RECEIVED

NOV 21 2007 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Dinsmore Shohl

Edward T. Depp (502) 540-2347 (Direct Dial) tip.depp@dinslaw.com

November 21, 2007

HAND DELIVERY AND E-MAIL

Ms. Beth O'Donnell Executive Director Public Service Commission 211 Sower Blvd. Frankfort, KY 40601

Re: Application of Kentucky-American Water Company, a/k/a Kentucky American Water for Certificate of Convenience and Public Necessity Authorizing Construction of Kentucky River Station II ("KRS II"), Associated Facilities, and Transmission Line; Case No. 2007-00134

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

LWC has enclosed an updated R. W. Beck Study that incorporates those revisions identified in the letters dated October 29 and November 20, 2007 to the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the "Commission").

Thank you, and please call us if you have any questions.

Very truly yours, Edward T. Depp

ETD/kwi Enclosure cc: All parties of record (Case No. 2007-00134) (w/ encl.)

Charleston Cincinnati Columbus

Barbara K. Dickens, Esq. (w/ encl.)

Final Report

Comparison of the Louisville Pipeline and Pool 3 Options to Serve Central Kentucky Water Customers

Louisville Water Company

September 2007 (Revised November 2007)



November 16, 2007



Mr. Jim Smith Manager, Infrastructure Planning Louisville Water Company 550 South Third Street Louisville, KY 40202

Subject: Revised Final Report

Dear Jim:

Enclosed is a revised Final Report providing a financial comparison between the Pool 3 option and a pipeline from Louisville to deliver future water supply needs to Central Kentucky. We recently discovered an error in one of the input variables to the model that alters the life-cycle present worth costs and the unit cost results for both options. The previous document (dated September 2007) was reporting on modeling results that used a 12.4% municipal bond interest rate instead of the intended 4.7% specified in the document. We have also removed the double counting of UV related return on rate base in the attached report.

The revised report properly reflects the correct interest rate, with a net effect of reducing the municipal debt service component of all options and modeling scenarios. Although all of the numerical results and graphical presentations change, the basic conclusions of the study are not impacted by the new output results.

This revised report modifies 12 pages and the Appendices from the original document. The impacted pages are 3-5 to 3-9, 4-4 and 4-5, 5-3 and 5-4, and 6-2 and 6-3, as well as page 4-1, where the first sentence of the last paragraph should reference the date 2050 instead of 2030 (this is the only modification not related to the changes outlined above).

We sincerely apologize for the error and the need to re-file this report with the Public Service Commission. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Very truly yours,

R. WA BECK, INC.

Edward D. Wetzel/Ph.D., P.E. Executive Vice President

Comparison of the Louisville Pipeline and Pool 3 Options to Serve Central Kentucky Water Customers

Louisville Water Company

Table	of	Co	ntents	i
-------	----	----	--------	---

Table of	Contents
List of Ta	bles
List of Fi	gures
List of Ap	pendices
Section 1	PROJECT INTRODUCTION
1.1	Background
1.2	Purpose of the Project
Section 2	FINANCIAL MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS
2.1	Capital Costs
2.2	Operation and Maintenance Costs2-2
2.3	Renewal and Replacement
2.4	Model Output
Section 3	PHASE 1 (2030) ANALYSIS
3.1	Initial Capital Expenditure Assumptions
3.2	Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses
3.3	Modeling Results
3.4	Sensitivity to LWC Wholesale Rate
Section 4	PHASE 2 (2050) ANALYSIS
4.1	Phase 2 Capital Costs
4.2	Operation and Maintenance Expenses
4.3	Modeling Results
Section 5	ALTERNATIVE LWC PIPELINE PROPOSAL
5.1	Capital Costs
5.2	Operation and Maintenance Expenses5-2
5.3	Modeling Results
Section (SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
6.1	Capital Costs6-1
6.2	
6.3	Conclusions



List of Tables

Table 2-1 Capital Cost Modeling Assumptions	
Table 3-1 Capital Costs - LWC Option	
Table 3-2 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option	
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure	
Table 3-4 Comparison of Present Worth Costs 2010-2030 Analysis	
Table 4-1 Phase 2 Capital Costs - LWC Option	
Table 4-2 Phase 2 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option	
Table 4-3 Comparison of Present Worth Costs 2010-2050 Analysis	
Table 5-1 Capital Costs of 36" LWC Pipeline	
Table 5-2 Comparison of Present Worth Costs 2010-2030 Analysis	
Table 6-1 Capital Cost Comparison	
Table 6-2 Present Worth Cost Comparison	
THOLE O THE FOOTH OF OF THE PROVIDENT OF	

List of Figures

Figure 3-1 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)	3-5
Figure 3-2 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD / yr Increase)	
Figure 3-3 Phase 1 (2030) Present Worth Cost Comparison	
Figure 3-4 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)	
Figure 3-5 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD / yr Increase)	
Figure 4-1 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)	
Figure 4-2 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD Increase)	
Figure 5-1 Phase 1 (2030) Present Worth Cost Comparison	
Figure 5-2 Unit Cost comparison (6 MGD Constant)	
Figure 5-3 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD Increase)	

List of Appendices

Appendix A Increasing Flow Scenario Sample Model Output Pool 3 Option LWC Option Apendix B Constant 6 MGD Flow Scenario Sample Model Output Pool 3 Option LWC Option

Section 1 PROJECT INTRODUCTION



Section 1 PROJECT INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A number of communities in the Lexington area are facing a long-term water supply shortage resulting from safe yield limitations of the Kentucky River. The major water purveyor in the area, Kentucky American Water Company (KAW), currently receives all of its' raw water from Pool 9 of the Kentucky River. Beginning in the early 1990's, KAW began looking for alternative supplies for future system growth. After evaluation of 50 alternatives, KAW selected an alternative that involved the purchase of treated water from the Louisville Water Company (LWC) and transmission of the water some 75 miles across central Kentucky to Lexington. A purchase and sale agreement was executed between KAW and LWC, but in response to opposition by certain potentially affected stakeholders, KAW determined not to pursue the pipeline project.

A number of the communities surrounding Lexington formed the Bluegrass Water Supply Commission (BWSC) in 2004 with a mission to develop a solution to the longterm water supply problem. Both KAW and the BWSC have analyzed their water supply alternatives over the past few years, and have each decided to pursue Pool 3 of the Kentucky River as the preferred water supply source for the foreseeable future. KAW has recently completed the engineering design and permitting processes for the implementation of a 20 MGD Pool 3 project, and have invited the BWSC to piggyback their project for an additional 5 MGD to serve the needs of their member communities.

Since 2003, the LWC has made four distinct proposals to the BWSC and its' member governments at their request. All proposals established a point of delivery at the intersection of Interstate 64 and KY-53 in Shelby County. These proposals are summarized below:

- August 8, 2003 (amended proposal from July 9)- presented two scenarios, one a 5 MGD base flow and 10 MGD reserve capacity (25 MGD design capacity) and the other a 9 MGD base flow with an 18 MGD reserve capacity (45 MGD design capacity). Fixed costs were assigned for the base flow amount, a separate rate charged up to the reserve capacity, and the wholesale rate charged for usage above the reserve capacity up to the design capacity of the pipeline.
- December 15, 2005- five alternatives were presented, with minimum purchase amounts ranging from 2 MGD to 6.2 MGD, and design capacities ranging from 10 MGD up to 31 MGD. Most alternatives suggested a three-tiered rate structure, with one option involving reserve capacity quantity that varied from the design capacity of the pipeline.



- October 25, 2006- "Tailored Solution" presented to the BWSC, involving multiple minimum daily purchase, reserve capacity and design capacities based on pipeline size and take or pay contract commitments. Three tiered rate structure used that resulted in the lowest effective rate at the limit of the reserve capacity.
- July 10, 2007- simplified solution presented to the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG). The tiered rate structure was replaced with the standard wholesale water rate (now \$1.71/1,000 gallons) for all water consumed. Minimum take-or-pay amount established as approximately 1/5 of pipeline design capacity. Capacities ranged from 10 MGD to 31 MGD, with take-or-pay amounts from 2 MGD to 6 MGD.

LWC understands that the safe yield of Pool 3 on the Kentucky River may not provide adequate capacity to serve the collective water supply needs of Central Kentucky, and the only safe, reliable water supply for Central Kentucky is the Ohio River. Further, LWC understands that KAW determined that the LWC pipeline supply of treated water was the low-cost alternative in the 1990s, and the BWSC determined that the LWC treated water pipeline supply was the low-cost alternative for their needs in 2004. In order to validate previous findings, R.W. Beck has been asked by LWC to perform an independent technical and financial evaluation of an LWC treated water pipeline alternative to the Pool 3 water supply option for Central Kentucky.

1.2 Purpose of the Project

The objective of this study is to develop a life-cycle cost comparison between two alternatives:

Pool 3 Option - Construction and operation of a new intake at Pool 3 of the Kentucky River, water treatment plant, and 30-mile transmission pipeline from Pool 3 to the intersection of Iron Works Pike (KY 1973) and Newtown Pike (KY 922) in Fayette County.

Louisville Pipeline (LWC) Option - Construction and operation of a pipeline from KY 53 in Shelby County to approximately the same point of delivery in Fayette County. In this alternative, the cost of delivery from the LWC to KY 53 is included as the wholesale water rate charged by LWC.

Both alternatives assume a design capacity of 25 MGD, with 20 MGD allocated for KAW customers and 5 MGD for the various BWSC members in Central Kentucky. In the case of the Pool 3 option, the infrastructure will be 80% owned by KAW and 20% owned by the public, while the LWC pipeline is assumed to be 100% in public ownership.

KAW has stated that they believe Pool 3 provides water supply under drought conditions of at least 30 MGD, and that this project will serve the needs of Central Kentucky customers until the year 2030. We have therefore divided our analysis into two phases, one extending to the year 2030 and the other to accommodate growth beyond 2030 to the year 2050.

Section 2 FINANCIAL MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS



Section 2 FINANCIAL MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS

The modeling objective is to determine the life-cycle cost impact of the two alternatives on the customers within Central Kentucky. These customers are currently served by both KAW and BWSC member governments. The goal is to analyze the alternatives from both a present-worth cost basis and an annualized cost per 1,000 gallons basis.

There are two major components to any life-cycle cost comparison—capital costs and operating expenses. R.W. Beck did not develop any independent cost estimates for either the capital or operating components of the projects. Much of the cost information was derived from two previously prepared engineering reports:

- 2. *Final Report for the Water System Regionalization Feasibility Study*, prepared for the Bluegrass Area Development District by O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc., February, 2004
- 3. *Water Supply Study*, prepared for Kentucky American Water Company by Gannett Fleming, Inc., March, 2007

R. W. Beck also reviewed numerous documents provided by LWC, containing Kentucky Public Service Commission testimony and previous presentations by KAW, LWC and O'Brien & Gere on behalf of the BWSC, incorporating the data into the models as appropriate.

2.1 Capital Costs

Capital cost information was obtained from various sources and adjusted to 2007 dollars by the Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index. Estimated construction costs were inflated for contingency, and soft costs added for engineering, legal, administrative expenses, permitting, easements and land purchases. The add-on percentages were held consistent with those used by both O'Brien & Gere and Gannett Fleming in their studies. Capitalized interest was charged during an assumed two-year construction period for Phase 1, and issuance costs were assumed for debt financing. Future capital expenditures were inflated by the Handy Whitman index for both pipeline and treatment plant cost elements.

The model translates the capital expenditures into an annual cost allocation by determining the principal and interest on a municipal bond issue for the publicly-financed portions of the project, or applying KAW's after-tax allowable rate of return on their rate base (7.75%).

The following table outlines the capital cost assumptions used as part of the baseline case in the financial model.



