalifying third parties and only issue bonds when they have the confidence that the third party has the skills, labour, equipment, cash, and experience to be able to complete the work.

#### Bonds in Developer Agreements

The County was approached by the Urban Development Institute (UDI) and developers to consider accepting surety bonds as financial security in developer agreements (also known as developer bonds). There are some municipalities in Alberta and Canada that have started to accept bonds, but this is a relatively new practice.

The structure of the developer bonds that would potentially be accepted as financial security in developer agreements would vary from the existing types of bonds that the County accepts in other agreements such as performance bonds, labour and material bonds, etc.

Author: Brain Shukalek, Corporate Finance

2aa 1 of 3

Directors: Laura Probst, Corporate Finance; Stacy Fedechko, Planning and Development Services; Mavis Nathoo,

Legislative and Legal Services

Associate Commissioner: Gregory J. Yeomans, Chief Financial Officer; Kevin Glebe, Infrastructure and Planning

Services; Lori Cooper, Corporate Services Lead Department: Corporate Finance



# **Priorities Committee Meeting\_Sep15\_2020**

<b>Developer Bonds</b>	Deve	loper	<b>Bonds</b>
------------------------	------	-------	--------------

	County	Developer
Pros	Encourages development by promoting affordability (reducing cost) for developers	Frees up working capital or lines of credit
	Provides assurance from the surety company that developers are qualified to complete developer agreement (unlike other forms of security where there are no prequalification considerations)	Fees to issue bonds would be comparable to fees to issue LOC and often lower depending on developer credit profile
	Promotes positive business relations and investment between developers and the County	No stand-by fees, only pay for the portion(s) of bond used
Cons	Potential risks (prior to mitigation strategies):  Process to call on bonds may be difficult (ability to prove default and collect appropriate amount in timely manner)  Reliability of surety company	None (developers can choose to use existing forms of security)
	Administrative changes will be required (templates, agreements, etc.)	
	Potential unknown risk (new to the County)	

### Risk Mitigation

The risks associated with bonds as a form of financial security in developer agreements can be mitigated through ensuring there are specific terms written in the contracts. In addition, the County will assess the reliability of potential surety companies permitted to provide developer bonds.

However, how the product works in practice and what creative legal arguments arise in the future is yet to be seen. Therefore, there will still be some inherent risk despite measures taken to mitigate them.

#### **Options**

The County can choose to:

- 1) **Maintain status quo:** Continue to only accept LOC, certified cheques, or bank drafts as part of developer agreements (i.e. do not accept any form of bonds).
- Accept bonds in developer agreements: Allow bonds to be an acceptable form of financial security in developer agreements. Administration to develop new agreements and details for bonds.
- Introduce a criteria-based approach: Develop criteria in accepting bonds as a form of security in developer agreements. To be discussed and finalized by Administration.

Author: Brain Shukalek, Corporate Finance

Page 2 of 3

Directors: Laura Probst, Corporate Finance; Stacy Fedechko, Planning and Development Services; Mavis Nathoo,

Legislative and Legal Services

Associate Commissioner: Gregory J. Yeomans, Chief Financial Officer; Kevin Glebe, Infrastructure and Planning Services; Lori Cooper, Corporate Services

Lead Department: Corporate Finance



# **Priorities Committee Meeting\_Sep15\_2020**

Administration supports the request from UDI and developers to accept developer bonds as a form of financial security in developer agreements (Option 2) and has included this in the Draft Policy SER-008-027 Establishing Security in Developer Agreements being brought to Priorities Committee on September 15, 2020. Administration will take the steps to ensure appropriate mitigation strategies are in place prior to the acceptance of developer bonds.

Other Impacts: n/a

Policy: Draft Policy SER-008-027 Establishing Security in Developer Agreements

Legislative/Legal: n/a

Interdepartmental: Corporate Finance, Planning and Development Services, Legislative

and Legal Services

Master Plan/Framework: n/a

Author: Brain Shukalek, Corporate Finance Page 3 of 3 Directors: Laura Probst, Corporate Finance; Stacy Fedechko, Planning and Development Services; Mavis Nathoo, Legislative and Legal Services

 $Associate\ Commissioner:\ Gregory\ J.\ Yeomans,\ Chief\ Financial\ Officer;\ Kevin\ Glebe,\ Infrastructure\ and\ Planning$ 

Services; Lori Cooper, Corporate Services Lead Department: Corporate Finance