-	
ENR Construction Cost Index (2007)	7959
Construction contingency	20%
Engineering/legal/administrative	20%
Permitting/easements	5%
Handy Whitman construction inflation rate	3%
Municipal bond interest rate	4.7%
KAW interest rate on debt	6.5%
KAW return on rate base	7.75%

Table 2-1 Capital Cost Modeling Assumptions

2.2 Operation and Maintenance Costs

In addition to the capital costs of the project, the model also considers the operation and maintenance costs of the two alternatives. For the Pool 3 option, this includes the labor, chemical, power and other miscellaneous expenses associated with operating and maintaining the new intake, treatment plant, transmission main and booster pump station. In the case of the LWC option, the O&M expense of operating the transmission main and booster pump station from KY 53 to Fayette County includes electrical costs and an allowance for line maintenance. The O&M costs are inflated each year by the rate of inflation, assumed to be 2.4% in the model.

The water delivered by LWC to the KY 53 point of connection in Shelby County is provided at the wholesale water rate, currently \$1.71/1,000 gallons, plus an annual meter service charge. The cost to deliver treated water in full compliance with all regulatory requirements is imbedded in that rate, which will increase from time to time. Over the past 15 years, the average increase in the LWC wholesale rate has been 2%. The model assumes an annual increase in the wholesale rate of 3%.

2.3 Renewal and Replacement

In order to ensure sustainability of the newly-constructed assets, the model assumes an annual cost for infrastructure renewal and replacement (R&R). The costs assume an average asset life of 75 years for pipelines, and 40 years for treatment plants and associated equipment. Therefore, the R&R funding is established at 1.33% and 2.5% of the total project costs for the transmission and plant elements, respectively. This same approach is utilized for determining the depreciation on the KAW assets.

2.4 Model Output

The financial model generates results in two basic ways. First, a present worth cost is determined by taking the annual cost for each year over the timeframe modeled, and discounting back to 2007 using an assumed discount rate of 4.7% based on the opportunity cost of capital to the impacted customers. The difference in the present worth cost represents the difference paid by the end users for the two alternatives over the 20 or 40-years of operation in today's dollars.

The second output from the model is a plot of the cost per 1,000 gallons over the timeframe analyzed. This approach provides a more graphical representation of the financial impacts to customers over time for the two alternatives.

Section 3 PHASE 1 (2030) ANALYSIS



The first phase of the investigation was to perform a financial analysis of two alternatives:

- 1. Kentucky River Pool 3 option, involving a 25 MGD intake, water treatment plant and high-service pump station at Pool 3, and a 30 mile, 42-inch transmission main from the treatment plant to the connection to the KAW system at Iron Works Road (KY 1973) and Newtown Pike (KY 922) in Fayette County.
- 2. A 42 mile, 42-inch finished water transmission main from KY 53 in Shelby County, along the I-64 corridor to approximately the same point of connection with the KAW system in Fayette County.

Both of the above alternatives include a booster pump station and a 3 million gallon storage tank along the transmission pipeline route, including the land acquisition costs.

The analysis for each alternative includes the capital construction cost in 2007 dollars, plus the operating and maintenance (O&M) expenses over 20 years starting in 2010. This initial investigation (Phase 1) is expected to provide a 20-year solution, assuming that Pool 3 can sustain a 30 MGD withdrawal under peak day flow conditions, and that customer growth will result in approximately 0.5 MGD of additional flow each year from an initial value of 6 MGD.

The wholesale rate from LWC is initially \$1.71/1,000 gallons, and inflates at 3% per year through 2030. Both the Pool 3 and LWC pipeline options include the Kentucky River Authority withdrawal permit fee of \$0.05/1,000 gallons. The Pool 3 alternative also includes a capital project to address the Long-Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR), published by the U.S. EPA in the Federal Register on January 6, 2006 with a 2012 compliance deadline. For the purpose of this investigation, we have assumed that the Pool 3 treatment plant will require an additional 1-log inactivation of Cryptosporidium, and that the likely technology to achieve the additional treatment credit will be with ultraviolet light (UV). The costs for UV disinfection were estimated in the March 2007 Gannett Fleming report and are included in the Pool 3 model assuming an installation date of 2011. Investments in the LWC system to comply with future drinking water regulations are included in the future increases in their wholesale rate.



3.1 Initial Capital Expenditure Assumptions

The following capital costs were used in developing the models for the Pool 3 and LWC pipeline options.

Capital Costs - LWC Option (2007 \$1,000)	
42" Transmission Pipeline (incl. KY river crossing)	\$ 68,280
Booster Pump Station/Storage Tank	<u>4,743</u>
Construction Cost Estimate	\$ 73,023
Contingency @ 20%	<u>14,605</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$ 87,628
Permitting/Easements @ 5%	4,381
Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 20%	17,526
Land	<u>87</u>
Subtotal- Capital Cost	\$109,622
Capitalized Interest @ 4.7% for two years	2,576
Issuance Costs @ 1%	<u>1,096</u>
Total LWC Phase 1 Project Cost	\$113,294

Table 3-1 Capital Costs - LWC Option (2007 \$1,000)

Intake, Pump Station and Treatment Plant	\$ 54,867
Raw Water Main	402
42" Transmission Pipeline	48,300
Booster Pump Station/Storage tank	<u>4,743</u>
Construction Cost Estimate	\$108,312
Contingency @ 20%	<u>21,662</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$129,974
Permitting/Easements @ 5%	6,499
Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 20%	25,995
Land	<u>788</u>
Subtotal- Capital Cost	\$163,256
Capitalized Interest @ 6.5% for two years	3,183
Issuance Costs @ 1% of long-term debt	<u>980</u>
Total Pool 3 Phase 1 Project Cost	\$167,419
Total Pool 3 Phase 1 Project Cost Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000)	\$167,419
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option	\$167,419 \$ 5,355
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000)	
Table 3-3Capital Costs - Pool Three OptionUV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000)UV Disinfection Costs	\$ 5,355
Table 3-3Capital Costs - Pool Three OptionUV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000)UV Disinfection CostsContingency @ 20%	\$ 5,355 <u>1,070</u>
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000) UV Disinfection Costs Contingency @ 20% Probable Construction Costs	\$ 5,355 <u>1,070</u> \$ 6,425
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000) UV Disinfection Costs Contingency @ 20% Probable Construction Cost Permitting @ 5%	\$ 5,355 <u>1,070</u> \$ 6,425 321
Table 3-3 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option UV Capital Expenditure (2011 \$1,000)UV Disinfection Costs Contingency @ 20% Probable Construction CostPermitting @ 5% Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 20%	\$ 5,355 <u>1,070</u> \$ 6,425 321 <u>1,285</u>

Table 3-2 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option (2007 \$1,000)

Total UV Project Cost	\$ 8,372
	and the second

3.2 Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses

The operating costs for the Pool 3 river intake, water treatment plant and transmission pipeline were obtained from KAW estimates for labor, power, chemicals, and security as detailed in testimony before the Kentucky Public Service Commission in March of 2007. An allowance was also made for ongoing maintenance expenses. At the initial flow rate of 6 MGD, these costs totaled \$0.98/1,000 gallons. Additional operating expenses for the Pool 3 option included the payment of property taxes by KAW and the Kentucky River Authority (KRA) withdrawal fee of approximately \$0.05/1,000 gallons.

O&M expenses for the LWC pipeline include power and maintenance costs for the pipeline, an annual metering charge from LWC, and the wholesale rate charge from LWC, currently at \$1.71/1,000 gallons of usage. For consistency, the KRA withdrawal fee of \$0.05/1000 gallons was also charged as an operating cost in the LWC pipeline option.

3.3 Modeling Results

The Pool 3 option has been described in various documents and reports as both a peaking plant as well as to provide capacity for future regional population growth needs. Under the peaking plant concept, the facilities would normally operate under some minimal flow condition (6 MGD), but be available to provide up to its' peak capacity under severe drought conditions. As an integral part of the water supply solution for the region, the Pool 3 plant flows would increase as the population of the region and water needs increased over time.

Two baseline cases were therefore studied in the modeling effort. The first assumes that the initial volume of water delivered through either the Pool 3 or LWC option is 6 MGD and remains constant through the year 2030. A second analysis accounts for customer growth and assumes that the average volume of water delivered starts at 6 MGD and increases by 0.5 MGD each year from 2010 until 2030. Under this assumption, the average daily flow in 2030 would be 16 MGD. With a peak day to average day ratio of about 1.6, this rate of flow increase depletes the new system capacity of 25 MGD by the year 2030.

The present worth cost of the Pool 3 and LWC pipeline options are compared below.

2010-2030 Analysis (\$1,000)		
	Constant Flow 6 MGD	Increasing Flow 0.5 MGD/yr
Pool 3 Option	\$ 293,986	\$ 303,890
LWC Option	<u>\$ 174,026</u>	<u>\$_221,584</u>
Difference	\$ 119,960	\$ 82,306
%	41%	27%

Table 3-4		
Comparison of Present Worth Costs		
2010-2030 Analysis (\$1,000)		

The model also compares the two options on a cost per 1,000 gallons basis. Figure 3-1 and 3-2 plot the cost of each option over the 20-year analysis period for the two baseline cases. When the flow rates remain constant, the Louisville pipeline option is always less expensive on a unit cost basis as shown in Figure 3-1. The LWC option curve goes up because both the operating expenses and the wholesale rate are increasing. The Pool 3 option curve goes down because asset depreciation is reducing the return to KAW on their portion of the project, and that reduction is greater than the increases in operating expenses. After 20 years, the municipal revenue bonds used to fund the LWC pipeline and 20% of the Pool 3 option are retired, which will reduce the unit costs in 2030 to below \$4/1,000 gallons for LWC and below \$10/1,000 gallons for Pool 3.

Figure 3-1 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)



Figure 3-2 compares Pool 3 with LWC when flows are increasing by 0.5 MGD per year from the initial 6 MGD in 2010. In this instance, the Pool 3 curve shows a decrease in the unit cost over time because of the impact of depreciation on the KAW return on invested capital, while the LWC curve remains relatively flat. This causes the two curves to cross around the year 2027, but the life-cycle, present worth cost of the Pool 3 option is still \$82 million more expensive over 20 years.

Figure 3-2 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD / yr Increase)



3.4 Sensitivity to LWC Wholesale Rate

The most significant variable in the analysis is the assumed increase in the rate charged by Louisville Water Company to its' wholesale customers. Over the past 15 years, the LWC wholesale rate has increased by an average of 2%. The baseline case presented above assumed an annual increase of the wholesale rate of 3% from the current rate of \$1.71/1,000 gallons purchased. The model was used to analyze the effect of varying the future rate increases from 1% to 5% per year over 20 years.

The lower increase of 1% was chosen to reflect the potential that selling wholesale water to Central Kentucky customers spreads the fixed cost of operation across a larger volume of water distributed, and could result in rate increases below the 2% per year average over the past 15 years. The upper limit of 5% recognizes the potential that addition of enhanced treatment at both the Crescent Hill and B.E. Payne treatment plants to meet the 2012 regulations could cause a short-term wholesale rate increase above the rate of inflation.

Figure 3-3 presents the present worth cost of each alternative through the year 2030. The results indicate that at a 6 MGD constant flow rate, the difference between the Pool 3 option and the LWC option ranges from \$129 million at 1% annual increase to \$108 million at a 5% annual increase. The second set of plots show the same comparison for the 0.5 MGD per year flow increase. In this case, the LWC option is lower on a present worth basis by \$102 million at 1% annual increase in the wholesale rate, down to a \$57 million advantage at a 5% increase.



Figure 3-3 Phase 1 (2030) Present Worth Cost Comparison

Figures 3-4 and 3-5 present the unit cost of each option with separate curves presented for 1%, 3% and 5% wholesale rate increases from LWC. At a constant flow rate of 6 MGD, the unit costs for the LWC option are significantly less than the Pool 3 option over the 20-year analysis period. Figure 3-5 presents the unit cost comparison assuming the 0.5 MGD per year flow increase. In this instance, the LWC curves at a 3% and 5% wholesale rate increase eventually cross the Pool 3 option. Nevertheless, the present worth costs remain lower for LWC under all assumed rate increases over the 20-year analysis period.



Figure 3-4 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)



Figure 3-5 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD / yr Increase)

Section 4 PHASE 2 (2050) ANALYSIS



Section 4 PHASE 2 (2050) ANALYSIS

Previous studies acknowledge that a Pool 3 solution on the Kentucky River is likely a 20 to 25-year solution based on projected regional growth and an assumed 30 MGD of available capacity. The recommended Kentucky River solution outlined in the O'Brien & Gere study contemplated a second phase raw water pipeline to the Ohio River from Pool 3 at some point in the future.

Given the need for source water from the Ohio River, our Phase 2 investigation analyzes options to expand on the initial 25 MGD plan. If we assume that demand continues to increase by 0.5 MGD each year, phase 2 options will need to provide an additional 10 MGD average flow over that timeframe, for a total peak capacity of 45 MGD. Since the previously constructed 42-inch transmission mains can carry up to 31 MGD, the additional 14 MGD can be accommodated with a 30-inch diameter line for both the new raw water main and the parallel treated water transmission lines in both alternatives.

Phase 2 of the Pool 3 option will therefore include the following capital components:

- Construction of a new 15 MGD river intake and raw water pump station in the Ohio River
- Construction of a new 30 mile, 30-inch raw water main from the Ohio River to the Pool 3 WTP
- Expansion of the treatment plant and associated facilities to 45 mgd
- Construction of a parallel 30-inch transmission main from Pool 3 to Lexington
- Addition of a new booster pump station for the 30-inch treated water main
- Addition of a new 2 million gallon storage tank along the 30-inch pipeline route

Phase 2 of the LWC pipeline option will include:

- Construction of a parallel 30-inch transmission main from Shelbyville to Lexington
- Addition of a new booster pump station for the 30-inch main
- Addition of a new 2 million gallon storage tank along the 30-inch pipeline route

Since the current peak day capacity of the LWC treatment plants is 240 MGD, one or both of their plants will need to be expanded by at least 10 MGD by 2050 to accommodate the 45 MGD peak day flow for Central Kentucky. LWC has indicated they will increase the capacity of the B.E. Payne plant by 15 to 30 MGD before 2030, and those costs will be reflected in the wholesale rate.

4.1 Phase 2 Capital Costs

Since the system capacity is needed before 2030, the capital components outlined above must be designed and constructed prior to that date. The model assumes design and construction over a three-year period starting in 2025.

The following capital costs were used in developing the models for the Pool 3 and LWC pipeline options in Phase 2. All costs shown are in 2007 dollars. These costs were inflated to 2025 at an assumed 3% construction cost inflation rate and input into the model.

Transmission Pipeline (incl. KY river crossing)	\$ 50,909
Booster Pump Station/Storage Tank	<u>3,165</u>
Construction Cost Estimate	\$ 54,074
Contingency @ 20%	<u>10,815</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$ 64,889
Permitting/Easements @ 5%	3,244
Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 20%	<u>12,978</u>
Subtotal- Capital Cost	\$ 81,111
Capitalized Interest @ 4.7% for two years	1,525
Issuance Costs @ 1% of long-term debt	<u>826</u>
Total LWC Phase 2 Project Cost	\$ 83,462

Table 4-1Phase 2 Capital Costs - LWC Option (2007 \$1,000)

Filase 2 Capital Costs - Foor Three Option (20	07 \$1,000
Ohio River Intake and pump station	\$ 3,774
Raw Water Main	34,060
Treatment plant expansion	35,765
Transmission Pipeline	34,060
Booster Pump Station/Storage tank	3,165
Land	<u>200</u>
Construction Cost Estimate	\$111,024
Contingency @ 20%	<u>22,165</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$133,189
Permitting/Easements @ 5%	6,659
Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 20%	<u>26,638</u>
Subtotal- Capital Cost	\$166,486
Capitalized Interest @ 6.5% for two years	3,871
Issuance Costs @ 1% of long-term debt	<u>998</u>
Total Pool 3 Phase 2 Project Cost	\$171,355

Table 4-2
Phase 2 Capital Costs - Pool Three Option (2007 \$1,000)

4.2 Operation and Maintenance Expenses

O&M expenses in phase 2 were computed in similar fashion as was done for Phase 1. Two additional staff are assumed for the new Ohio River intake and raw water pump station facilities. Other fixed treatment plant costs were increased by the rate of inflation, while variable costs increased by both the rate of inflation and flow rate. Wholesale rate increases were once again assumed at 3% per year to be consistent with the assumed rate of inflation and construction cost increases.

4.3 Modeling Results

The model was run through the year 2050 under two distinct scenarios.

1. Both the Pool 3 and LWC option continue to provide 6 MGD on an average day basis throughout the analysis period. Under this scenario, the second phase of capacity expansion is not constructed.

2. Increasing flows by 0.5 MGD per year require an expansion to increase the capacity of each option to 45 MGD to accommodate future flows through the year 2050.

The table below presents the present worth cost comparison of the two options for each scenario. Note that when the analysis is extended beyond the initial 20-year analysis period, the LWC option remains more attractive under either scenario presented.

Table 4-3

Comparison of Present Worth Costs 2010-2050 Analysis (\$1,000)		
	Constant Flow 6 MGD	Increasing Flow 0.5 MGD/yr
Pool 3 Option	\$ 372,039	\$ 586,345
LWC Option	<u>\$ 220,720</u>	<u>\$ 432,733</u>
Difference	\$ 151,319	\$ 153,612
%	41%	26%

The same unit cost comparison was analyzed as was done for Phase 1 and presented in Section 3. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 provide the unit cost curves for the 40-year analysis period for the constant flow and increasing flow scenarios.

Figure 4-1 Unit Cost Comparison (6 MGD Constant)





Figure 4-2 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD Increase)

Section 5 ALTERNATIVE LWC PIPELINE PROPOSAL



Section 5 ALTERNATIVE LWC PIPELINE PROPOSAL

Louisville Water Company believes that delivering up to 25 MGD from Louisville can be accomplished with a 36-inch pipeline rather than the 42-inch pipe utilized in the modeling effort. The reason for using a 42-inch pipeline, our model from Shelby County was to have an "apples-to-apples comparison" between the Pool 3 project and the LWC option. The 42-inch pipeline was chosen to transport the water from the Pool 3 facility to Fayette County in order to maintain water velocity below a nominal 5 feet per second (fps) at up to a 30 MGD flow rate. The larger diameter pipe also dissipates less energy (head loss) over the length of pipeline to be constructed, thereby reducing the need for additional booster pumping and lowering power costs to transport the water.

R.W. Beck was asked to consider the viability of a 36-inch pipeline for this project. While a detailed engineering study of the pipeline plan and profile would be required to fully understand the issues surrounding the use of a smaller pipeline, it appears the 36-inch alternative has merit in this application for the following reasons:

- 1. Given the lower cost of a 36-inch pipe, the total project cost could be as much as 20% less than the 42-inch option modeled based on lower construction costs and if lower contingencies and engineering cost assumptions are used;
- 2. The 5 fps velocity criterion is violated when flows exceed 23 MGD, which would occur only under the most severe peak flow conditions anticipated (at 25 MGD the velocity is 5.5 fps); and
- 3. Energy loss across the pipeline is about twice as large for the 36-inch versus the 42-inch pipeline, which will likely require an additional booster pumping station and higher electrical costs to operate.

5.1 Capital Costs

The following capital costs were used as input to the financial model for an assumed 36-inch pipeline alternative from Shelby County to Fayette County. This alternative includes an additional booster pump station along the pipeline alignment, but also includes lower contingency and engineering costs typically associated with pipeline projects. The total project cost for the 36-inch alternative is \$25 million (22%) less than the cost for the 42-inch pipeline.



-	
Transmission Pipeline (incl. KY river crossing)	\$ 57,140
Storage Tank	2,165
Booster Pump Station (2)	<u>5,155</u>
Construction Cost Estimate	\$ 64,460
Contingency @ 10%	<u>6,446</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$ 70,906
Permitting/Easements @ 5%	3,545
Engineering, Legal, and Administrative @ 15%	10,636
Land	<u>150</u>
Subtotal- Capital Cost	\$ 85,237
Capitalized Interest @ 4.7% for two years	2,003
Issuance Costs @ 1%	<u>853</u>
Total LWC Phase 1 Project Cost	\$ 88,093

Table 5-1					
Capital	Costs	of	36"	LWC	Pipeline

5.2 Operation and Maintenance Expenses

O&M expenses are generally assumed to be the same for the 36-inch pipeline with the exception of power costs. Given that the head loss doubles in the 36-inch alternative, the power costs were assumed to double in this option as well.

5.3 Modeling Results

The model was once again run under two scenarios for the 36-inch pipeline. The first scenario holds the flow rate constant at 6 MGD over the 20-year operating period, and the second increases the average flow by 0.5 MGD per year. The present worth cost of the Pool 3 and 36-inch LWC pipeline projects are compared below.

2010-2030 Analysis (#1,000)		
	Constant Flow	Increasing Flow
	6 MGD	0.5 MGD/yr
Pool 3 Option	\$ 293,986	\$ 303,890
36-inch LWC Option	<u>\$ 146,694</u>	<u>\$ 194,252</u>
Difference	\$ 147,292	\$ 109,638
%	50%	36%

Table 5-2
Comparison of Present Worth Costs
2010-2030 Analysis (\$1,000)

Figure 5-1 presents the present worth costs for the Pool 3 option and both LWC options under both scenarios. A comparison was also made between the unit costs of the three options for both scenarios as shown on Figures 5-2 and 5-3. These results clearly demonstrate the benefits of using the smaller diameter pipeline to deliver water from Louisville to Central Kentucky, and the enhanced benefit of that alternative over the Pool 3 option.

Figure 5-1 Phase 1 (2030) Present Worth Cost Comparison





Figure 5-2 Unit Cost comparison (6 MGD Constant)

Figure 5-3 Unit Cost Comparison (0.5 MGD Increase)



Section 6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS



6.1 Capital Costs

The capital costs for the Pool 3 and LWC pipeline options were compared. R.W. Beck performed no independent cost estimates, but rather extracted the estimated capital costs from previous engineering studies. Our investigation also included a 36-inch pipeline alternative from Louisville, as well as a Phase 2 project to expand both options in the case of increasing flows and capacity needs beyond the year 2030. Table 6-1 presents a summary of the capital cost comparison.

Table 6-1 Capital Cost Comparison (2007 \$ million)			
	Pool 3	LWC-42"	LWC-36"
Phase 1 (2007-2030)			
Construction Estimate	\$ 108.3	\$ 73.0	\$ 64.5
Contingency	<u>21.6</u>	<u>14.6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
Probable Construction Cost	\$ 129.9	\$ 87.6	\$ 70.9
Engineering/permitting/admin	33.3	22.0	14.3
Interest/financing	<u>4.2</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total Phase 1 Project Cost	\$ 167.4 ¹	\$ 113.3	\$ 88.1
% difference		32%	47%
Phase 2 (2030-2050)			
Construction Estimate	\$ 111.0	\$ 54.1	
Contingency	<u>22.2</u>	<u>10.8</u>	
Probable Construction Cost	\$ 133.2	\$ 64.9	
Engineering/permitting/admin	33.3	16.2	
Interest/financing	<u>4.8</u>	<u>2.4</u>	
Total Phase 2 Project Cost	\$ 171.3	\$ 83.5	
% difference		51%	



The capital costs are significantly lower for both a 42-inch and 36-inch pipeline from Louisville to Lexington than to build a new treatment plant on Pool 3. In the event future capacity needs require a connection from Pool 3 to the Ohio River, the cost to build that project is twice the cost of constructing a parallel LWC pipeline.

6.2 Present Worth Cost Comparison

The capital costs outlined above were translated into annual debt service and/or return on rate base numbers for the two options, added to the annual O&M expenses, and discounted back to 2007 to calculate a life-cycle present worth cost for each. Table 6-2 provides a comparison under both the constant 6 MGD flow and the increasing flow scenarios for phases 1 and 2. The LWC option shown is for the 42-inch pipeline so as to present an "apples-to-apples" comparison with the Pool 3 option.

Table 6-2 Present Worth Cost Comparison (2007 \$ million)			
	Constant Flow 6 MGD	Increasing Flow 0.5 MGD / yr	
Phase 1 (2010-2030)			
Pool 3 Option	\$ 294	\$ 304	
LWC Option	<u>174</u>	<u>222</u>	
Difference	\$ 120	\$ 82	
%	41%	27%	
Phase 2 (2030-2050)			
Pool 3 Option	\$78	\$ 282	
LWC Option	<u>47</u>	<u>211</u>	
Difference	\$ 31	\$71	
%	40%	25%	
Combined (2010-2050)			
Pool 3 Option	\$ 372	\$ 586	
LWC Option	<u>221</u>	<u>433</u>	
Difference	\$ 151	\$ 153	
%	41%	26%	

The life-cycle, present worth cost comparison indicates that the LWC option has a lower present worth cost under both the constant 6 MGD and increasing flow assumptions. The LWC cost is lower in either the 20-year or 40-year analysis, and the difference exceeds \$150 million (26-41%) over the 40-year timeframe.
The only scenario that produced a present worth cost for the LWC option within 20% of the Pool 3 option was the case where the LWC wholesale rate increased by 5% each year as opposed to the 3% per year assumption used in the baseline models. In discussing this with LWC, we believe it is possible that rate increases of that magnitude are possible in the short term, but unlikely over a sustained 20 or 40-year period. The economic conditions assumed in the model include a 2.4% inflation rate and an annual capital construction cost increase of 3%. Given these metrics and the fact that the LWC wholesale rate has increased by an average of 2% over the past 15 years, R.W. Beck is comfortable with the 3% per year wholesale rate increase assumption.

6.3 Conclusions

Delivering water from the Louisville Water Company to Central Kentucky customers through a publicly-owned pipeline from Shelby County is a more cost-effective alternative than constructing the proposed new intake and treatment plant on Pool 3 of the Kentucky River. Although the Pool 3 option becomes more cost-effective with increasing flows and better utilization of the assets, the LWC wholesale rate must increase by more than 5% per year for more than 20 years in order for the LWC pipeline option to approach the Pool 3 present worth cost.

Increasing flows will eventually deplete the capacity of Pool 3 and require an Ohio River supply. The capital cost to provide an Ohio River expansion of the Pool 3 option is twice the cost of a parallel pipeline to Louisville, and translates into even higher present worth costs for the Pool 3 option beyond 2030.

Appendix A INCREASING FLOW SCENARIO SAMPLE MODEL OUTPUT



Appendix A-1 POOL 3 OPTION



Water Jurys Jurum Landy Kis Lautsvila Water Campany Pool Trivo Optian

Matrix function Matrix fun	Matrix Matrix<	va va va	s		
The state of	0 0			°	
Image: intermediation	300 4000000 4000000 4000000<				
The state st	000000000000000000000000000000000000				
Matrix 10	301 313030 313133 313133 313133 313133 5 44530	5 5			
Matrix I Control I Contro I C	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$,	5	5	
Constrain Constrain <t< td=""><td>000 0</td><td>5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	000 0	5			
Constraint Constra			n	•	
Image: intermediate Image: intermediate <thimage: intermediate<="" th=""> Image: intermediate</thimage:>					
International Internat	0.0 0.00000 0.	5	\$		
Control Contro Control Control <th< td=""><td>010 0100000000000000000000000000000000000</td><td>5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	010 0100000000000000000000000000000000000	5			
	0 0			5	
<td>0.01 0.011/01 0.0201/01 0.0010/01 0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	0.01 0.011/01 0.0201/01 0.0010/01 0.00				
Image: section of the sectio	1000 1000 2 0000 1 1 1 <	,			
Optimum Table I Table I <t< td=""><td>Biological interview Control interview</td><td>*</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Biological interview Control interview	*			
Methode Control Contro Control Control <th< td=""><td>Mathematic Mathematic Mathema</td><td>5</td><td></td><td>s</td><td></td></th<>	Mathematic Mathema	5		s	
The state st	Mathematic Mathema	5	~	\$	
The sector of the sector	Math Math <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>				
International Internat	Mathematic Mathema				
Image: sector	Optimization Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>			5	
Manutal Image <	Note Note <th< td=""><td></td><td>J</td><td>5</td><td></td></th<>		J	5	
International Internat	1 2 3 5 3 5	•	9	•	
Control (Control (Cont) (Control (Control (Control (Control (Control (Control (Control	Number of the sector				
Control Contro Control Control <th< td=""><td>MI Mo. S<td>5</td><td>s</td><td>s s</td><td></td></td></th<>	MI Mo. S <td>5</td> <td>s</td> <td>s s</td> <td></td>	5	s	s s	
The contract of the cont	Mf Ho. 2 3 5 <td></td> <td>8</td> <td>s s</td> <td></td>		8	s s	
Matrix Matrix<	Number S <td>5</td> <td>s </td> <td></td> <td></td>	5	s 		
No. No. <td>No No No<</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	No No<				
Interface Interface <thinterface< th=""> Interface <thinterface< th=""> Interface Interface</thinterface<></thinterface<>	Mithod S <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
International frame International frame <thinternat< th=""> International frame <thi< td=""><td>M(no. S<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td></thi<></thinternat<>	M(no. S <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
Matter Matter<	241 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2				
International control 2000	2000 2000 <th< td=""><td>ŝ</td><td></td><td>s</td><td>315.0</td></th<>	ŝ		s	315.0
International control 2310 bit control 23100 bit contro 23100 bit control 23100 bit c	241 241 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>354,177 354,177</td>				354,177 354,177
	2 3 5 5 5 1 5 17 10 5 17 10 5 17 10 5 17 10 5 17 10 5 17 10 5 17 10		.	.	1 707 6
cumulation 24, answer (a) 24, and (b) cumulation cu	24 ¹ 24 ¹ 64.43 64.44 64.44 <th< td=""><td></td><td>n</td><td>0</td><td></td></th<>		n	0	
	7 ¹ 7 ¹ 5 5 5 5 100	67.654			74.270
and framementation 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2</th2<>	Allower 2 3 5 3 2 3 2 3 </td <td></td> <td>s</td> <td>5</td> <td>2662</td>		s	5	2662
Answer Constrained Constrained <t< td=""><td>alterio 5 5 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 10 <</td><td>2.520.135</td><td>\$7</td><td>s</td><td>3,031,743</td></t<>	alterio 5 5 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 10 <	2.520.135	\$7	s	3,031,743
Mean 241, 5 5 5 1 1010 1 5 1020 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1 5 1021 1	241, 5 5 5 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 127163 5 128164 104043 128164 104043 128164 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040434 1040444 10404444 1040444 <td< td=""><td></td><td>s</td><td>s</td><td>0.89</td></td<>		s	s	0.89
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	24 ⁴ 5 5 5 5 5 5 7730 b 7 7 7 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>1105 201 1 3</td><td></td></t<>			1105 201 1 3	
Read Read of the set of th	168.0153 16.50.413 16.17.203 10.04.42 10.17.203 10.04.42 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44 10.04.44	136,875		\$ 164.250	375.671
Contraction (10) Contraction (10) <td< td=""><td>2.618.014 2.018.014 1.064.023 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 5 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 5 2.018.014 2 5 5 5 5 5 2.017.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>14,513,717</td></td<>	2.618.014 2.018.014 1.064.023 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 5 2.018.014 5 5 5 5 5 5 2.018.014 5 2.018.014 2 5 5 5 5 5 2.017.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.018 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5 2.010.019 5				14,513,717
Antica (2 ¹¹) (n) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11)	S S	1.019.620			2618.014
La Casavard (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	5 5 5 5 7177523 5 71277524 5 71277634 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 71277764 5 71277764 5 71277764 5 71277764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 7127764 5 71277764 5 7127				
W LLPrintet 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 1 2	5 5 5 5 2737 648 5 2737 648 5 2737 648 5 2737 648 5 2737 648 5 2737 648 5 2733 648 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 748 5 2733 24 5 2733 24 5 2733 24 5 2733 24 5 2733 24 5 2734 24 5 2733 24 5 2734 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5 2134 24 5	21018 802 5	1.	5 19,966,159	10.650.160
Control fund 29/1 2 5 2	2.61 5 5 5 5 5 5 2.553.02 5 2.553.05 5 2.5555.05 5 2.5555.05 5 2.5555.05 5 2.5555.05 5 2.5555.0555.0	201010102	•		
261 221 21	2.9', 2.2',	2.253.028 200.323	5 V	\$ 2.263.628 \$ 209.323	2.253.628
Repletement Find Costs (Prevention) 5 3.230.057 5 3.230.057 5 3.230.057 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.443.01 5 9.432.41 5 10.414.5 5 10.213.41 5 9.43 5 10.414.5 5 10.213.41 5 10.414.5 5 10.214.45	5 1239.057 5 1.234.057 5 1.443.481 5 14.462.481 5 17.249.057 5 1.244.2481 5 14.443.481 5	982.129		١.	1 295 T
Modellion 5 5 5 113 5 7 100 6 114 5 102 6 103 5 114 5 103 5 114 5 103 5 114 5 103 5 114 5 103 5 114 5 103 5 114 5 102 5 103 5 <th1< td=""><td></td><td>S DICTORYC</td><td></td><td></td><td>26,187,283</td></th1<>		S DICTORYC			26,187,283
5 52272/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/02 5 21/027/05 5 72/04/05 5 72/04/05 5		9.82 5	5	s	F.
	5 5 5 5 5 2222962 5 21,132,702 5 21029674 5	10.945.531	\$	\$ 17.034.455	16.167.776

Water Supper synon Materia Lauisville Water Company Paul Titree Option
--

International Internat	Matrix Matrix<																
International Internat	The section of	Capital Expenditures															
0 0	Matrix Matrix<	Intake. Pump Station. Truatmont Planky,		53.217.500 S	5		\$	ŝ	s	J.	~		10	s		s	
(b) (b) (b) (b) (c) (c) <td>Matrix Matrix Matrix<</td> <td>UV Desetection Costs (2011) (3)</td> <td>3.1025</td> <td></td>	Matrix Matrix<	UV Desetection Costs (2011) (3)	3.1025														
International state of the state o	The sector of the sector	Ruw Water Mars (a)	3.10%	393,000													
	0.0000 0.0000<	Fransmission Lano (wodel? borings) ₍₁₆	3.10%	46.309.000 2 100.000													
0. 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000	Indication Indicat	Acceler Prime Stated	1010	2 Edd d00											1		
<td>International International Internat</td> <td>Initial Capital Exponditures</td> <td>5</td> <td>106.507.500 5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>۰</td> <td>.</td> <td></td> <td></td>	International Internat	Initial Capital Exponditures	5	106.507.500 5			5	5	5		5	5		۰	.		
me. me. <td>The formation of the formation of</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11.143.500 \$</td> <td>S</td> <td>ŝ</td> <td><i>с</i>л</td> <td>v</td> <td>51</td> <td></td> <td>s .</td> <td>s</td> <td>U1</td> <td>8</td> <td>vi</td> <td>уз</td> <td></td>	The formation of			11.143.500 \$	S	ŝ	<i>с</i> л	v	51		s .	s	U1	8	vi	уз	
Match I Cubic is in the second secon	Image: interpretatione	Transmission Line Contingency (n Total Contractiony		10 158 000 21.301,500													
No. No. <td>Image: interplane int</td> <td>Cainion of Probable Construction Cost</td> <td>5</td> <td>127.805.000 \$</td> <td>\$</td> <td>5</td> <td>S</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>s</td> <td></td> <td>и</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td></td>	Image: interplane int	Cainion of Probable Construction Cost	5	127.805.000 \$	\$	5	S		5	5	5	s		и	5	5	
International and the second of the	Math Math <th< td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td>a successful</td><td></td><td></td><td>ų</td><td></td><td></td><td>v</td><td></td><td>5</td><td></td><td>10</td><td>5</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	-		a successful			ų			v		5		1 0	5		
Monta 31 3200000 3200000 3200000 <td>(i) (i) (i)<td>Lund (1) Easonumts and Permitting (0)</td><td></td><td>6.359.450</td><td>n </td><td>a</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td></td></td>	(i) (i) <td>Lund (1) Easonumts and Permitting (0)</td> <td></td> <td>6.359.450</td> <td>n </td> <td>a</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Lund (1) Easonumts and Permitting (0)		6.359.450	n 	a				•	•		•		•		
	No. No. <td>Engineering, Legal, Administrative ₍₂₎</td> <td></td> <td>008182522 008182522</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td> </td> <td>-</td> <td> s</td> <td>s</td> <td></td> <td>s</td> <td> s .</td> <td></td>	Engineering, Legal, Administrative ₍₂₎		008182522 008182522		5			5		-	s	s		s	s .	
No. 1	Image: constrained by the sector of	tern Tarm Batt		56.318.750													
International control of the sector	International constraints In																
Interfactor	Image:	tssuance Cast (11) Capitalized Interest	1.0% 5 6.50%	503.168 S		~	5	. .	8	и			^	•		n :	
International and solution and sol	The formation of	Total Phase One Capital Expenditure		n		S	5		5	s	\$	s ·	s	.	5		
Control Control <t< td=""><td>The sector of the sector</td><td>Phase Two Capital Expenditures</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>u</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	The sector of the sector	Phase Two Capital Expenditures						u									
	The matrixed between the sector of the	15 MGD (ntake and Pump Station at the Onio River 30 Mile 30° Raw water muin from Otio River to Pool 3	J.	'n	o 		~	n 	•		•	•		•			
	intention intention </td <td>20 MGO Treatment Plant Expansion 30 mile 301 Transmission main to Learnsten</td> <td>\$</td> <td></td>	20 MGO Treatment Plant Expansion 30 mile 301 Transmission main to Learnsten	\$														
	International Internat	New booster pump station and starage	s														
	Openalization Image: second seco	Land Initial Expenditures		1.0				s 			0	5	15	5			
No. No. <td>The contract of the cont</td> <td></td> <td>ı</td> <td></td> <td>ų</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>v</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>s.</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>s</td> <td></td>	The contract of the cont		ı		ų			v				s.		5		s	
International Internat	International matrixInternational <td></td> <td>~ J</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		~ J		•			•	•		•	•	•				
International conditional conditiconal conditional conditional conditional conditional cond	Image: constraint of the sector of the sec	I GAR CONTINUEDROCY	n														
Interfacion 2 2 5 <th< td=""><td>mattering,<</td><td>Opinion of Probabie Construction Cost</td><td>U1</td><td>S</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>s</td><td></td><td>s</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>LA</td><td>s</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td></td></th<>	mattering,<	Opinion of Probabie Construction Cost	U1	S	5	5	5	s		s	5	5	LA	s	5	5	
Introlution End of the part of the par	Anothologe Contractione C	Easomonts and Postnitiers ₄₅		s	s	2	5		.	s				5	55		
Moto E	International conditional condi	Engineering, Legal, Administrative ₍₂₎ President Prese	1.			5			• • - -	5	·		5		s		
Moto S	(i) (i) <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>v</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								-		v						
Motion 5 <td>Interesting the sector of the sector o</td> <td>Issuance Coat (11) Captairted Interest(11)</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>ια</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>• • • </td> <td></td> <td>•••• </td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> , - -</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Interesting the sector of the sector o	Issuance Coat (11) Captairted Interest(11)		0	ι α				• • •		••••				, - -		
(a. Phan One rad Frac 5	(nonline). Function for function f	Total Phase Two Capital Exponditure	•	5	s		5		2		s				10	ŝ	
	MatterMatte	Grand Total Capital Expenditures - Phase One and Two	\$	s	s		5	s	ŝ	5	s	-	5	5		v	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0 0	Annual Operating Expenses WTP Operations and Maintenance Expenses ₍₁₎															
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(1) </td <td>Chomicals Latiar</td> <td>245</td> <td>5 </td> <td>339.618 5 786.428</td> <td>365.157 \$ 805.302</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>448.056 S</td> <td>477,969 S</td> <td>509.018 5 500.086</td> <td>1.097.045</td> <td>1.124.205</td> <td>1,151.279</td> <td>1.173.505</td> <td></td> <td>1.236.176</td>	Chomicals Latiar	245	5 	339.618 5 786.428	365.157 \$ 805.302			448.056 S	477,969 S	509.018 5 500.086	1.097.045	1.124.205	1,151.279	1.173.505		1.236.176
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Indicative 1	Seculty Alaintymatrus (Plant)	2.45		342,678 380,205	371.382 369.422	380.295 358.768	389.422 408.339	308.768 418,139	408.339	418,139	428.174	125,740	470.783	182,081	403.651	505.490
	and matrixed matrixed (1), (1), (1), (1), (1), (1), (1), (1),	Treatment Plant Electricity Total Annual Operating and Maintonance Expenses	2.4%	م		3.071.687 5				3.692.670		1,208,856	4.392.463	1	4.783.337 5		5,201,82
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Booster Pump and Transmission Line O&M								j na je	000.00	204 V3	01 1543	194 FR	01.010	5	101 101
	Introminition (1) 27 2 313.35 3 313.35	Iduolonance (Rensmission Line) Beoster Pump Electricity	245		242,336	280,560	779 518	200,237	119.54	341.058		339,235	410.153	434 696			515 392
image: second	(4.1) (4.1) <th< td=""><td>Total Booster Pump and Transmission O&M</td><td></td><td>s</td><td>318.305 S</td><td>338,444 5</td><td>359.272 \$</td><td>360.505 \$</td><td>403.365 \$</td><td>426.682 5</td><td></td><td>476.029</td><td>502.102</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>610.40</td></th<>	Total Booster Pump and Transmission O&M		s	318.305 S	338,444 5	359.272 \$	360.505 \$	403.365 \$	426.682 5		476.029	502.102				610.40
And Concention 5 0.05 0.00 5 0.00 5 0.01 0.01 0.01 <t< td=""><td>Consisting from a from a</td><td>Total Operating Expenses</td><td></td><td>\$</td><td>3.248.075 \$</td><td>3.410.131 \$</td><td></td><td></td><td>3,932,511 \$</td><td>4,119,303 \$</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>5.818.313</td></t<>	Consisting from a	Total Operating Expenses		\$	3.248.075 \$	3.410.131 \$			3,932,511 \$	4,119,303 \$							5.818.313
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Met 24 ¹ 2	Total Annual Operating Expenses (\$1000 gallon)		5	0.80 \$	0.85 \$	0.69 \$	0.85 \$	5 D5P	0.00 S	0.61 5	0.95 5	0.66 \$	5 250	0.93 \$	0.93 \$	1.0
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	Other Operating Expenses Proporty Taxos	2 46 5	ب					1,612,133 5			1,731,015	1,772,559				1.548.050
Halle Galler Balanci Halle Galler Balanci Halle Galler Balanci Halle Galler Balanci Haller Balanci Haller Filse Haller Filse Faulty Filse Faulty <td>$\frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12}$</td> <td>KRA Wandrawal Fow Inst</td> <td>\$0.05</td> <td>s</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>219.000 \$</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>246,375</td> <td>255.500</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>292.000</td>	$ \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{12} $	KRA Wandrawal Fow Inst	\$0.05	s					219.000 \$			246,375	255.500				292.000
2010 Control Control <thcontrol< th=""> <thcontrol< th=""> <thcont< td=""><td>$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>Frase I Project KANYC Cost of Capital (892-5) 11/1</td><td></td><td></td><td>14,181,665</td><td>13,850.014</td><td>13.518.163</td><td>13,186,312</td><td>12,854 401</td><td>12,522,609</td><td>12, 160, 753</td><td>11,959,622 607 676</td><td>11.627.771</td><td>11,295.920</td><td>10,664,069 617 138</td><td>10,632,217 507 108</td><td>10,300,366</td></thcont<></thcontrol<></thcontrol<>	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Frase I Project KANYC Cost of Capital (892-5) 11/1			14,181,665	13,850.014	13.518.163	13,186,312	12,854 401	12,522,609	12, 160, 753	11,959,622 607 676	11.627.771	11,295.920	10,664,069 617 138	10,632,217 507 108	10,300,366
221 5 10,201466 5 10,201457 5 10,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,201456 5 20,20	dramatility, (1) dramatility, (1) <thdramatility, (1)<="" th=""> <thdramatility, (1)<="" t<="" td=""><td>UV Cost of Capital (100%) (11) Mark Dock Sarveo (23%) (11)</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.613.914</td><td>2,018,914</td><td>2.018.914</td><td>2.618.914</td><td>2618.914</td><td>2.018.014</td><td>2.618.914</td><td>2,618,914</td><td>2618 914</td><td>2.618.914</td><td>2.618.914</td><td>2,618,914</td><td></td></thdramatility,></thdramatility,>	UV Cost of Capital (100%) (11) Mark Dock Sarveo (23%) (11)			2.613.914	2,018,914	2.018.914	2.618.914	2618.914	2.018.014	2.618.914	2,618,914	2618 914	2.618.914	2.618.914	2,618,914	
2 1 0.031406 5 10.03160 5 10.31466 5 10.31466 5 10.31466 5 10.31466 5 10.31466 5 10.31666 5 10.31666 5 10.31666 5 10.31676 5 10.316666 5 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.316666 10.3166666 10.3166666 10.3166666 1	Mone (2014) (17) 5 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17) 1 (2014) (17	Phase 2 Project KAV/C Cost of Capital (80%), 117)															
221, 5 5 220,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,023 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5 200,024 5	Interfared 251, 1 2 2,20, 10, 2 2 2,20, 10, 3 2 </td <td>Muni Dect Sorves (20%) (17) Total Other Operating Expenses</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>19.020.01</td> <td></td> <td>16.394.413</td> <td>18,032,639</td> <td>277.177.71</td> <td></td> <td>17 253.561</td> <td>16,545,547</td> <td>10.038.530</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>13.104 790</td>	Muni Dect Sorves (20%) (17) Total Other Operating Expenses	5			19.020.01		16.394.413	18,032,639	277.177.71		17 253.561	16,545,547	10.038.530			13.104 790
	201 5 20120 <td>Renow al and Replacement Fund</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>000 696 6</td> <td>000 636 6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>828 E92 2</td>	Renow al and Replacement Fund										000 696 6	000 636 6				828 E92 2
1.1	13/1 13/1 <th< td=""><td>R5R (17) (15) R5R (UV) (1</td><td>2.61</td><td>~ ~</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>209,323</td><td>206.323</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>209.323</td></th<>	R5R (17) (15) R5R (UV) (1	2.61	~ ~								209,323	206.323				209.323
2 20.0124-02 2.54.01/00 2.25.710,548 2.2550,4660 5.24.004201 5.2520,4012 5.2520,4122 5.2520,5120,5122 5.2520,51200,51200,51200,51200,51200,51200,51200	S Turbutur S Turbutur S Statutur S	RSR (1L) ₍₁₄₎ Total Ranewai and Replacement Fund Costs (Deprecision)	1.34,	5		3 195,244 5						3,445,331	3.445,381		3,445,381 5		3.445.38
	0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	Total Expenses		50		25,876,105 S A 74 S		25.591.950 5		25.336.516 5.55	220.132 5.32	25.381.828 5.15	25.285.493		25,118,465 5 4.65 5		22.366.484 3.83
	a revenue a revenue e revisare		•	•							010 010	100 000 00	107 200 00		0 101700		2.604.120
2019201 2 01000211 5 020002 1 5 0200001 5 0200001 5 0000000 5 0000000 5 0000000 5 0000000		Discounted Value	5	5		14 573,553 5		13,148,508	12,433,781	11.674 800	11,235,649	10,851,987	10.325.501		< 1007/cc.6		2010014

Piera sector de la constante la constant l'auming Report Piera sector de la constante na constante la uniora constante la unior. Ca Fauora Pasau 20 1.2016 de la constanción matalante la uniora constante la uniora constante de la constante de la constante de 1.2016 de la constante de la constante la constante la constante de la constante de la constante de la constante 1.2016 de la constante de l

5 r Tran

11. Later or - Sound Distribution Constrained Const 75% at 20 1 100

Series el payments el principal an 2.51ª Depreciation Rate Utriced fo 2.01ª Depreciation Rate Utriced fo

Appendix A-2 LWC OPTION



Water Supply Option Analyzic Louisville Water Company Louisville Water Company Option

	Basis 2007	2008	2009 2010	2011		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Phase One Capital Expenditure	\$ 66,528,000 \$ 6	\$ 33,264,000 \$	33,264,000 S	s	10	у		,	у	
Kymeer Crazina Ky Rheer Crazina Booster Crazina Storage co	3.1% \$ 1.700.000 \$ 1.752.700 3.1% <u>4.000.000</u> 4.742.000 \$ 72.023.300	2.371,300 5 30.511.650 \$	2.371.300 30.511.050 \$							
titua capita Exponence o	20% 14,565,600 14,604,660	7,302,330	7,302,330							ŗ
Oninium of Prohabile Construction Cost	87,393,600 87,627,660	43,813,950	43,813,030							
Optimited for the commencement of the commence	5% 5 4,360,060 5 4,361,362 20% 17,478,220 17,555,562 2,40% <u>87,342</u> 2,40% 5 100,327,000 5 100,021,090	\$ 2,100,699 \$ 8,762,796 43,520 \$ 54,810,995 \$	2,190,099 S 8,702.706 54,010,095 S	ю ю 	00 VA	თ თ 		v a va		
cutura oos Icaunae Cost,n Copialared Interest, s Total Phase One Castral Expenditure	1% S 1.083.270 S 1.086.220 4.7% <u>2.560.185</u> 2.576.117 S 112.080.455 S 113.204.227	\$ 548,110 \$ 1,288,058 \$ 50.647,163 \$	548,110 S 1.288,058 56,047.103 S	s s	ю ю 	• • •		· · ·		
Less Grant 7-1-1 Mar Covinal Cort	\$ 113.204.327									
					•	v			5	
Phase T we deput Expenditures At Ming 20" Parallel Transmission Line Kentuck Rived Crossion New booster Purin Station and stacage	0.00% S · · S · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · ·	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	w w		n Ivi .			-	
muai capitai expressiones Contingency ₍₂ ,	s . s %o	5	5	\$	v >	.				
Opinion of Probable Construction Cost				1 0 0	из и			 	• • •	
Easomonts and Pormitting Engineering, Legal, Administrative	0% S 5			,	• • • •	, 				
Capitalized intorest _(c) Capital Cost	0% S	5			s				. , w	
Iscuance Cost ₁ 7, Total Phase Two Capital Exponditures	0% <u>\$</u>	\$, ,		•• • •		,		
Grand Total Capital Expenditures - Phase One and Two	S 113,294,327	s	s	8	s					
Operations and Maintenance Expenses Electricity _{es}	5	5	s	172,260 \$ 94,489	191,100 \$ 96,756	210,739 \$ 99,078	231,211			\$ 297,913 108,938
Maintenance, ₁ . Whidesele Water Cost (₆ ,	2.40% 		3.7				5	5,019,891 20,846	6,150,208 21,472	6,707.410 22,116
Meter Charge Total Annual Operating Expenses (\$1000 gallon)	S	s	.	ŝ		4,904,593 S	5,408,008	\$ 5,097,173 c 2.05	\$ 0,552,602	2.17 2.17
Total Annual Operating Expenses (\$)		v		1.84	¢ 1971		8			
Othor Operating Expenses Debt Service - Phase One ₄ ts	5 5	w	S	\$	B, B61, 222 S	8,861,222 S	8,861,222			\$ 8,861,222
Debi Service - Phate Two ₁₀ , KGA Windrawi Fee T-sto Ont-concettion Experiments	\$0.05 S		s 8.0	100,500 8.070,722 \$ 8	118,025 8,079,847 \$	8,088,072 \$	8,008,007	\$ 9.007.222		\$ 0.025,472
Renowal and Replacement Fund (Transmission) (1)	1.33% • 66-		9	050,275	887,040	887,040	887,040	887,040	687,040	887,040 887,040
Renewal and Replacement Fund (Treatment Mant) ৷৷৷৷ Total R & R Fund	5.0.4					887.040	0+0,188	252 108 34 \$	S 18.456.270	\$ 17.048.880
Yolal Annuai Expenses (5)	s s	S		13.051,173 S 14	14,352,505 \$		19'5	5.44 5.44		\$ 5.10
Total Annual Expenses (\$1000 galjon}	<i>и</i> ,		5 U U				11,300,507	\$ 11.260.638	\$ 11,300,507 \$ 11,200,638 \$ 11,137,427 \$ 11,020,533	\$ 11,020,533
Discounted Value	· · ·									
Total Discounted Cost un Discount Rate	s 221.683.608 4.7%									

Meter:
 The main page of Scotificat KWW Research to Documents - BirkhowliS-wardand Scotone Tax, Scatt Boorer Form Scatton - 52 on tobit inflated to 2007 \$5; Garnett Flamma Resort 30 XMs with add Caratteristic Carast

Water Supply Option Analysis Louisville Water Company Louisville Water Company Option

	ests Basts	\$	2017	2018	2019	2020	20	2021	2022	2023	2024	20	25	2026	2027	2028	2028		2030
Phase One Capital Expenditure Preitre m Ky. River Crossing	3.1% S 3.1% S	66,526,000 \$ 1,700,000		vs	s	v	v) ,	UN L		s	v	w	v >	•	s	s	s	s	
Booster Pump Station & Storage ₍₂₎ Initial Capital Expenditures	3.1% \$	72,828,000			5	\$	s				s	s	v) .	. .			ß	va	. .
Contingency ₍₂₎	20%	14,565,600		,				,											
Opinion of Probable Construction Cost		87,393,600						-											•
Exsements and Permitting _{to} Ergineering, Legal, Administrative _{on} Land (4 Acres for Booster Pump Station) ₁₅ Capital Cost	5% \$ 20% 2.40% 5	4,369,680 5 17.478.720 85,000 100,327,000 5	 ഗഗ	 	v vs	<i>м</i> и	თ თ 	••••••		, 	ക	თ თ	ທ ທ 		ч м. м. м.	v v	v v	va va 	
Issuance Cost _{in} Capitalized Interest _{(a}	1% S	1,093,270			s	s	ا مر ا	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				ا در	м I. 				۱	<i>s</i>	
i otal Phase One Capital Expenditure Loss Grant	in I	112.080,455	,	n	n	n		л -		A	n	n	.		a	•	0	?	
Total Net Capital Cost																			
Phase Two Cardial Expanditures a Mia 60 Yazahi Tranzmizicon Line Katakiy River Crossien New booster framp Subion and storage Linu A court Ex-meditione	0.00% 8.000%		 		·~ /•	v v	v v .	· · · ·		 		ىر مى	v v v v			· ·	0 0	v, v	
inital Capital Expenditures Contrigency ₁₃	r s %0		 	 	n vi	n vn 	л и 	n və 		 	 л из	ი თ	n vn 			n vi	n va	n va 	
Opinion of Probable Construction Cost	s		, s	s	s	s,	\$	•			v	s	17		s	ŝ	ŝ	s	
Ecomonts and Pormitting ₁₄ Engineoring, Legal, Administrativo ₄₄	0% \$		5	 v	s	\$	s	· · ·		 s	10	s	ю 	•••	 из	s	w	v >	
Capitalizad Interest ₍₆₎ Capital Cost	s 80		, , ,	s	5	s					s	5	vs .	*			s	s	
Issuance Cost. ₀ ; Total Phase Two Capital Expenditures	v 8				s						er l	0			· .	0	5		
Grand Total Capital Expenditures - Phase One and Two	S		S	S	s	\$	1 2	v		5	və	s	s		, s	və	s	s	
Oporations and Maintonanco Expanses Electricity. J			s 322.011	760 2FL S	5 373 106		400.350 S	J28 593 S	457 961	S 488.402	S 520.224	5	553.198 S	587.456	S 623.039	0 S 659.991	~ ~	698.359 S	738,188
Autoronys Autoronys Wholesale Water Cost ₁₀ ,	2,40%		~	F.	, – u	- C(,		02		12			138,095 14,022,085			10		151,837 18,036,549
Meter Churge Total Annual Operating Exponses (\$1000 gallon)	0		22,779 \$ 7,748,788	23,403	S 9,0	S 0,7	24,892 0,771,880 \$ 10	25,038 10,512,535 \$	26,408	27,200 \$ 12,101,810	28,016 \$ 12,953,015	S	28,850 13,844,380 \$	29,722 14,777,358	30,014 \$ 15,753,622	2 31,532 2 5 10,774,031	10	ŝ	33,452 18,000,027
Total Annual Operating Expenses (5)	10		\$ 2.23	\$ 2.30	ŝ	2.37 S	2.43 \$	2.50 \$	2.58	\$ 2.65	s	2.73 S	2.81 \$	2.89	\$ 2.96	3 \$ 3.08	s	3.15 S	3.25
Other Operating Expenses Debt Service - Phase One _{nci}	s		\$ 8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	ŝ	8,861,222 \$ E	8,861,222 \$	8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	ŝ	8,861,222 S	8,861,222	\$ 8.861,222	2 \$ 8,861,222	22 \$ 8,861,222	222 \$	
Debt Service - Praze Two _{nc} . KRA Withdrawal fee Total Other Operating Expenses	\$0.05		173,375 \$ 0.034,507	182,500 \$ 9,043,722	s 9.052.847	100	200.750 B.061.972 \$ 1	209,875 9.071,007 S	210,000 0,080,222	228.125 \$ 0,080,347	237,250 \$ 9,098,472	s.	246,375 0,107,507 S	255,500 0.116.722	264,625 \$ 9,125,847	5 <u>273,750</u> 7 5 <u>0,134,072</u>	s,	282,875 144,097 S	292,000
Renowal and Replacomont Fund (Transmission). ₁₁₁ Renowal and Replacoment Fund (Treatment Plant). ₁₁₀ Tenit R. & R. Fund	1.33% 2.5%		887,040	0+0.788	887,040		887,040 887,040	887,040 687,040	887,040 887,040	887,040	887,040		887,040 887,040	887,040	887,040 .040	0 897,040		687,040 687,040	887,040 887,040
Total Ammual Expenses (\$)	5		3 17,670,425	\$ 18,322,094	S 19	S 10	62	20.470.672 S	21,255,691	\$ 22,078,000	\$ 22	\$ 23	630,023 \$	24,781,120	\$ 25,766,509	\$ 28	42 \$ 27,874,240	ŝ	20,139,067
Total Annuai Expunses (\$1000 galion)	s		\$ 5.10	\$ 5.02	s	4.00 S	4.01 \$	4.88 \$	4,85	5 4.84	s	4.83 \$	4.84 \$	4.85	\$ 4.87	s	4.60 \$	4.93 \$	3.45
Discounted Value	s		\$ 10,000,550	\$ 10,804,092	\$ 10,703,705	\$	10,608.314 \$ 10	10.517.323 \$	10,430,515	\$ 10,347,599	\$ 10.268.301	s	10.192.362 \$	10,119,537	\$ 10,049,596	3 \$ 9,982,322	22 \$ 0,017.511	s	6.843.721
al Discounted Cost un Discount Rate	221.583,508 4.7%																		
The pipe (B) SSO00451XM Request for Deciments. Bindwell/Sindland and Thirds 23th Biochemic Phynic Station - 22 din both inflated to 2007 55. Cannet Fleming Report of Initial Canall Expenditors. International Canall Expenditors. The Stationary Station of Probable Canstruction Cast rest Technony. Studiand et al. Thirds used during cancer and the stational Q. M. Cast New WTP KAW of Example Vincense with the of Phillips and Annual Q. M. Cast New WTP KAW 16 (Examp bond - 2% of Canall Cast and Phillips of Annual Q. M. Cast New D. Stationary Stationary 16 (Examp bond - 2% of Canal Cast and International Antimetric Cast and Cast and Internation and Internation 17% at 20 vers of on 2% of the with assumed life 20 vers of on 2% of the Cast	unnelt Fleming Rec Costs New WTP Presentation to BV urs	oot KAW																	

Appendix B CONSTANT 6 MGD FLOW SCENARIO SAMPLE MODEL OUTPUT



Appendix B-1 POOL 3 OPTION



Automatication and constrained and constra		Baris 5 2907	2008. 200	00 2010	2011	2012	2012	2014	2015	2018	2017
The section sect	Canadian Damandel transm										
Operation Operation <t< td=""><th>Capital Expenditures Intake. Pump Stalton. Treatment Plank_{ti}</th><td>\$ 53,217,500 \$</td><td>27,433,621 \$</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>~</td><td>5</td><td>s</td><td>s</td><td>2</td><td></td></t<>	Capital Expenditures Intake. Pump Stalton. Treatment Plank _{ti}	\$ 53,217,500 \$	27,433,621 \$		5	~	5	s	s	2	
The state is a s	UV Disinfection Costs (2014) (1) Raw Water Ithen	390.020		31.045	d 425.271						
0.1 1.1 <th>Transmission Line (w. assif bounds) 14</th> <td>010.000.54</td> <td></td> <td>50.000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Transmission Line (w. assif bounds) 14	010.000.54		50.000							
Max Max <th>Storage Tank (s)</th> <td>2, 100,000</td> <td></td> <td>32.550 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Storage Tank (s)	2, 100,000		32.550 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
const. const.<	paaster rund summ ₍₅₎ Inlish Capital Expenditures	\$ 108,507,500	54,155,068 5	55,000 5	0.425.271		5	5		-	
million million <t< td=""><th>Tootmont Plant Contronance</th><td>101212111</td><td>5.744.474 \$</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>s</td><td>s</td><td>ю</td><td>s</td><td>s</td><td></td></t<>	Tootmont Plant Contronance	101212111	5.744.474 \$		5	s	s	ю	s	s	
Image: sector	Transmission Line Contingency in	10 153 000	5 080 710	66 719 11 101							
Image: constrained by the co			5 Upt 22079					5	5		
The sector of the sector											
Mathematical matrix and the second	Land (s) Easomonts and Pormiting (s)	5 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2 0/07/07 2	3.249.358	46,358	321,204	-	• · ·	•	n		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Engineering, Lugul, Admensitative ₍₂₎ Cenital Cost	25 561 809 5 160.531.250	12 507,432 81.628.189 S	28,186 5		s	- - -		5		
Image: second	Long Term Ducs (140)	5 53.318.750		76.914							
International conditional condi	teoring Cost	Bat Loo		5 607,65	60,316				ъ		
Image: constrained by the co	Copratized interest (11) Copratized Interest (11)	1011705		91.750	291.027						
Matrix for the formation of the fo	Total Phase One Capital Expenditure	5 187.418.416		5 EAL'60	S 6.372.931		5				
The state of the field of	Phace Two Capital Expenditures 15 (UCD Intaxe and Perms Station at the Onio River	5 50		5	5	s	5	ی د	د	5	
International Internat	30 Mile 30" Raw water main from Ohio River to Poel 3 20 Milo Treetmoot Plunt Examision										
Methods: Sector Secto	30 mile 30° Transmission men to Luvengton New Beesder Punts statistic and storage	v									
International Internal International International	Land Todital Contral Franchistors		5				5	- - - -			
The contract of the cont							•		·		
i i	Troatment Ptant Cardingoncy _(c) Transmission Pilant Cantingoncy _{co}	5	ua 10				0	•			
Internet 1<	Total Contratancy	s									
Ruth, including	Opinion of Probable Construction Cost	თ თ	\$			5	ы	s	s	5	
Minimulation	Facultures and Particular		5	5			5	5		5	
1 2 3	Engineering, Legal, Administrative (a)										
0. 1	Capital Cost			n				•			
intermediateiii <th< th=""><th>tisuance Cost (11) Capitalized interest (13)</th><th></th><th></th><th>\$</th><th></th><th>111</th><th></th><th>. </th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<>	tisuance Cost (11) Capitalized interest (13)			\$		111		.			
Image: constraint of the	Total Phase Two Capital Expenditure			5				5			
matrix matrix<		s		s				5			
International static stati static stati static static static static static static static st	Annual Operating Expenses WTP Operations and Maintenance Expenses (1)						180.985 \$	185.326 \$	169.776	5 187,331	108.595
(i) (i) <th>Labor</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td>606.468</td> <td>715.252 328 863</td> <td>917.755</td> <td>740.996</td> <td>767,996 354,177</td>	Labor				,		606.468	715.252 328 863	917.755	740.996	767,996 354,177
and information 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2</th2<>	Naintenusse (Ptant)	्र स्वयंत्र स्वयंत्र		314,573		329,853	037.770 965 238		354.177	362.678 606 916	371.382
Answer 24, and and and and and and and and and and	reasment Fusit cucurery Total Annual Operating and Maintenance Expenses	S	ss	5 1.660.061	\$ 2,007,102	2 055.273	2.104.509 5	155.110	2.206.832 \$	2.259,796 \$	2.314.032
Indefinition 2 ⁴¹ 2 ⁴¹ 2 ⁴¹ 4 ⁴¹ 2 ⁴¹ 2 ⁴¹ 4 ⁴¹	Booster Pump and Transmission Line O&M Mathemanue (Transmission Line)	ំទុកខ្		42.915		126'50	67,554	69,175	70,835	72.536	74.278
and interaction 2 3 4 1 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 2 7 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	Boaster Pump Electricity (14)	2 451			173 160 5 187 684	125.116					216.270
and control 2 and cond 2 and control 2 and control	Total Boostar Pump and Transmission Ca.M	o v	n v 	0	2 2 104 687	2.247 355	2.301.296			11	2,630,302
Mat 24 ¹ 24 ¹ 5 24 ¹ 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 127,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 5 123,24 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14 123,14<	Tatal Annual Obstation Expenses (\$000 gallen)	 		\$ 0.98							1 16
	Other Operating Expenses										
International (control) (international (control) (control) (contro) (control) (control) (control) (control) (control)	Property Taxos (c.) XRA Withdrawal Fuo (s	s		5 11241-042 5 108-690	1,271,749	1.302.271 105.500		1,365.530	1.352,500	1,431,862 109,500
molecularity 1004.03 1004.03 0.004.03 0.004.04 2010.04	Phase I Project KANC Cost of Contal (801s)			16,836,075	-	16, 172, 973	15,841,121	072,609,270	15,177,419	14.845.568	112,613,717
matrix 2 <th>UV Cost of Capital (100%) 4(4)</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2 618 014</td> <td></td> <td>1.046,452 2.618,914</td> <td>1.015.620 2.618.014</td> <td>002.735 2.018,014</td> <td>2.618.914</td> <td>839.124 2.618.014</td> <td>012.202 2.618,514</td>	UV Cost of Capital (100%) 4(4)			2 618 014		1.046,452 2.618,914	1.015.620 2.618.014	002.735 2.018,014	2.618.914	839.124 2.618.014	012.202 2.618,514
manufactivity 2 <	Phase 2 Project										
Internation 201 2 2.231/32	KAVC Cost of Captual (117) Katur Dots Serves (205) (17) Teel Ober Contribut Extension		5		\$ 20.475.181	21,219,588	20.881,427		20.237.319	19.911.409	
201 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2 2</th2<>	Construction of the second sec										
13.1 13.1 <th< td=""><th>SER (TP) (14</th><td>5</td><td></td><td>\$ 2,253,528</td><td>5251622</td><td>2,253,623</td><td>2,253,625 208,323</td><td></td><td>2.253.523 209.323</td><td></td><td>2253,523 209,323</td></th<>	SER (TP) (14	5		\$ 2,253,528	5251622	2,253,623	2,253,625 208,323		2.253.523 209.323		2253,523 209,323
Auditoria 5 3 <th3< th=""> 3 3 3 <</th3<>	1	135,	-	5 3 236.057	942.129 5 3.236.057			3.445.381 5	982 129 3.445.361 5	582.126 3.445.381 S	3,445,381
Jualloni 5 5 15 5 1154 5 12.02 5 12.06 5 1172 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1175 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1177 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1177 5 1177 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176 5 1176	2		5	5 26.157.230	\$ 26,945,925	26.912.328	26,633,103		26.095.784		25,501,567
5 5 22.277.072 5 21.008.703 5 20.064.728 5 19.008.703 5 20.064.728 5 19.025.805 5 17.001.338 5 10.065.230 5 10.065.250 5 10.065.250 5 10.065.250 5 10.065.250 5 10.065.250 5 10.065.250 5 1	i otal Exponses Total Exponses (5/000gallon)			5 11.64	11 83	12.29	12 16		11 92		11 67
Faal Disconted Cati, 10 5 231543 300	Discounted Value		2		\$ 21.068.763	20.904.728	12,702,863			16.095.280 \$	15.781.712
	Tatal Discounted Cast (In	000 200,666 300									

Manual Annual Region of 21 (12) Plans - Chemical Remains Region
 The sensitive model scient of 21 (12) Plans - Chemical Remains Region
 The Sensitive Manual Research Plans Of The Sensitive Manual Region Manual Regio

A Professionand burnded certar 43 54 1020 Point - Cannad Flamma Silvert or Feature in contransmer moders - Advanced Flamma Silvert or Feature in contransmer moders - Advanced Flamma Silvert or Feature in contransmer moders - Advanced Flamma Silvert Tatamane and Silvert Manual Silvert Tatamane and Silvert Manual Silvert Tatamane and Silvert Silvert Flamma Silvert Silvert Flamma Silvert Silvert Flamma Silvert Silvert Manual S

Appendix B-2 LWC OPTION



Water Supply Option Analyzis Louisville Water Compony Louisville Water Compony Option

	Basis 2007	2008	2009 2010	2011	2012 2013	3 2014	4 2015	5	2016
Phase One Capital Expenditure Pipeline	\$ 66,528,000 \$	\$ 33,264,000 \$	33,264,000 \$	5	57	s	s	s	
Ky. River Crossing Booster Purmo Station & Storade 🕫	1,700,000		876.350 2,371,300						
Initial Capital Exponditures	\$ 72,828,000 \$	\$ 30,511,050 \$	36,511,650 S	5	.	v >	s	s ,	
Contingency _{c2}	20% 14,565,600 14,604,660	7,302,330	7,302,330		,				
Opinion of Probabia Construction Cost	87,393,600 87,627,060	43,813,980	43,813,080						
Easomonis and Pormitting u. Engineering, Legdi, Aramitting u. Land (4 Actes for Boczter Pump Station) Capital Cost	5% 5 4,209,080 5 4,381,308 20% 17,478,720 17,525,502 2.40% 65,000 87,040 5 109,327,000 5 109,621,990	2,100,600 \$ 8,762,706 43,520 5 54,610,905 \$	2,100,600 S 8,762,706 43,520 54,810,005 S	о о ,	из из ,	თ თ 	a a	v v	
Issuence Cost ₁₀ Capitalizad Interest ₁₀ Total Phase One Capital Expenditure	1% 5 1,093,270 5 1,096,220 4.7% 2.369,195 2.576,117 5 113,204,327 5 112,086,455 5 113,204,327 5	S 548,110 S 1,288,058 S 50,047,103 S	548,110 \$ 548,110 \$ 50,047,103 \$	s s .	0 0 1 .	s		o o	• • .
Loss Grant	\$								
Total Not Capital Cost	\$ 113.294.327								
Phase Two Capital Expanditures 44 Mile 30 Parailel Transmission Line Kentucky River Crossing	0.00% \$ 	ν ν	о , ,	თ თ	və 	v i 	1 2	ы 	
New boostiar Pump Station and storage Initial Capital Exponditures	, s . s	S			, ,	s	5	.	
Contingency ₁₃ ,	. \$. 5 . \$ %0	s s			1 29	v	\$.	,
Opinian of Probabio Construction Cost		5 5	\$	s S	s	5	\$	s	
Ecsements and Permiting us Ensineerins, Legal, Administrative us	0% 5 · 5 · 5	0 , . 0		s 	vs 	s	v >	10	
Capitalized Interest (0) Capital Cost	0% · · · · ·	vi , vi	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		, ,	s			
lacuarce Coci, ₁₀ Total Phase Two Capital Exponditures	0% · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	S . S						.	
Grand Total Capital Exponditures - Phase One and Two	\$ 113,204,327		29	2 , S	v	s	s	s ·	
Operations and Maintenance Expenses			.		.		31 3 001 Val	403 0EA C	108 600
Electricity _{.es} Mainterance	2.40% · \$	va va		1/0,400 96,756	n	•	•	•	108,938
Whilesale Vater Cost (a)			3,744,900	3,857,247 19,077	4				4,471,608 22,116
meter Untrage Total Annual Operating Expenses (\$1000 gallon)	s S 4,0	S 187'071'5 S	4,272,328 \$ 4,3	S.4.5	4 10	4,663,176 \$	4,801,269
Total Annual Operating Exponses (\$)	ບ ບ	s s	. \$ 1.84	\$ 1.80 \$	1.95 \$	2.01 \$	2.07 \$	2.13 S	2.19
Other Operating Expenses Debt Service - Phase One _{tte}	, , , ,	ы , ,	. \$ 8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222 \$	8,861,222 \$ 8,5	8,861,222 \$ 8,8	8,861,222 \$ 8,8	8,861,222 \$	8,861,222
Doit Servica - Phaze Two _{in} KRA Withdrawl Fee Total Other Operating Expenses	s		5 8.070,722	100.500 \$ 8.970,722 \$	100,500 8,070,722 \$ 8.0	100,500 11 8,970,722 \$ 8,0	100,500 10 8,070,722 \$ 8.0	100,500 8.070,722 \$	109,500 8,970,722
Ranowal and Roplacement Fund (Transmission) Renowal and Roplacement Fund (Tradiment Plant)	1.33% 2.5%		050,275	887,040	BB7,040 B	887,040 8	887,040 81	687,040	887,040 887,040
Total R & R Fund		, ,	6/7/05R -	040'/00	v	6	5	in	14,059,031
Total Annual Expenses (\$)		, v , v	· ·	ž.	s	5	s	6.63 S	6.69
our Artistan Layousses (aroos station)		s	\$ 11,870,477	\$ 11,301,800 \$	10.075.849 \$	10.576.986 \$ 10.1	\$ 10,104,475 \$ 9,827,600	27.609 \$	9,475,711
Total Discounted Cost _{fra} 5 Discount Rate	174,025.810 4,7%								
 Motors: Hardine para (§) SDO(Dos KAN Recuest): Ge Documenta: - Eliqiveril/Sividitad Hardine para (§) SDO(Dos KAN Recuest): Ge Documenta: - Eliqiveril/Sividitad Storate Trans. S2: Im Booscar Primo Station - S2: Clin Nath Initiated to 2007 \$5. Claiment: Flemma Report As a Breechaster of Primol Constituence. A station of Primol Primal Primol Primal Primal Primal Primal Primol Primol Primol P	la: Gannett Flemma Report b: Gannett Flemma Report 6 M Cozic New WTP KAW Dr. P. Cozic New WTP KAW								
12) Total of all econtract discontant is 2007 dollars 12) Total of all econtract discontant is 2007 dollars 13) Total 4 KAW Amutal O & M Expenses									

Water Supply Option Analysis Louisville Water Company Louisville Water Company Option

	Basis	•	2100	2018	0100	0502	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026		2027	2028	2029	002
Phase One Capital Expenditure				1							v	v	5	v i		S.	
Pypeline ₍₁₎ Ky. River Crossing	3.1% S 3.1% S	66,526,000 \$ 1.700,000		•	n	n	n	n	•		•	•	•	•			
Boocter Pump Station & Storage _{i2} , Initial Capital Expenditures	3.1% 5	4,600,000 72,828,000 \$				 \$				s	s	s	s	v	s	ю .	-
Contingency ₁₂₁	20%	14,585,600			Ŧ		,										
Opinian al Probable Canstruction Cost		87,303,600	¥														
Easomonts and Pormitting ₄₁	5% \$	4,369,680 \$				s	s	•	5	s	5	\$	%	9 	• •	s , ,	
Engineoring, Logal, Administrative ₄₁ Land (4 Acres for Booster Pump Station) ₄₂		17,478,720 85,000	• •			•••											
Capital Cost	s	100,327,000 \$				v	s	w	v		n	^				• •	
Issuance Cost ₍₇₎	196 S 4 700	1,093,270 \$ 2 540 185		• .		•••	s	5	УЗ	 s	s	8	• • •	us 	• • •	ا م 	
-upplements under ext (a) Total Phase One Capital Expenditure	s	112,080,455 S				s		s	s	s	ŝ	so	v	.		.	
Loss Grant																	
Total Not Capital Cost																	
Phase Two Capital Expenditures 44 Mile 30" Parallel Transmission Line	0.00% \$.			S	sə	, s	\$	v	S	ŝ	s,	s	N	.	s	
Kentucky River Crossing New booster Pump Station and storage Latiat Cronalial Erenanditrine	0.00% S	v	. .			, . s		s	. . 		s s	5		, .	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ي ا . ا.	
	\$ %0					, v	və	s	s	s	vi	w	s	у	υ	1 2	
	v				v	5	s		və	13	s	s	s	s	s	s	
Upinion of Probable Conservation Cost		•	, ,						v	v	•	5	ю	59	s ,	s '	
Easomonts and Pormitting 4) Enginoering, Logal, Administrative 4)	^ % 5	n 			 0	 •	 D	•	, ,	•						. 1	
Capitaizad interest _(c) Capital Cost	0% \$		1 vs . .				s				lus l	,	s	v		0 .	
Issuance Cost ()							5	. . م	, ,		s.	.	"		. .		
								ŝ	0	v	s	\$	03	v	S		
Grand 1 otal Capital Exponditures - Phase Une and 1 we	,																
Operations and Maintenance Expenses Electricity tet	s	.		208,257	\$ 213,255	ŝ	ŝ	14 \$ 228,980	s	s	5 245,866	s	251,767 \$ 138.005	257,809 \$	263,997 \$ 144.803	270,332 \$ 148 279	276,820 151.837
Maintenance, _{1:2} Whiolesate Water Cost _{in}	2 40%		111.552 4,605.755	114,230 4,743,927	116,971 4,886,245						5,6		6,009,465	6,189,749	6,375,442	6,568,705	6,763,706
Meter Charge T-viel Annual Onerwiter Exnenses (\$1000 radian)	S	د .	22,779 4,043,462	23,403 \$ 5,080,876	24,167 \$ 5,240,038	S	5	38 20,408 23 \$ 5,720,317	8 27,200 7 \$ 5,880,700	28,010 \$ 6,064,314	s S	s	0,429,049 \$	30,614 6,619,581 S	31,532 6,815,773 S	32,4/8 7,017,794 S	7,225,816
Total Annual Operating Exponses (5)	s	υ ν	2.20 \$	26.2	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.46	s	2.54 \$ 2.61	1 \$ 2.69	S 2.77	s	2.85 \$	2.04 \$	3.02 \$	3.11 \$	3.20 \$	3.30
Other Operating Expenses Dart Service - Physic Oper	ŝ	<i>и</i> л	8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	\$ 8,861,222	5 8,861,222	2 \$ 8,861,222	22 \$ 8,861,222	2 \$ 8,661,222	S 8,861,222	2 \$ 8,861,222	s	8,861,222 \$	8,861,222 \$	B,861,222 \$	8,861,222 \$	
Debt Service - Phase Two	50.05		100 500												109.500	109,500	109,500
KAN WURDERME FOO Total Other Operating Expenses	- s		8,970,722	\$ 8,070,722	\$ 8,970,722	\$ 8,970,722	2 \$ 8,070,722	22 \$ 8.970,722	2 \$ 8.070.722	S 8,970,722	2 \$ 8.070.722	ŝ	s	\$	8.070.722 \$		109,500
Renowal and Replacement Fund (Transmission) nin	1.33%		887,040	887,040	887,040	887,040	0 887,040	40 887,040	0 887,040	887,040	010,788		887,040	887,040	887,040	887,040	887,040
Renewal and Replacement Fund (Treatment Plant) n:: Total R & R Fund	9,07	I	887,040	887.040	987,040	887,040	0 887.040	40 887,040	0 387,040	0+0.188	3 867.040		687,040	887.040	687.040	010,040	887,040
Тоtal Аллиаl Ехропsos (\$)	s	S	14,801,224	5 14,047,638	S 15,008,400	\$ 15,253,037	7 S 15,413,485	85 \$ 15,578,079	9 S 15,747,581	\$ 15 022 070	3 \$ 10,101,775	s	10.280.811 S	16,477,343 \$	16,673,535 \$	10,875,553 \$	8.222,356
Total Annual Exponses (\$1000 gallon)	s		6.76	S 0.83	\$ 0.80	\$ 8.97	ŝ	7.04 \$ 7.11	1 \$ 7.19	S 127	w	7.35 \$	7.44 S	7.52 \$	7.01 \$	7.71 \$	3.75
Discounted Value	ŝ	у ,	9,138,133	5 8,814,258	\$ 8,503,494	\$ 8.205.276		\$ 7,919,000 \$ 7,844,348 \$ 7,380,623	4 S 7,380,62	\$ 7,127,427	7 \$ 6,884,303	ŝ	6,850,829 S	0.420.584 \$	0.211.170 S	6.004.230 \$	2.794,147
al Discounted Cost (12) \$	174,025,816																
Uscount Mate	ł																
nile pipe @ \$3000/foot KAW Request for Documents - Bridwell'S vindland	0																

info paper dis Stotoric KWA Research for Documents - Binkwell/Stotefund and Final - St. In Bocartel Parino Station - St. On both inflated to 2007 Str. Gameet Flemma Report e of Initial Catantia Estremations i entimation of Continued Flemaback Construction Cost : The Telemony - Stondard with Indiata used dumin construction Rep. 2. (In Catantia Development Cost) of Strataming 2 year buildout for facture the Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW in the Reasters with name of Inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is 2.17 increases with name of Inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is 2.17 increases with name of Inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is 2.17 increases with name of Inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is an expensive characterized and inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is an expensive characterized and inflation and ware usates - Table 4 Annual O. & M. Costo New WTP. KAW is an expensive characterized and inflation and ware at a 4 XAW Annual O. & M. Expensive